

END STATION J J



John O'Loughlin

Centretruths Digital Media

END STATION J J

JOHN O'LOUGHLIN

This edition of *End Station J J* first published 2022 by Centretruths Digital Media

Copyright © 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: 978-1-716-00221-2

* * * *

Today is my birthday, and I find it is just another day, but one in which – thank God!
– I am one day closer to death. Frankly, it seems to me that (women, youths, and kids notwithstanding) the only (male) people who celebrate their birthdays are fools, for whom the curse (of life) that was inflicted upon them, by circumstances of which at the time they knew nothing, is something in which to rejoice and even for which to be grateful! The idiots!

Increasingly, the word 'discrimination', or the ability to discriminate (as between good and evil) has become a term of abuse, to be levelled against those – usually upper-order types – who can (still) discriminate, whether morally (on the basis of male vis-à-vis pseudo-female) or immorally (on the basis of female vis-à-vis pseudo-male), with the kinds of theocratic and autocratic antithetical implications that lower-order types normally 'fight shy of', given their amoral bias and tendency, in consequence, to avoid discriminating, on whichever basis. Yet the only result of this lower-order predilection (of the democratic and/or plutocratic) is to increase equalitarianism (or egalitarianism, as some prefer) and, hence, whatever conduces to either civilized decadence or subcivilized (uniconical) degeneration from (biconical) civilization, of whichever sort.

There are people – an awful lot of them – who have no religion (nor, properly considered, even science) simply because they are too low (and therefore plebeian) for any such acquirement, even as it derives, via extrapolation, from properly upper-order positions.

When there is neither ruling (autocracy) nor leading (theocracy) there will be only representing (democracy) or profiteering (plutocracy), both of which are amoral in their antithetical ways, with a tendency, in consequence, to avoid discriminating (even on necessarily Comparative terms) from either Immoral or Moral standpoints.

Multiculturalism – is that not just another word for cultural anarchy, the kind of thing that no self-respecting people with a uniform culture, developed over many centuries, could possibly endorse.

Getting involved with a woman – is that not the last thing a man of God would do? Whereas for the common man, it is the only solution to an otherwise ego-ridden solitary predicament.

Beauty (to generalize non-ratio specifically) is the Devil's mask which enables Her to achieve Her reproductive ends (in nature). It (beauty) has nothing to do with Truth; it is simply a Fact.

Beauty is a scientific Fact that religious Truth (when religion is genuine) strives to subordinate to itself by first moderating and then neutralizing (within reason) its freedom of manoeuvre. For morality (which is religious) can have it no other way.

And that is as it should be!

There is Supermorality/Subimmorality in Supermetaphysics/Submetachemistry, and Superimmorality/Submorality in Supermetachemistry/Submetaphysics, the former leading, via extrapolation, to Morality/Unimmorality; the latter ... to Immorality/Unmorality.

Being against these extrapolations, which hover just above each of the lower-order positions (or atoms), leads, in due course, to antithetical kinds of amorality/unamorality, which, whether in physics/unchemistry or in chemistry/unphysics, are of the 'world' in strictly lower-order secular terms, the amorality/unamorality ($2\frac{1}{2}:1\frac{1}{2}$) of plutocracy/undemocracy (in psyche/unsoma) contrasting with the amorality/unamorality ($2\frac{1}{2}:1\frac{1}{2}$) of democracy/unplutocracy (in soma/unpsyche), in what are antithetical approaches to secular worldliness.

The 'people', when left to their own (secular) devices, are neither Moral/Unimmoral or Immoral/Unmoral, neither Religious/Unscientific or Scientific/Unreligious, but simply economic/unpolitical (in plutocracy/undemocracy) or political/uneconomic (in democracy/unplutocracy), with subordinate (pseudo-gender) positions mirroring these dichotomous alternatives on reverse ratio terms, as with the upper-order positions as such, where not 3:1 one way or the other (psyche/soma or soma/psyche) but 1:3 either way will be the appropriate subordinate situations, both of which will – or would have been – just as capable of fostering pseudo-extrapolations in the wake of the extrapolations of the hegemonic atomic antithesis, and be no less subject, moreover, to both extrapolations (hegemonic) and pseudo-extrapolations (subordinate) issuing from 'below' (lower-order/pseudo-lower-order positions), to hover, as it were, just beneath what is proper, whether on hegemonic or subordinate terms, to the 'above' (upper-order/pseudo-upper-order positions).

