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PREFACE TO PHILOSOPHICAL RUMINATIONS

This slightly ironically-titled collection of revised and reformatted weblogs, written intermittently between 2006-7, chews the philosophic cud in a variety of settings, some metaphysical, others not so metaphysical (as in the opening supernote), but does so with an essayistic flair that owes more, I think, to the blogging medium from which these supernotes were derived than to any conscious intent on my part to be essayistic or discursive. Nonetheless, these supernotes – habitually defined by me as aphoristic essays and/or essayistic aphorisms – are recognizably a part of my overall literary canon, and I think the reader familiar with my works in general would find ample evidence of fresh cud-chewing of an ideologically-motivated nature to satisfy his hunger for Social Theocratic truth.

John O’Loughlin, London 2007 (Revised 2012)
PHILOSOPHICAL RUMINATIONS
GROWING OLD WITH YOUNG MUSICIANS

They say that people outgrow music or, at least, certain musical tastes, and that is doubtless true. For I no longer take much interest in classical or jazz, which used to preoccupy me a great deal more than ever it does at present. I was always keen on rock music, particularly what is called progressive rock, but even that changes and one finds oneself listening to what is called heavy metal and, by contrast, electronica, meaning Tangerine Dream-like stuff which is likely to be synthesizer-based instrumental. Not that one listens to a great deal of it or all that often. There are other things besides music; but, all the same, if I had to describe my predominating tastes at present it would be heavy metal and electronica, and would include such bands as Motorhead, Iron Maiden, the Spiritual Beggars, Black Label Society (BLS), Michael Schenker Group (MSG), King Crimson, the aforementioned Tangerine Dream, and - yes - Arch Enemy. I don't know what it is about them, maybe a combination of factors including Michael Amott (also of Spiritual Beggars), but their music and lyrics impress me sufficiently for me to want to rate them as high if not higher than all the rest. And I'm fifty-four, for christs sake! Anyway, it seems to me that age is not really - thank god! - a problem in regard to taste and that, when push comes to shove, one would rather listen to good contemporary music, with a 2000+ date, than simply regurgitate the past or, worse, dwell on the past as though nothing else mattered. Certainly it is good to keep the faith with some of one's old favourites, and it sure as hell makes one feel better to be buying and/or listening to someone approximately one's own age who, like Alice Cooper or Ozzy Osbourne or even Deep Purple, is still, to all appearances, 'going strong' and sounding hip. But I couldn't do that exclusively, and I thank my lucky stars, or whatever it is, that I am flexible enough to change with the times and grow new tastebuds with the passing of time.

DISTINGUISHING ‘OLOGY’ FROM ‘OSOPHY’ IN KNOWLEDGE AND TRUTH

I've often thought that philosophy is a hyped term which is generally used to describe a love of truth when, in point of fact, it is only a love of knowledge, which is something of a (physical) shortfall from the metaphysical nature (sic) of truth. Besides, if philosophy is a love of
knowledge then surely philology would be a more suitable term for the pursuit of knowledge, something analogous to theology having to do with the pursuit of truth and not the love of truth, which I should imagine would be theosophical in character, using that term, like the aforementioned one, in a wholly novel and more metaphysically pertinent way than is usually the case. Thus theology would stand to theosophy as philology to philosophy - as an egoistic alternative to anything psychoistic, and therefore having more to do with truth than joy, not to mention, where philology and philosophy are concerned, with knowledge than pleasure. Yet even the expression 'love of' is problematic in this context, love being irrelevant to both metaphysics and physics. Rather could it be said that there is pleasure in knowledge and joy in truth; though knowledge can also lead to pleasure and truth to joy, which, if experienced for their own sake, would transcend both a 'love of knowledge' and a 'love of truth', being arguably more than either philosophical or theosophical. For ego and soul are both aspects of psyche, the difference between the two (male) contexts normally being that soul tends to revolve around ego in the case of physics and ego around soul in the case of metaphysics, where theology should lead beyond theosophy, or a 'love of truth' and, hence, God, to something approximating a heavenly redemption of ego in pure soul, which would truly be the joyful transcendence of both theology and theosophy.

