



# **D(R)EAD ENDS**

*Or*

**Revelation Resurrection**

**John O'Loughlin**



**Centretruths Digital Media**

# D(R)EAD ENDS

*Or*

## Revelation Resurrection

Aphoristic Philosophy by  
**JOHN O'LOUGHLIN**  
Of Centretruths Digital Media

This title first published as an eBook 2022 and republished (with revisions) 2025 by Centretruths Digital Media

Copyright © 2022, 2025 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: 978-14716-6446-5

\* \* \* \*

# CONTENTS

## Preface

*First Section: 1 – 25*

*Second Section: 26 – 50*

*Third Section: 51 – 75*

*Fourth Section: 76 – 100*

*Fifth Section: 101 – 125*

*Sixth Section: 126 – 150*

*Seventh Section: 151 – 157*

## D(r)eadendix

Emblematic Revelations

## Preface

Following on from *End Station J J*, my previous collection of notational aphorisms, this project brings my philosophical journey to a conclusive peak, as it both sums-up and enlarges upon my recent thinking in relation to modern/post-modern criteria and the frankly dreadful pass to which reason (stemming from the so-called 'Age of Enlightenment') has come, and why it must be opposed from a kind of 'third way' beholden to the resurrection of revelation, if what amounts to the opposite of true enlightenment is eventually to be consigned to the 'rubbish bin' of regrettable history, and civilization accordingly be enabled to move-on towards a universal resolution owing little or nothing to the current 'dark ages' which, directly or indirectly, characterize the contemporary world. There are a number of possible interpretations of the pun-like title to this book of original thought, but the discerning reader – if, in future, I'm fortunate enough to have any – will sooner or later draw the most credible conclusions from it and think accordingly, joining me in my opposition to everything that 'flies in the face' of godly truth from standpoints that are more usually, these days, not even directly beholden to the 'Devil' (a generalized term for what exists 'up back' in Quasar-derived fashion), but are demonstrably human-all-too-human in their secular audacities and profanities. Finally I should confess that, since I'm not beholden to triangles, as to the moral limitations of 'tripartite' thinking, to use a term associated with Arthur Koestler, but represent a kind of 'fourth dimension' beyond anything triangular (and thus rooted, in a manner of speaking, in the 'Devil'), I'm, as a serious thinker, a self-taught philosopher, obliged to publish myself, since self-publishing is really par for the course of being 'beyond the pale' of 'Devil'-rooted or derived triangularity, ruled over, as it usually is, by persons for whom rectilinear pediments and the like are taken for granted and anything approximating the curvilinearity of a dome is only acceptable if it prostrates itself, so to speak, before the said pediment in subordinate – one might even say 'sonofabitch'-like – vein, thereby confirming the hegemonic rule of autocracy in all too 'once-born', God-denying fashion (although, since the people will never, so we're told by no less a luminary than Eugene Ionesco, 'demystify themselves', God-denial would be the last thing to which they'd ever admit!). Be that as it

may, self-publishing is only to be expected for thought that, to any extent, is true, honest, and, hence, more genuinely philosophic. Therefore whilst anyone can, in theory, read me, only the best will appreciate what I have to say and – who knows? – even undertake to review this book and spread the 'good news' that not every branch of literature exists within the commercially-oriented moral constraints imposed by triangular control, and that if philosophy is to be true to its vocation as both a truth-seeker and revealer of 'higher truths' not altogether dissociated from a credibly comprehensive interpretation of the world, it must continue to distance itself from the 'marketplace' of those who knowingly exploit writers – particularly poets, novelists, and dramatists – for self-enrichment through the various channels of worldly commerce. For few if any commercial writers escape the rectilinear pediment other than via the debasement of the dome, and that's a fate I can happily leave to what certain other notable independently-minded freelance thinkers of the past would've identified with the 'professors of philosophy'!