All of which, I believe to be logically incontrovertible, even though no-one before me has got anywhere near to understanding and delineating it, least of all in Britain where, even after several decades of unparalleled philosophical excellence, I am still unknown and – what's more – blatantly ignored, as might be expected from a people who 'fight shy of the Truth by either opposing it or hyping Fact as Truth in time-honoured 'once-born' fashion. Incidentally, I was writing, previously, about root Protestantism (Anglicanism, Lutheranism, etc.) being pseudo-Religious. Yet that is a description more befitting the lower-order position of Nonconformism, because root Protestantism is fundamentally anti-Christian, with a bias, in consequence, for the Old Testament, in due upper-class/pseudo-upper-middle-class vein. And the Christianity it is against is not so much Nonconformism, which happens to be polar to it on the same axis, as Roman Catholicism, the one 'true' form of Christianity whose centre is the Vatican. In their anti-Papal apostasy, the root-Protestant heretics are simply anti-Christian, and many were those who have been able, historically, to avail of their anti-Catholicism, taking full advantage of their heretical predicament to batten-on to them, as it were, and effectively 'call the shots' from even more

advantageously fundamentalist positions!

* * * *

Contrary to what I used to think, amorality is not only lower order and, hence, secular; there is also what, traditionally, might be called an ecclesiastic acceptance (within reason) of amorality which, stemming from contrary upper-order positions in extrapolative vein, is implicit when that which, as sperm/penile intromission deriving, in some sense, from the prior (upper-order) dichotomy of spinal-cord fluid/spinal cord (in which essence precedes existence) comes into coital contact (for reproductive purposes) with what effectively derives, as the ovarian/uterine cycles, from the prior (upper-order) dichotomy of the heart/blood (in which existence precedes essence), and is accordingly compromised in ecclesiastically amoral vein.

A 'holy man', or 'man of God', would avoid such a compromise to begin with, but the mass man, when not overly secular and indisposed to aiding and abetting the reproductive designs of women, will act according to principles that owe less to morality than to social and/or sexual pressures, with predictably amoral implications. For his partner, however, the heart/blood-derived paradigm of monthly periods (as conditioned by Time) in which the menstrual cycle progresses from egg-releasing ovarian to tissue-shedding uterine stages in which blood is discharged from the womb, such a fundamentally immoral/unmoral dichotomy, whilst contrasting with the moral/unimmoral dichotomy of sperm/penile intromission, the derivation of which, as noted above, hails from a contrary source, albeit one destined, through reproductive-orientated coitus, to be amorally compromised (as by the immoral/unmoral dichotomy alluded to above – for the woman, to repeat, matters can only get better, as and when pregnancy progressively ensues, and what was once fundamentally immoral/unmoral on the terms described is gradually superseded by a moral/unimmoral dichotomy deriving, in some sense, from her own spinal-cord fluid/spinal cord in the transmuted guise of amniotic fluid (essence) on the one hand and the foetus (existence) on the other hand, both of which owe more, in a manner of speaking, to the Soul/Unwill than to the id/unego, given the ecclesiastic criteria that stem, by extrapolation and inevitable transmutation, from what is proper to the 'above', as to an upper-order disposition, so that not only does this situation differ from the secular amorality of the lower-order positions proper, in which, whether via anti-Will/anti-Unsoul or anti-Soul/anti-Unwill (depending on the overall gender case), contraception of one (gender) kind or another complemented, where necessary and even when desired, by a right to abortion, but it effectively leaves the male partner trailing behind as one whose morality/unimmorality (sperm/penile intromission) is no longer relevant and even likely to be dismissed in relation to one who, in Schopenhauer's memorable words, 'carries her pregnancy with pride'. But precisely because pregnancy assumes a paradoxically if not purgatorially moral dimension in respect of the parallel between amniotic fluid and the woman's own spinal-cord fluid (soul), it is endorsed by the Roman Catholic Church, as the worldly solution to the fundamental immorality/unmorality of what stems, in periodic vein,

from the heart/blood, and such activity as compromises the conventional man's morality/unimmorality (sperm/penile intromission) is accordingly tolerated. At the risk of seeming somewhat Kantian, such is the paradoxical nature of the reproductively-orientated 'moral world order' to which the Church necessarily has to subscribe, whilst still upholding – and even preferring – the path of Christ, which leads, eventually, to world-rejecting Holiness.