**THE REAL TRUTH ABOUT BEING**

As a self-taught philosopher, or thinker, I have long maintained that being, metaphysical being, is inconceivable without the assistance, in antimetachemistry, of antidoing, its female or, more correctly, antifemale corollary. For unless doing is 'brought low', as from metachemistry to antimetachemistry, space to antispace, there can be no 'rising up' of being, as from antimetaphysics to metaphysics, antitime to time, and hence the repudiation of what can be called antibeing under doing. Being requires antidoing no less, across the axial divide, than doing, its metachemical antithesis, the antimetaphysical corollary of antibeing, since neither can be unequivocally hegemonic unless their respective gender complements are 'upended' and effectively subordinated to their control. Now what applies unequivocally on the noumenal planes of space/antitime and time/antispace applies to an equivocal degree, with due axial subversion having to be borne in mind, on the phenomenal planes of volume/antimass and mass/antivolume, where the equivocal hegemony of physical taking requires the 'upended' subordination of antichemical
antigiving, its 'antifemale' complement, in relative contrast to the
subordination of antiphysical antitaking under an equivocally hegemonic
chemical giving. For unless giving is 'brought low', as from chemistry to
antichemistry, volume to antivolume, there can be no 'rising up' of taking,
as from antiphysics to physics, antimass to mass, and hence the
repudiation of what has been called antitaking under giving. But this is
not universally established or encouraged, since these phenomenal
positions are also subject, as intimated above, to axial interplay with their
sensual or sensible (depending on the axis) noumenal counterparts, and
this is what paradoxically precludes a simple switch from phenomenal
sensuality/antisensibility to phenomenal sensibility/antisensuality on the
part of those who, under Catholic guidance traditionally, would more
relate to the possibility of some degree of being and/or antidoing as the
solution to their lowly predicament in giving and/or antitaking than a
straightforward switch, across the axial divide, from that to taking and/or
antigiving, as the gender case may be. For the Catholic Church, relative
to Western civilization, is the 'one true' church, the one that offers a
degree of being and/or antidoing to those who have not 'sold out', usually
via some degree of puritanical rejection of Anglicanism, to taking and/or
antigiving, but such a Church, being Western, is still a far cry from global
universality, which transcends both the West and the East alike, and
therefore its 'take' on being and/or antidoing is less than what could be
and, hopefully, will be independently of such a church when once the
march of global civilization reaches its sensible/antisensual destiny in the
light of a metaphysics that is unequivocally hegemonic over
antimetachemistry and not subject, as is Catholic Christianity and indeed
Christianity in general, to the subversion of metaphysics by
metachemistry hipped as metaphysics in time-honoured, alpha-stemming,
Old Testament fashion, with Devil the Mother hied as God (the Father)
always precluding anything but a Son-like fulcrum in relation to itself
which, even in the Catholic postulate of a resurrected Saviour, persists as
a sort of paradoxical extrapolation to the detriment of metaphysical
independence and, hence, freedom. For there can be no such
independence in the 'Son', only in relation to a 'Father' who precedes 'His
Son', as psyche precedes soma in male actuality, independently of
metachemical subversion and therefore on the basis of metaphysical
freedom and the repudiation, democratically and peaceably, of Devil the
Mother hied as God, without which there can be no authentic
metaphysical being, much less beingful approach to antidoing, in
metaphysical bound soma, of the Son, and therefore no authentic and
fully universal truth. Catholicism may appertain to the 'one true church',
but such a church, being Christian, i.e. centred in the 'Son', still falls short
of global universality and, hence, the transcendence of everything rooted
in Old Testament Creatorism, with its hype of Devil the Mother as God. We advocates of global universality, whom I have in the past identified with and continue to identify with Social Theocracy, can no more endorse the West than the East where religion is concerned. We are beyond both traditions in our revolutionary advocacy of the one true centre. And yet we are the profoundest theocrats. For Devil the Mother hyped as God the Father was never truly theocratic but autocracy in disguise, the sugar coating, as it were, of the bitter pill of metachemical autocracy, the 'best of a bad job', to speak colloquially, and we repudiate all autocracy and everything that pays tribute, in aediculated architectural vein, to Creatorism. If we refuse to regard ourselves as 'atheist' it is because that would be to pay too much credit to what was never properly theocratic to begin with, but effectively antitheocratic in its autocratic roots. There is nothing atheist about Social Theocracy, and for that reason it can only encourage true being and not the subversion of being by doing and, hence, the vitiation of being in relation to what fundamentally remains contrary to it. The real truth about being is that it has never really come to pass because doing has been hyped as being pretty much as the cosmos as universal and the first-mover She as He. We absolutely reject this fundamental lie from the standpoint of truth.

