

# BEYOND IMAGINATION

John O'Loughlin



# BEYOND IMAGINATION

By  
JOHN O'LOUGHLIN  
Of Centretruths Digital Media

## CDM Philosophy

This edition of *Beyond Imagination* first published 2012  
and republished with revisions 2022 by  
Centretruths Digital Media

Copyright © 2012, 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: 978-1-4466-6622-7

# CONTENTS

## PREFACE

Responsibility

Immorality vis-à-vis Morality

Amorality

Eternal Life

The Truth about God

Willpower

Culture and Religion

Art Forms

State and Church

God and Heaven

Gender Divisions

Contrasting the Arts

True Religion

Redemption

Atoms

The Soul

The Self

The Undersoul

Eternity  
Dreams  
The Few and the Many  
Religious 'bovaryizations' vis-à-vis the  
Truth  
Philosophy and Religion  
Theory and Practice  
The Four Kinds of Literature  
Musical Quadruplicities  
Passing from Sensuality to Sensibility  
Saved from the Curse and Damned from the  
Blessing

BIOGRAPHICAL FOOTNOTE

## PREFACE

This project is, for me, another high-point in a long and winding philosophical career which has led this pilgrim, inexorably, towards the 'Celestial City' of heavenly Truth, and thus towards the 'Omega Point' of his oeuvre, wherein many subjects are explored afresh and one or two long-standing assumptions or presumptions summarily abandoned.

Certainly, the title was based on conclusions I had reached about the religiously undesirable nature of imagery, imagination, imaginings, and other such appearance-based variations on a common metachemical theme, from the standpoint of philosophical *essence*, which is ever metaphysical and thus essentially *beyond* appearances.

John O'Loughlin, London 1999 (Revised 2022)

## *Responsibility*

01. The more one is responsible to oneself the less one can be responsible to others.
02. Conversely, the more one is responsible to others the less one can be responsible to oneself.
03. Those who are responsible to themselves tend to be irresponsible to others, and *vice versa*.
04. Responsibility to oneself is Christian; responsibility to others – heathen.
05. The wise man is responsible to himself; the foolish man ... irresponsible to himself.
06. The good woman is responsible to others; the evil woman ... irresponsible to others.
07. In being irresponsible to himself the fool may well become responsible to others, and thus quasi-good.
08. In being irresponsible to others the evil woman may well become responsible to herself, and thus quasi-wise.
09. Since the genders are not, by nature, equal, it is

illogical to speak of the desirability of equal responsibility, whether to oneself or to others.

10. The subjectivity of the male sex ensures that, by and large, men are happier being responsible to themselves than responsible to others.
11. Conversely, the objectivity of the female sex ensures that, by and large, women are happier or, at any rate, more resigned to being responsible to others than responsible to themselves.
12. Accusations of irresponsibility (in not being responsible towards others) are more often levelled at men by women than *vice versa*.
13. The wisest men will always be most responsible to themselves and least responsible to others.

### *Immorality vis-à-vis Morality*

01. The immorality of unnature vis-à-vis the morality of 'nature'. Or, more correctly, the immorality of unnature vis-à-vis the morality of subnature, with the amorality of supernature and of nature coming in-between, like chemistry and physics in between metachemistry and metaphysics.

02. From the immorality of the Devil/Hell to the morality of God/Heaven via the amorality of woman/purgatory and of man/earth, as from alpha to omega via the world.
03. From the immorality of beauty/love to the morality of truth/joy via the amorality of strength/pride and of knowledge/pleasure.
04. From the noumenally objective absolutism (metachemical) of immorality to the noumenally subjective absolutism (metaphysical) of morality via the phenomenally objective relativity of chemical amorality and the phenomenally subjective relativity of physical amorality.

### *Amorality*

01. If morality, or the choosing of metaphysical right over physical wrong, is a godly thing, as I happen to believe, then morality is only possible and, more to the point, credible in connection with God, or godliness.
02. Take away God, or the possibility of godliness, and you are left with a moral vacuum, with the absence, in short, of a reason for being moral.



03. Consequently life ceases to be an affair guided by morality and becomes one in which amorality is widely prevalent, albeit governed and/or ruled by immorality.
04. For if you remove God from the overall picture, the Devil inevitably steps-in to take His place, and the world becomes his or, rather, her oyster – to be exploited and manipulated as a matter of diabolic course.
05. Yet revolt against immorality is of course possible and, to some extent, inevitable, though only in relation to an objective form of amorality which is as good to evil, or woman to the Devil, or purgatory to Hell, or punishment to crime, or justice to cruelty.
06. Parliament is, in effect, the epitome of the revolt of objective amorality against the tyrannical evil of immorality, which is of course also objective, if from a noumenal rather than a phenomenal point of view. Such a revolt has been symbolized by, amongst other things, 'Britannia'.
07. Thus a society bereft of God but not overly partial to the Devil becomes characterized by the goodness of objective amorality. Such is also true of the individual, even when not literally feminine or, at any rate, a woman. And in such a society and for such an individual, politics rather than science is hegemonic. Hence parliamentary democracy.