As for the secular amoral rights to contraception and abortion, I could not condone them, having never personally availed of male contraception, or, indeed, indulged in what I describe as ecclesiastic amorality. But I do believe that the solution to the 'world', as to the Adamic 'Fall' (via Eve), is not a permanent 'moral world order' of the sort described, but a new approach to 'world overcoming' that will have to avail of the secular fools that currently exist in such numbers in order to take the 'people', or relevant 'peoples', towards what I have usually referred to, in various of my writings, as 'Kingdom Come', since the old 'moral world order' is, in any case, being undermined (through secular values) on what are often regarded as post-humanist terms, which, whilst in opposition to Catholic humanism and even to its Protestant opponent, would not, by themselves, lead to the cyborgistic overhauling of the 'world' in the interests, it need hardly be added, of an 'otherworldly' alternative in which religious truth, or true religion, will come into its own on such a revolutionary basis that man will, indeed, be 'overcome' (to return to Nietzsche), the better to ensure a future in which everything godly and anti-devilish, holy and anti-clear, righteous and anti-vain, will become the upper-order/pseudo-upper-order norm, culminating, at its peak – or in the transcendent apotheosis, in other words, of its development – in a genuinely Universal antithesis to the Cosmos, just as Christian Humanism formerly constituted an antithesis, 'down below', to Heathen Pantheism, and thus to religions stemming, in untransvaluated vein, from the Cosmos, as, in religious terms, from Fundamentalism.

Finally, let me say that being against the 'world', or 'moral world order' (of ecclesiastic amorality), whether from a democratic or a plutocratic (to generalize non-ratio specifically) point-of-view, is not the same as being for 'otherworldly' deliverance (from the 'world/anti-world'), for which a new theocracy and, hence, some form of Messianic Intervention is required, as intimated at above. Such a new theocracy I call 'Social Theocracy'; for it must appeal to the people of certain appropriate countries to utilize their democratic (anti-'moral world order') freedoms in the interests of an ultimate sovereignty, identified, by me, with the concept of 'religious sovereignty', which would of course entail rights (previously discussed in several of my books) that transcend 'human rights', as currently understood and upheld in relation to 'political sovereignty' in respect of democracy. Such a society, which, as noted, is more anti-worldly than worldly, can only be overhauled by one upholding the aforementioned 'religious sovereignty' and, hence, the ultimate theocracy,

* * * *

The Radicalism of Nurtural Liberation (in the wavicle-centred essence of the 'Soul') from Natural Determinism (with the particle-based existence of the 'Will'), as, to a paradoxically limited extent, in the amoral rejection (with chemistry/unphysics) of the upper-order-derived imposition of Immorality/Unmorality (in Metachemistry/Unmetaphysics), which is equivalent to a democratic/unplutocratic rejection of Autocracy/Untheocracy (Mary/Unjoseph), and hence to a kind of 'Liberty Leading the People' (Delacroix) libertarian opposition to the reproductive-orientated inevitability (with females) of the ovarian/uterine cycles (governed by Time/Unspace) through a democratically-upheld right to contraception, if not, when needs arise, to abortion.

But since the monthly discharge of blood-carried excess tissue (nutrients, re-absorbed egg residue, excess lining, etc) from the womb stems, in an extrapolative kind of transmuted way, from the heart/blood (of what, on inner terms, is Supermetachemical/Submetaphysical), and therefore from what, in the heart (of the Superwill) is at the roots of Natural Determinism, it follows, more broadly, that the chief Catholic agents of the spinal-cord fluid/spinal cord (which are antithetical, on upper-order terms, to the heart/blood) will have a moral interest, as Christians, in curbing the extent of Natural Determinism accruing to the heart, in order to maintain the moral supremacy of psyche (as represented by the spinal-cord fluid and symbolized, in the Catholic approach to civilization, by the Pope) over soma (as represented by the heart and symbolized, in the Catholic approach to civilization, by the Monarch), whose somatic Primacy is correspondingly Immoral (to generalize non-ratio specifically), so that, with the Superwill duly moderated if not, in a manner of speaking, effectively neutralized, the Subsoul (as represented by the blood and symbolized, in the Catholic approach to civilization, by the Princes of the 'Blood Royal') can then defer to the Supersoul (as represented by the spinal-cord fluid and symbolized, as noted, by the Pope), in the overall interests of the Faith, which, with Catholicism, is centred in the well-being of the Supersoul, to which the Subwill (of the spinal cord) is affiliated (as Cardinals to the Pope) and from which, in consequence of its reduced freedom of action in proximity to the 'binding to Self' ... of the Supersoul, a moderating influence upon the Superwill (of the heart) can be inferred, thereby partially freeing, as noted, the Subsoul (of the blood) from what would otherwise remain a condition of reduced binding, in proximity to the greater freedom of the Superwill (of the heart), and in such fashion that its capacity to defer to the ultimate binding (of the spinal-cord fluid), as epitomized by the well-being of the Supersoul, would otherwise be correspondingly diminished, if not undermined, and effectively negated.