**DISTINGUISHING BEAUTY FROM TRUTH AND TRUTH FROM BEAUTY**

Some say that beauty is truth and truth beauty, but they couldn't be more wrong so far as I'm concerned. Beauty and love, which hang together like will and spirit in metachemistry, are a product of noumenally objective appearances, whereas truth and joy, which hang together like ego and soul in metaphysics, are the product of noumenally subjective essences. Thus there is all the difference between alpha and omega, appearance and essence, between beauty and truth, love and joy, and incompatible they remain. Either you defer to the outer heat of metachemical free soma or, in rejecting it, you cultivate the inner light of metaphysical free psyche. The one is absolutely female, the other absolutely male. Outer heat is as incompatible with inner light as spatial space with repetitive time; for space and time are absolutely antithetical, like alpha and omega. But outer heat can rule the outer mode of time, which I call antitime, and equate with an antimetaphysical subjection to the spatial space of metachemistry which takes the form of sequential time. Contrariwise, inner light can rule ('lead' would probably be too soft a term here for what amounts to a gender distinction) the inner mode of
space, which I call antispace, and equate with an antimetachemical subjection to the repetitive time of metaphysics which takes the form of spaced space. Hence either females get the better of males, who become antimale, or males get the better of females, who become antifemale. Yet to the truth-rejecting male, the antimetaphysical antimale, beauty may well seem like truth, since it is what rules him and keeps him in subjection to its metachemical appearance. Likewise, if from a contrary gender standpoint, truth may well seem like beauty to the beauty-rejecting female, the antimetachemical antifemale, since it is what rules over her and keeps her in subjection to its metaphysical essence. Lacking truth-proper, which is inner, the antimetaphysical antimale may well project his sense of truth onto beauty and convince himself that beauty is truth. Lacking beauty-proper, which is outer, the antimetachemical antifemale may well project her sense of beauty onto truth and convince herself that truth is beauty. Neither one of them is correct. There is no more, strictly speaking, any such thing as outer truth than there is inner beauty. Truth is by definition inner and beauty outer, essence and appearance. The worship of beauty is only possible because of the absence of truth, while, conversely, the worship of truth is only possible because of the absence of beauty. It is the absence of truth from antimetaphysical antimales that makes the worship of metachemical beauty possible for them and, conversely, the absence of beauty from antimetachemical antifemales that makes the worship of metaphysical truth possible for them, albeit in both cases the worship of the ruling, or hegemonic, factor is not equivalent to that factor as such, but is only a symptom of subjection. Beauty does not worship itself but projects itself objectively as a metachemical expression of spatial space, which is the appearance of outer heat. Neither does truth worship itself because, being intensely subjective, it is a metaphysical impression of repetitive time, which is the essence of inner light. Space and time are as incompatible as appearance and essence, and therefore beauty is never truth nor truth ever beauty. Beauty rules over the antitruthful want of truth as space over antitime, spatial appearance over sequential anti-essence, while, conversely, truth rules over the antibeautiful want of beauty as time over antispace, repetitive essence over spaced anti-appearance. Either the noumenally objective heat of metachemistry rules over the noumenally antisubjective antilight of antimetaphysics as Vanity Fair over Anti-Celestial City or, across the upper-order planes of what is an axial divide, the noumenally subjective light of metaphysics rules over the noumenally anti-objective antiheat of antimetachemistry as the Celestial City over Anti-Vanity Fair. You can't have it both ways, for you cannot be simultaneously superheathen and/or anti-superchristian and superchristian and/or anti-superheathen, alpha and/or anti-omega or
omega and/or anti-alpha. But the latter is much harder, much more difficult, of attainment than the former, which is in general terms everywhere the alpha rather than the omega of civilization and therefore that which is most basic and, at certain epochs (of which the present is a case in point), by far the more prevalent, and not just - though certainly more so - among juveniles!