John O'Loughlin, London 2022 (Revised 2025)

## *First Section*

### *1*

The weaker cling to the stronger, as the ignorant to the knowledgeable, the ugly to the beautiful, and the false to the true. For the negative is always inferior to the positive.

### *2*

A tolerant indulgence of and even sentimental deference towards those who can't be expected to fully – or even partly – understand one, whether from gender, class, age, occupation, species, or any other limitation characteristic, to varying extents, of their simple natures, isn't without its advantages; for it isn't necessary to be understood by all and sundry, particularly since, as Baudelaire observed, the world 'only goes around through misunderstanding'.

### *3*

As things stand, one can only get to the Afterlife via life and the termination of life at death; but it helps to have had an ecclesiastic as opposed to a secular bias, if one is to have any faith in such an eventuality at all, and most especially as a male adult, for whom psyche should take precedence over soma, or the mind over the body, on properly subjective terms.

### *4*

The Divine achieves Otherworldly peace by neutralizing the Diabolic, whereas the feminine achieves worldly peace by neutralizing the masculine ... in what's a distinction, after all, between ecclesiastic and

secular, noble and plebeian values.

5

I, unlike most writers (particularly those of a narrative prose cast), don't sacrifice content – and hence contentment – to form, no more than Heaven would or should be sacrificed to God, even while the earth is being sacrificed to man! On the contrary, I override the rectilinear form characteristic of most books to the extent that my thought is centralized and thus effectively presented in a kind of curvilinear light closer, in effect, to a dome than to a (rectilinear) pediment.

6

When one is all 'fucked up' and 'pissed off', it's usually because of other people and/or the machines and programmes they've made which are either letting one down or getting the better of one, as and when one's nerves are driven to the brink – if not over it – by soulless automata.

7

The thing I most detest after noisy and troubling workmen in close proximity to one is ... noisy and troubling neighbours thereof! Obviously, one would be better off without them, since such workmen and neighbours are, for the most part, a nuisance, and the idea that one should, never mind could, love either of them, in such circumstances, is frankly bizarre!

8

One tries to avoid hate as far as possible, since it's an intensely disagreeable thing that often interferes with one's physiology; but sometimes circumstances leave one with no alternative but a hatred for what's troubling and even tormenting one, particularly when it's recognized as being the product of low-calibre persons and/or machines,

and drags-on for weeks if not months on end!

9

Anyone who's a 'cut above' the average man or woman doesn't believe in equality but, rather, leaves rhetorical notions of that sort to the average if not subaverage men and women for whom it's convenient to reduce everything to their own lowly levels, for want of an above-average and sensibly discriminating disposition!

10

Only democratic or plutocratic types write for the masses, as opposed to writing independently of them and, as it were, in spite of them, with a view, at least in the theocratic case, to their eventual 'overcoming', to use a term reminiscent of Nietzsche.

11

A great country full of petty people ... Any thoughts? Not Ireland, at any rate!

12

There are two kinds of people in this world that I particularly dislike: the nose-y and the noisy, although experience has taught me that they're often one and the same, since superficiality has a common origin.

13

There are also those, including the above, who're allergic to thought and react from a standpoint rooted in soma (as opposed to psyche), with physical implications. In other words, the common man and/or woman

who's either, according to gender, a son-of-a-bitch or a bitch. One can't bring oneself to like such people, try as one might; for they simply stand in opposition to anyone who can think, particularly when he happens to live in close proximity to them in some communal dwelling or other through no particular fault of his own but as the product, not unusually, of ostracism and neglect. Are they being 'freaked out' by a sensitivity to thought, or are they just waiting for an opportunity to, as it were, physically pounce on a sensed thought out of some philistine if not predatory instinct, rooted in nature, to react to culture. I guess it would depend on the kind of (simple) person.

## 14

How often is educated and cultivated sensibility 'put upon' and effectively brutalized by the barbarous doings of manual workers and/or builders in close proximity to where one lives and/or works! One begins to wonder whether such sensibility (as one still possesses) isn't a liability, since society makes no effort, it would appear, to protect it from just such impositions as are at loggerheads with it from standpoints rooted, more usually, in material gain.