For if, through heresy, that which corresponds to the heart (namely the Monarch) breaks free of or, for some reason, is excluded from religious moderation (as was Henry VIII) in the manner described, not only will the blood – and hence the Princes of the 'Blood Royal') – be all-the-more bound to and thereby compromised by it, but its capacity for the paradoxically wilful freedoms granted by Natural Determinism

will be correspondingly enhanced, thereby setting back the 'moral' agenda which can only stem from the psychic hegemony of the Supersoul and the well-being of its moral supremacy.

The notion that such an anti-Christian (anti-Catholic) situation as follows from heresy is commensurate with 'Free Will' is only credible insofar as such a 'Will' (corresponding to the Superwill, and hence to the Will *per se* rather than to some extrapolated Will from it) becomes free of psychic moderation via the Subwill (as represented by the spinal cord and symbolized by the Cardinals), as though independent of the Vatican and, hence, of Papal supremacy. But such 'freedom' ignores the fact that the heart is at the roots of Natural Determinism, which includes its knock-on effect on periodic (monthly) menstruation in the case of women, and can only become increasingly beholden to such determinism the freer it is from the moderating influence of the Catholic Church, to be paradoxically free to serve Nature's predetermined interests, not least in respect of reproduction, since Nature is determined, above all else, to survive through reproducing itself in whichever guise is most applicable!

Such, then, is the paradoxical outcome of so-called 'Free Will' which, in truth, is now at the mercy of Natural Determinism, or the determination of nature to reproduce as the fundamental means to its survival, to an extent likely to result in the most unequivocally predatory of objective dispositions, including (in its 'political' manifestations) unbridled imperialism of a correspondingly profane nature.

* * * *

The Self (as psyche) has the moral right to moderate the Not Self (as soma), as of the Supersoul to moderate, via the Subwill, the Superwill. But the 'self' (in soma) will reject the Not Self (in soma), as the id will reject the Will (stemming, by extrapolation, from the Superwill), whilst the 'not self' (in psyche) will reject the Self (in psyche), as the ego will reject the Soul (stemming, by extrapolation, from the Supersoul), with predictably amoral implications in each antithetical lower-order secular case.

* * * *

Advice for noble males: Don't let yourself get tied down by the human equivalent of 'Lilliputians'!

Further advice for noble males: Don't let the bitches drag you down!

* * * *

Nature's principal intention is for vacuous Beauty to lovingly objectify in the interests of reproduction. For reproduction is Nature's *raison d'être*, its means to

reproduction being predation, irrespective of environment.

The great Lie of 'Free Will', whose roots lie in Natural Determinism „, as the predatory means by which Nature reproduces itself. Being 'free', as a heretic, of Vatican moderation of the 'Will' (as Superwill) is not commensurate with liberation from Natural Determinism, a liberation which can only apply, in ultimate terms, to the 'Soul' (as Supersoul), and most especially to the Afterlife following Death, or the mortality of the body (soma) that, like all bodies, was rooted in Natural Determinism and the reproductively-orientated freedoms which it requires.

* * * *

Everywhere the cancerous assaults upon biconical civilization of migrant workers, who are uniconically undermining its foundations, replacing what was there before with something much worse, something akin to the disease alluded to above, which (if not cured or curable) kills what it comes into contact with as a matter of (totalitarian) course. Most people fail to realize, it seems to me, that the disgraceful prevalence of personal cancer in contemporary industrial society owes much – if not everything – to the universal scourge of sledgehammer-wielding subproletarians of foreign origin, whose only desire is to barbarously reshape Western civilization in their own autocratic image, undermining it at every turn and with every opportunity that presents itself!

The phrase 'sledgehammer-wielding' could be just as tellingly described as 'sludgehammer-wielding'. For such subproletarians (who are anti-biconical) only regard uniconical criteria, which I would regard as degenerate, as constitutive of social progress, no matter how detrimental to the biconical status quo and, more particularly, to civilized people in general!