**DISTINGUISHING CULTURE FROM CIVILITY ON GENUINE AND PSEUDO AXIAL TERMS**

One has to distinguish, whether one likes it or not, between genuine culture and pseudo-civility, the respective attributes of metaphysics and antimetachemistry at the northeast point of what I like to think of as the intercardinal axial compass, and pseudo-culture and genuine civility, the respective attributes of physics and anticchemistry at the southeast point of the said compass. For not only are these pairings distinct from each other, but they appertain to two diametrically antithetical axes, the church-hegemonic/state-subordinate axis that also embraces, at its southwest point, chemistry and antiphysics, or pseudo-barbarity and genuine philistinism, and the state-hegemonic/church-subordinate axis that also embraces, at its northwest point, metachemistry and antimetaphysics, barbarity and pseudo-philistinism. That said, it should be evident that a polarity between philistinism and culture on the one hand and pseudo-barbarity and pseudo-civility on the other ... should not be confounded with the polarity between barbarity and civility on the one hand and pseudo-philistinism and pseudo-culture on the other.... The polarities of each axis are as distinct as their respective components, and that is why they rarely or never see eye-to-eye, as it were, across the axial divide, but remain symptomatic of ethnic incompatibility and rivalry. But pseudo-culture and civility (the genuine article) are no less guilty of hyping the pseudo-cultural element to the standing of genuine culture than they are of hyping Man to the standing of God. Unfortunately or fortunately, depending on your standpoint, there is all the axial difference in the world - and even above it - between these two superficially parallel but diametrically incompatible elements! Pseudo-culture is *not* and never has been or ever will be genuinely cultural, but the worldly opponent of such culture that puts commercial considerations above the truth or, at the very least, the artist's endeavour to be as sincere and honest in his pursuance of self-enlightenment, of self-discovery, as he possibly can be. No one who has been published in book form on the basis of commercial expedience or in relation to commercial sense is or ever can be a genuine artist, a
purchaser of genuine culture. Books are illustrative of pseudo-culture in
the pocket of civility and are axially beholden to pseudo-philistinism in
the pocket (hegemonically speaking) of barbarity. They are no more
expressive of genuine culture (coupled to pseudo-civility) than Man is
expressive of God. And by 'God' I do not mean Devil the Mother hyped
as God (in metachemistry), but the genuine metaphysical article, which is
God the Father in metaphysical free psyche and the Son of God in
metaphysical bound soma, psyche preceding soma as 'father' preceding
'son' in male actuality. The Son of Man, which is the more prevalent take
on humanism, is not even on the physically free-psychic level of Man the
Father, an almost unheard of term. But he is still hyped nonetheless, like
the bullshit that passes for truth or, in colloquial terms, for bullgas.