## 15

Anybody who's for life is an enemy of God or, at any rate, of the godly, as epitomized, in the Western tradition, by Christ on the Cross and, more specifically, by the Catholic concept of the 'Mother of God', God, of course, being Christ on the Cross and not the so-called Father ... of attenuated Creatorism (Jehovah) in back of the world, where a Supermother/Subfather superlative dichotomy (3:1, or most:least) between Superscience and Subreligion, or the Superdevil/Subgod (whether unequivocally as Supersatan/Subjehovah or, in attenuated extrapolation, as Supermary/Subjoseph) would be the atomic reality according with the Supermetachemistry/Submetaphysics of the context in question, which only gradually changes, in overall terms, from regressive negativity to progressive positivity, as from the devolution of negativity in the Cosmos and Nature to the evolution of positivity in Mankind and Cyborgkind, the

latter of which has still to, as it were, transpire ... in what would have to be a post-Christian and therefore properly global framework according with a true concept of Universality, a concept antithetical to everything Cosmic, including the unequivocal Creatorism of Supersatan/Subjehovah in relation, I'd imagine, to the Quasar/Black Hole configuration at the roots of the Galaxy, as presumably of any galaxy in the so-called Universe ... if one is to extend one's concept of this particular reality back to pre-'monotheistic' – and therefore avowedly 'polytheistic' – contexts, irrespective of whether or not one endorses such terms or simply dismisses them as just another example of cosmic hype.

## 16

Catholic priests, who've a vocational duty to remain celibate (and usually do) are truly godly and therefore against life as a reproductive offshoot of diabolical intent in Quasar-stemming vein. The ecclesiastic amorality of the Church acquiescing in monogamy – that 'monotheistic' parallel – is of course unavoidable in relation to the generality of people, even those who're other than Catholic, but shouldn't be confounded with ecclesiastic morality, which 'fights shy' (in the 'good fight') of worldly compromises between the genders in the interests, needless to say, of true spirituality and, hence, of a properly religious orientation such that requires the celibacy alluded to above. Nothing like that, of course, can be got or expected from Protestants, never mind those who're anterior to them in respect of Fundamentalist and/or Pantheist allegiances with regard to the Cosmos and Nature.

## 17

So-called 'political correctness' may be on the side of life, but religious correctness won't be, least of all when such correctness is vocational and, hence, a spiritual rejection not only of sensuality but of the instinctuality, so to speak, and intellectuality over which sensuality tends to preside, whether directly or indirectly, in due triangular fashion.

Neutrality, whereby a country 'sits on the fence' rather than takes sides in war or diplomacy or whatever, is effectively amoral, since amorality can be found in between immorality on the one hand and morality on the other hand, which have little or nothing in common and stand, in consequence, on opposite sides of the proverbial fence, the one behind amorality and the other beyond it.

The Father, as a Christian concept, can have no place in Judaism, since this term corresponds to the notion of an attenuated Creator that, unlike Jehovah, allows for both a Mother and a Son, which, in the Catholic – and particularly Irish Catholic – context is habitually transformed into the 'Mother of God' saying that, unlike with Protestantism (and root Protestantism in particular), makes no bones about identifying God with Christ or, more specifically, with the Crucified Saviour, whose death on the Cross paves the way for Eternity. But just as the term 'Father', used in this religious sense, can have no place in Judaism, so the term 'Hallelujah', which some truncate to 'Jah', can have no place in Catholicism, whether Irish or otherwise, since it's a term used in praise of the Hebrew God, Jehovah ('jah' and 'vah' having similar if not identical implications), and thus would be irrelevant even to the so-called Father ... of the Son via the Mother ... as a Creator-esque concept unique to Christianity; even though, in reality, this Father is but the least aspect of the atom 'up back' in which, as previously described, the main aspect (most:least) corresponds to a Mother and, specifically, to a Supermother vis-à-vis a Subfather that, whether negatively identified, in Judaic vein, with Supersatan/Subjehovah or positively identified, in Christian vein, with Supermary/Subjoseph, is effectively a Superscientific/Subreligious extrapolation, directly or indirectly, unequivocally or equivocally, from the Quasar/Black Hole configuration at the ('monotheistic') roots of the Galaxy, such that I'd atomically identify (on 3:1 superlative ratio terms) with Supermetachemistry/Submetaphysics or, indeed (if we make a clinical distinction between a negative and a positive approach to this atom), with