* * * *

The rise, in recent decades, of so-called 'boy bands' and 'girl bands' is surely one which parallels, on 'cultural' terms, the biconical decadence of so-called 'gays' and 'lesbians', in which gender equalitarianism runs on parallel 'homosexual' tracks as a prelude, one could argue, to any uniconical degeneration from such biconical decadence that likely takes a unisexual form, thereby reducing everything to the utmost subcivilized equalitarianism!

Such, morally considered, is the bitter fruit of Protestant heresy, which in England harks back, as we all know, to the early sixteenth century with the ex-communication of Henry VIII (whose Act of Supremacy was the effective nail-in-the-coffin of moral credibility), and has since, following the English Civil War of the mid-seventeenth century, gained secular momentum, reducing the Protestant-derived approach to civilization if not to its lowest common (subcivilized) denominator, then certainly to a toleration of such a predicament (as evidenced by ever-more radical approaches to

equalitarianism on a variety of levels, not least cultural and sexual).

* * * *

1. One should contrast the Superbarbarity/Subculture of the Superclassism/Subracism of Supermetachemistry/Submetaphysics, which is Superscientific/Subreligious ... with the Superculture/Subbarbarity of the Superracism/Subclassism of Supermetaphysics/Submetachemistry, which is Superreligious/Subscientific, extrapolating from the former the Barbarity/Unculture of the Classism/Unracism of Metachemistry/Unmetaphysics, which is Scientific/Unreligious, as against, from the latter, the Culture/Unbarbarity of the Racism/Unclassism of Metaphysics/Unmetachemistry, which is Religious/Unscientific.
2. Subordinate to the above alternatives one should contrast the pseudo-Subbarbarity/pseudo-Superculture of the pseudo-Subclassism/pseudo-Superracism of pseudo-Submetachemistry/pseudo-Supermetaphysics, which is pseudo-Subscientific/pseudo-Superreligious ... with the pseudo-Subculture/pseudo-Superbarbarity of the pseudo-Subracism/pseudo-Superclassism of pseudo-Submetaphysics/pseudo-Supermetachemistry, pseudo-extrapolating from the former the pseudo-Unbarbarity/pseudo-Culture of the pseudo-Unclassism/pseudo-Racism of pseudo-Unmetachemistry/pseudo-Metaphysics, which is pseudo-Unscientific/pseudo-Religious, as against, from the latter, the pseudo-Unculture/pseudo-Barbarity of the pseudo-Unracism/pseudo-Classism of pseudo-Unmetaphysics/pseudo-Metachemistry, which is pseudo-Unreligious/pseudo-Scientific.

Such, then, are the upper-order/pseudo-upper-order antitheses conceived, as is only logically correct, in due ratio-specific (3:1 Most:Least hegemonically Superlative vis-à-vis 2½:1½ More:Less hegemonically Comparative on the one hand, and 1:3 Least:Most subordinately pseudo-Superlative vis-à-vis 1½:2½ Less:More subordinately pseudo-Comparative) dichotomous terms.

There are also, however, the lower-order/pseudo-lower-order antitheses to bear in mind, concerning which I shall now attempt a critique, as follows:—

1. To contrast, from a civil/unphilistine standpoint, the anti-Barbarity/anti-Unculture of the sexism/unworkism of chemistry/unphysics, which is political/uneconomic ... with, from a philistine/uncivil standpoint, the anti-Culture/anti-Unbarbarity of physics/unchemistry, which is economic/unpolitical, extrapolating from the former, on supercivil/subphilistine terms, the anti-Superbarbarity/anti-Subculture of the supersexism/subworkism of superchemistry/subphysics, which is superpolitical/subeconomic, as against, from the latter, on superphilistine/subcivil terms, the anti-Superculture/anti-Subbarbarity of the superworkism/subsexism of superphysics/subchemistry, which is supereconomic/subpolitical.

2. Subordinate to the above alternatives one should contrast, with pseudo-uncivil/pseudo-philistine implications, the anti-pseudo-Unbarbarity/anti-pseudo-Culture of the pseudo-unsexism/pseudo-workism of pseudo-unchemistry/pseudo-physics, which is pseudo-unpolitical/pseudo-economic ... with, from a pseudo-unphilistine/pseudo-civil standpoint, the anti-pseudo-Unculture/anti-pseudo-Barbarity of the pseudo-unworkism/pseudo-sexism of pseudo-unphysics/pseudo-chemistry, which is pseudo-uneconomic/pseudo-political, extrapolating from the former, on pseudo-subcivil/pseudo-superphilistine terms, the anti-pseudo-Subbarbarity/anti-pseudo-Superculture of the pseudo-subsexism/pseudo-superworkism of pseudo-subchemistry/pseudo-superphysics, which is pseudo-subpolitical/pseudo-supereconomic, as against, from the latter, on pseudo-subphilistine/pseudo-supercivil terms, the anti-pseudo-Subbarbarity/anti-pseudo-Superculture of the pseudo-subworkism/pseudo-supersexism of pseudo-subphysics/pseudo-superchemistry, which is pseudo-subeconomic/pseudo-superpolitical.