EXAMINING THE SENSIBLE REJECTION OF SENSUALITY
FROM THE STANDPOINT OF ELITES

The general rule on either a noumenal or a phenominal, an ethereal or a
corporeal, basis, is that the male comes properly to pass in sensibility in
consequence of having rejected the antimale whose subordination to the
female in sensuality precluded his moral enlightenment and kept him
more or less in the position of an Antichrist. For antigods, whether as
bound psychic antifathers or free somatic antisons, only exist by dint of
the hegemony of devils, whether as free somatic mothers or bound
psychic daughters, as antimetaphysics under metachemistry or, in terms
of plane, antitime under space. Likewise antimen, whether as bound
psychic antifathers or free somatic antisons, only exist by dint of the
hegemony of women, whether as free somatic mothers or bound psychic
daughters, as antiphysics under chemistry or, in terms of plane, antimass
under volume. For gods and men to respectively come properly to pass,
there must be a sensible rejection of antigods and antimen, the former,
whether as free psychic fathers or bound somatic sons, constraining the
noumenal female-become-antifemale to the subordinate status of
antidevils, whether as bound somatic antimothers or free psyche
antidaughters, as antimetachemistry under metaphysics or, in terms of
plane, antispance under time, and the latter, whether as free psychic fathers
or bound somatic sons, constraining the phenomenal female-become-
antifemale to the subordinate status of antiwomen, whether as bound
somatic antimothers or free psychic antidaughters, as antichemistry under
physics or, in terms of plane, antivolume under mass. Hence no antidevils
in antimetachemical antispance without gods in metaphysical time, and no
antiwomen in antichemical antivolume without men in physical mass.
But the rejection of antimetaphysics by the metaphysical is from pseudo-meekness to righteousness and brings in its train the eclipse of vanity by pseudo-justice as metachemistry is abandoned for antimetachemistry by noumenal females-become-antifemales, whereas the rejection of antiphysics by the physical is from meekness to pseudo-righteousness and brings in its train the eclipse of pseudo-vanity by justice as chemistry is abandoned for antichemistry by phenomenal females-become-antifemales. For the unequivocal hegemony of metaphysics over antimatetachemistry is not subject, like its physical counterpart, to axial subversion at the hands of its female complement, but is free to maintain a psychic emphasis at the expense of bound soma. With physics, as with the physical, by contrast, the equivocal hegemony finds itself subject to antichemical subversion to bound somatic emphasis in consequence of the gender-based axial polarity that antichemistry establishes with metachemistry or, rather, that metachemistry, ever somatically free, establishes with antichemistry to the detriment of psychic freedom. The pseudo-righteous are subject to somatic emphasis at the expense of free psyche, whereas the righteous-proper are in an axial position, unequivocally hegemonic over antimatetachemistry and axially antithetical to antiphysics, to maintain a free psychic emphasis and to constrain the antiphysical, their gender counterparts, to bound psychic emphasis at the expense of free soma, thereby precluding what would otherwise be a heathenistic emphasis, under the chemical hegemonic pressures of free females, on free soma. Such are the paradoxes of axial polarity, whether the axis be church-hegemonic/state-subordinate, as in the metaphysical-antiphysical and antimatetachemical-chemical case, or state-hegemonic/church-subordinate, as in the metachemical-antichemical and antimatetaphysical-physical case. But, contrary to this, are the respective class rejections of sensuality by sensible males which broadly establish the representative elites on either a righteous or a pseudo-righteous basis, with antifemale pseudo-justice or genuine justice their respective subordinate corollaries. The salvation of the antiphysical to metaphysics and the counter-damnation of the chemical to antimatetachemistry is a quite separate and more paradoxically problematic matter that has not yet achieved its final, because maximum, solution. Contrariwise, the damnation of the metachemical to antichemistry and the counter-salvation of the antimatetaphysical to physics will only ensue to anything like a conclusive extent in the wake of the achievement of class-elevated salvation and counter-damnation, the class-elevated as opposed to class-modified options hitherto being very much, despite appearances to the contrary, the exception to the general rule, since it is easier to transfer from sensuality to sensibility on either a noumenal or a phenomenal basis than to be transformed from the phenomenal to the noumenal or from the
noumenal to the phenomenal on a sensual/sensible basis, as the class case may be. Yet even so, there are sound traditional reasons why the transference from sensuality to sensibility, to speak in general terms, on the phenomenal planes has not been encouraged and why, in consequence of axial intransigence, phenomenal sensibility was achieved more in relation to a puritanical rejection of Anglican interference than as a consequence of mass Catholic transfers from the alpha to omega, as it were, of worldly alternatives.