Antisupermetachemistry/Antisubmetaphysics on the one hand, and Supermetachemistry/Submetaphysics on the other hand, as between Judaic and Christian, Primal and Supreme, alternatives deriving from devolutionary and evolutionary distinctions. Be that as it may, it would be as ethnically illogical for a Jew to cite the 'Father' as for a Christian to sing or chant 'Hallelujah', bearing in mind the difference between Judaism and Christianity, an unequivocal take on the Creator and an equivocal take that, though largely extrapolated – for pagan solar precedent can't be entirely ruled out – from the former, permits, in its attenuated Creatorism, of precisely what Judaism rejects: namely a Mother and, more importantly, a Son, with the latter, as Christ, being the actual focus of Christian devotion, and one that, not least in the Irish Catholic context, becomes identified with God via the Mother, so that Transcendentalism not only trumps Pantheism but effectively relegates Fundamentalism to the margins, together with any undue (Puritan) emphasis on Humanism, as on the 'Son of Man', which would otherwise bog Christianity down in what, with Nonconformist Protestantism, becomes an emphasis on 'the Word', and hence the Bible from a standpoint polar, in the New Testament, to the Old Testament bias favoured by root Protestantism, with its anti-Catholic fundamentalism as ample testimony to a heretical departure from Christian transcendentalism, and hence from what, in consequence, is properly religious, and most especially so in the Supermetaphysical aspects of the Supermetaphysical/Submetachemical atom to which genuine religion subscribes when truly positive and not only world-rejecting, but a rejection, not least, of whatever's behind the world on, again to be ratio specific, either primally negative (Supersatan/Subjehovah) or supremely positive (Supermary/Subjoseph), Antisupermetachemical/Antisubmetaphysical or Supermetachemical/Submetaphysical terms, the former therefore arguably Antisuperfundamentalist/Antisubtranscendentalist, and the latter Superfundamentalist/Subtranscendentalist.

In Christianity – and Roman Catholicism in particular – the crucifixion of the flesh (as of somatic nature) paves the way for the resurrection of the soul (as of psychic nurture), which necessarily transcends one's mortal remains.

## 21

Just as the Star is behind Nature, so the Cross is beyond it. For just as the Star is behind Life, so the Cross is behind the Afterlife, which is as antithetical to Life as Death ... to Birth.

## 22

Those who believe in Life ... from the standpoint of the Star, don't and can't believe in the Afterlife ... from the standpoint of the Cross. For you either believe in the Birth that leads to Life or, antithetically, in the Rebirth that leads to the Afterlife. And this, believe it or not, is largely down to gender, whereby either soma trumps psyche or psyche trumps soma, nurture succumbing to Nature or nature succumbing to Nurture, the former ruled by the Star, as by Creatorism, and the latter led by the Cross, as by the Saviour, whose death upon it paves the way for the resurrection to Eternal Peace.