Such, then, are the lower-order/pseudo-lower-order antitheses conceived, as is only logically correct, in due ratio-specific ($2\frac{1}{2}:1\frac{1}{2}$ more:less hegemonically comparative vis-à-vis $3:1$ most:least hegemonically superlative on the one hand, and $1\frac{1}{2}:2\frac{1}{2}$ less:more subordinately pseudo-comparative vis-à-vis $1:3$ least:most subordinately pseudo-superlative) dichotomous terms.

* * * *

If seems that what should be termed disjunctive polarities between contemporary (secular) and traditional (ecclesiastic) are, in some respects, more convenient to each, since representative of their respective root positions, than would be the representative-to-subverted (or the position conditioned by vertically compatible criteria issuing either from antithetically 'above' or antithetically from 'below') polarities appertaining to and characteristic of the traditional or contemporary axes *as such*, granted the suspicion that would accrue to the representative, or root, position in any given polarity vis-à-vis its subverted, or antithetically conditioned, counterpart or, rather, pole, as, for example, with the Marian polarity to what is Crucifixion-centred in the representatively Catholic case and, contrariwise, with the Nonconformist (puritan) polarity to what is representatively, in its root Protestant manifestation, fundamentally anti-Christian.

For the King James Bible, to illustrate the latter point, is arguably if not patently Most:Least Superlative (upper order) in respect of the overall ratio of the Old to the New Testaments, whereas radical Nonconformism tends to prefer a New Testament emphasis, even to an exclusive (Gideon) extent, in keeping with what I hold to be its Christ-centred disposition on subverted (by extrapolation from vertically 'above') lower-order terms that not only contrast, on a polar basis, with the State Religion (of Anglicanism, whether in relation to the Church of England, of Scotland, of Ireland, or of Wales), but owe much to the upper-order Crucifixion-centred representative bias of Catholicism, and probably to an extent that most Nonconformists would ordinarily not admit to or allow!

Be that as it may, it is evident to me, in returning to the contention I was previously positing, that what has been termed a disjunctive polarity (of overlapping axes) between contemporary sexism and traditional racism on the one hand, with a contrary disjunctive polarity (of overlapping axes) between contemporary workism and traditional classism on the other hand, is likely more convenient, in their mutual representativeness, to each than would be – or have been – the traditional polarities of racism (in its root, or representative, form) and classism (conditioned from vertically 'above' by upper-order criteria based in fundamentalism) in the one axial case, and of classism (in its root, or representative, form) and racism (conditioned from vertically 'above' by upper-order criteria centred in transcendentalism) in the other axial case, the contemporary polarities being (from the bottom up) sexism (in its root, or representative, form) and workism (conditioned from vertically 'below' by lower-order criteria based in realism) in the one axial case, and of workism (in its root, or representative, form) and sexism (conditioned from vertically 'below' by lower-order criteria centred in naturalism) in the other axial case, in what is then, on either axis, a representative-to-subverted polarity, the latter pole of which will always (as with traditional axial polarities) prove problematic for the former, and for the reasons described.

* * * *

It would seem that, on disjunctive contemporary-to-traditional axial terms, the British are given to a workist-to-classist polarity, whereas the Irish, by axial contrast, can be characterized – at least in mainstream terms – as favouring a sexist-to-racist polarity – the former torn between economics and 'Science', the latter ... between politics and 'Religion'.

Both sexism and workism are the amoral retorts to and rejections of the traditional impositions (from 'above') of Classism and Racism, or, in general terms, of Science and Religion, having (as noted) political (democratic) and economic (plutocratic) implications that are opposed, on strictly comparative terms, to the Immorality of Science on the one hand, and to the Morality of Religion on the other hand (to cite only the 2½, or major, ratio aspects of each in relation to their derivations from Superscience (3) and Superreligion (3), or, in other words, from the Supermetachemical and Supermetaphysical aspects, respectively, of Supermetachemistry/Submetaphysics and Supermetaphysics/Submetachemistry, the