THE INSTINCTIVE IRRATIONAL REDUCTIONISM OF POPULAR EXPLETIVES

Just as the phrase 'sonofabitch' is logically incorrect, insofar as one can only be an 'antison' of a 'bitch' in the sense of that which antichristically lines up either as antimetaphysics under metachemistry or as antiphysics under chemistry, the hegemonic position of somatic freedom being in each case female and, hence a 'mother', so such terribly populist terms-of-abuse as 'motherfucking' and 'motherfucker' are completely illogical as far as their relevance to the contexts - metachemical or chemical - of 'mothers' is concerned. In fact, such expressions simply mirror the instinctive or instinctual nature of expletives generally. For, in reality, both the metachemical and chemical positions should be identified with the specifically female attributes, in noumenal objectivity and phenomenal objectivity, of somatic licence, which are 'frigging' in the one case and 'sucking' in the other. Hence the phrase 'motherfrigging' for metachemical objectivity and 'mothersucking' for chemical objectivity would be logically more sustainable than the populist - albeit aggressively generalized - term, 'motherfucking'. But just as a somatically free 'antison' (not to mention psychically bound 'antifather') lines up under a somatically free 'mother' (not to mention psychically bound 'daughter') in both noumenal and phenomenal modes of sensuality, and more gender representatively in terms of antisensibility than of sensuality, so one could - though not necessarily should - speak of an 'antisnogging-antison' in the case of antimetaphysical antisubjectivity and an 'antifucking-antison' in the case of antiphysical antisubjectivity, the antimal free-somatic converse, in each case, of a hegemonic 'snogging-son' in metaphysical sensibility and a hegemonic 'fucking-son' in physical sensibility, not to mention of a 'snogging-father' and a 'fucking-father' where the free psychic aspects of such metaphysical and physical hegemonies are concerned. For free psyche is simply the concomitant of bound soma, which both the metaphysical and physical 'sons' are
illustrative of. However that may be, the corollary, from an antifemale standpoint, of metaphysics is antimetachemistry and hence what could vis-à-vis the 'son' be called an 'antifrigging-antimother', whereas the corollary of physics is antichemistry and hence what could vis-à-vis the 'son' be called an 'antisucking-antimother'. Thus, even without reference to 'antidaughter' positions in both antimetachemistry and antichemistry, both of which would have more to do, under male-hegemonic pressures, with free psyche than bound soma, the overall perspective on such terms is far more complex than a simple generalized - and fundamentally irrational - instinctive reductionism would have us believe. Just as 'sons-of-bitches' only exist in the imagination of those who resort to such language, so such complementary terminology as 'motherfucking' and 'motherfucker' fail to stand up to logical scrutiny. Yet, in the heat of the moment, such instinctive populism as passes muster will always curry favour with the broad masses at the expense of that which only flows, after all, from a considered analysis by a mind at an intellectual remove from expletive instinct, and therefore determined not only to apply more apposite terminology - no matter how unpleasant such terms may be - but to broaden out the perspective until every factor is embraced and one can see why such and such a term has specific applicability to only one point or position on the overall compass, so to speak, of alternative options.

FREEDOM AND DETERMINISM

What if the much-vaunted dichotomy between determinism and free will is really a fallacy? For can't free will be a product of determinism? I mean, nature flourishes on both free will and free spirit, and therefore can it not be said that both are determined by the underlining drive to either wilful (instinctual) or spiritual freedom of nature? Certainly there is, as I have sought to logically demonstrate in the past, a distinction between somatic freedom as a product of natural determinism and psychic freedom as a product of, well, a certain supernatural or cultural determinism, with metachemistry and chemistry lining up on ...