## *Eternal Life*

01. The notion of God dying or of the 'death of God', whether conceived of from a Christian or a Nietzschean standpoint, is, if taken literally, something of a contradiction in terms. For nothing defies the idea of death more than that which, as God, is identifiable with Eternal Life.
02. It is not God Who dies, but an outworn concept of God, a traditional or conventional way of conceiving of God, or godliness.
03. God is the One who defies death in the interests of Eternity, of life lived beyond the mortality of the flesh.
04. Eternal Life is the life of God, the life that is attuned to the Heaven of metaphysical *being*.
05. That, on the contrary, which dies eternally, being synonymous with Eternal Death, is the Devil, and an age or society obsessed by death, particularly of an immortal character, is necessarily ruled by the Devil, as by the will and the ego of noumenal objectivity, wherein the hells of metachemical spirit and soul have their life-denying throne.

06. An age or society ruled by the Devil worships beauty and rejects truth. In such a context the poet is sovereign, not the philosopher!
07. God may be absent from such an age or society, as from that in which woman is amorally sovereign, but godliness as such is not identifiable with death. On the contrary, it is man who must die (to the flesh) if God, or godliness, is to come into its rightful 'high estate' in Eternity.
08. In ideological terms, I have identified this death with the abandonment of political sovereignty following the assumption, democratically mandated, of religious sovereignty through the Messianic Second Coming, that is to say, through the will of he who corresponds, in his life and teachings, to the bringer of 'Kingdom Come'.
09. As the reader may know from previous texts by this author, I effectively identify with that destiny on the basis of my Social Transcendentalist ideology, including, not least of all, its doctrine of deistic deliverance from theism, and the concomitant acceptance of religious self-determination in a 'triadic Beyond' (relative to the present), wherein Eternal Life will come more fully and lastingly to pass.

## *The Truth about God*

01. I have recently been reading Sartre's essay Existentialism and Humanism, with its subjective starting-point in the *cogito*, and in many respects it could be said that my philosophy is a continuation of existentialist humanism to the subjective *ne plus ultra* of Social Transcendentalism, wherein man transcends himself in ... God, not, be it noted, theistically, but deistically, in relation to Transcendental Meditation.
02. For at the high-point of his evolution man becomes God; with Social Transcendentalism God is the ultimate Creation and outcome of evolution, not the Creator and power behind evolution.
03. Thus instead of God being responsible for man, man is responsible for God; for God is a higher type of man, a man (whom I have called subman) who practises Transcendental Meditation.
04. So what is truth? – Truth is about God. And what is the truth about God? – Not only that God is, in any truly religious sense, the end rather than the beginning of things, but, more to the point, that God is but a means to the end ... of Heaven; that God is not an end-in-Himself but, on the contrary, someone

(primary) and/or something (secondary) in need of redemption. And for God, Heaven is precisely that redemption, whether in terms of the Holy Spirit for the Father (secondary God) or of the Holy Soul for the Son (primary God).

05. But the metaphysical ego (self) of the Son-God can only achieve heavenly redemption for itself in the metaphysical soul via the metaphysical will (not-self) of the Father-God and the metaphysical spirit (not-self) of the Spirit-Heaven, the Holy Spirit the selflessness of which is but a means for the metaphysical ego of enhanced selfhood in the Holy Soul – one extreme duly leading to another as the self recoils from selflessness in relation to the spirit with a spring-like zeal the effect of which is to drive it more profoundly into self (as soul) than would otherwise be possible.
06. Yet only until such time as, reverting to its egocentric fulcrum, the self plunges anew into not-self, ego into will, to be borne aloft, as before, on the wings of spirit, breath from lungs, in what amounts to a cyclic recurrence of self–not-self–not-self–self; ego–will–spirit–soul; Son–Father–Holy Spirit–Holy Soul ... for the duration of one's Transcendental Meditation.
07. Yes, like Sartre, my starting-point is also subjective and my ending-point, no matter how briefly, an enhanced subjectivity. But it is not simply that man

transcends himself in God, although this can and does happen. Rather is it a case of God transcending Himself in Heaven. For God would be meaningless without Heaven, which is His – mine, your, our – Resurrection.

08. God lives not for Himself, but for Heaven, wherein truth is transmuted into joy, ego into soul, wisdom into holiness, grace into peace – the peace that surpasses understanding, as the sublimity of joy surpasses the divinity of truth, the Heaven (resurrected Son) of metaphysical soul surpassing the God (unredeemed Son) of metaphysical ego.
09. Social Transcendentalism points the way forward for those who, as submen, wish to be redeemed in the Heaven-of-Heavens. It is the prerogative of man-become-subman not only to be God, but to achieve Heaven.

### *Willpower*

01. To contrast the appearance of *doing* (acting) with the essence of *being*, as one would contrast the will with the soul, power with contentment – not least of all in relation to the noumenal axes, germane to space and time, of metachemistry and metaphysics, wherein the will and the soul have their respective *per se*

manifestations.

02. To contrast the quantity of *giving* with the quality of *taking*, as one would contrast the spirit with the ego (mind), glory with form – not least of all in relation to the phenomenal axes,