## 23

But in an age when the Superstar has eclipsed the Star, so must there come a time when the Supercross will supersede the Cross, with the resurrection to a New Eternity following the death of all flesh and the triumphant victory of Nurture over Nature, which, in specific ratio dichotomous terms, would imply a Supernurtural/Subnatural hegemony, with Supermetaphysics/Submetachemistry, over a pseudo-Subnurtural/pseudo-Supernatural subordination, with pseudo-Submetaphysics/pseudo-Supermetachemistry, as the concept of 'Saint' and (neutralized) 'Dragon' was taken to a new and altogether superior understanding in relation to Superreligion/Subscience on the one hand, and to pseudo-Subreligion/pseudo-Superscience on the other hand; though not, however, without a kind of administrative aside to this ultimate structure which, with cyborgistic mobility, would be pledged to its service in as many contexts as were deemed necessary for ever and anon, as to the service, if I may be so bold, of the religiously sovereign, whose cyborgistic status

wouldn't be mobile and individualistic but inherently immobile and collectivistic.

24

How they replicate the Cosmos in their cosmopolitan cities!

25

With them, everything is loose and variegated; for they're untransvaluated in their Cosmos-stemming cosmopolitanism.

## *Second Section*

26

Sooner or later, one way or another, life will make a fool out of you (man). Only in the Afterlife can one be guaranteed true wisdom and, most especially, grace, provided one is of the Faith to begin with!

27

They say, in the media, that Putin, the Russian President of several years, is an autocrat, is authoritarian, and so on, but in reality he's a kind of dictator within the context of a so-called 'people's democracy', a one-party democracy that elects a president every once in a while to govern on its behalf, and in this respect the current president is little different from previous presidents in that he's no Czar or Kaiser or King equivalent, but a politician operating within the context of a republic that, by definition, falls well short of anything upper-order and, hence, authoritarian.

Republics, whether biconical or uniconical, are politically and economically lower order and, hence, plebeian. One can't dignify such a context with epithets properly appertaining to a society ruled or, for that matter, led by nobles and clerics, where authoritarianism, based or centred on the ecclesiastic authority of one man, be he king or pope, actually obtains. Nor would what would likely be regarded as a 'bourgeois democracy' from a proletarian-oriented so-called 'people's democratic' perspective qualify for upper-order epithets of the kind to which I allude.

The fact is that democracies, whether biconical or uniconical, are effectively totalitarian in respect of universal suffrage, since necessarily embracing the people generally, irrespective of race or ethnicity. And in that respect, as in so many others, they differ demonstrably from autocracies and/or theocracies, which require the authority of a select few to rule over or lead the masses, as the prevailing upper-order case may happen to be. Societies of that order are either fundamentally scientific or transcendently religious, not naturalistically (with universal suffrage) political or realistically economic, whether in respect of capitalism or

socialism or, indeed, of a biconical combination of both the one and the other. Previous so-called 'people's democracies' tended to be economically socialist, but under increasing pressures from the 'bourgeois democracies' of the West even they, as mainly found in the East, tended to adopt capitalism, which has proved to be no-less compatible with uniconical democratic criteria such that prefers a one-party state. That, however, isn't to be compared with the, as it were, liberal criteria of the West, since it's less civilized, even subcivilized, in its illiberal approach to totalitarianism (as Adolf Hitler well knew when he dubbed Bolshevism 'what stands lowest in the scale of civilization'), since the implication is of a kind of proletarian absolutism rather than a compromise between bourgeois and proletarian elements in which the relatively more civilized, or lower-middle class, effectively dominate the less civilized, or lower class, who serve their plutocratic purposes. So, in returning to my opening theme, let's not make the puerile mistake of dignifying people like Putin, still less his Byelorussian or Chinese counterparts, with connotations properly belonging to an aristocracy and, in particular, to royals and high-ranking clerics in their antithetical ways! So far as I'm concerned, democracies, together with their economic corollaries, leave much to be desired: namely the ultimate theocracy, which can only transpire if and when the people are given an electoral opportunity, under Messianic auspices, to exchange political sovereignty for religious sovereignty and be led into a context analogous to 'Kingdom Come', in which a Saint and (neutralized) Dragon paradigm, corresponding to a gender differentiation between males and females or, better, subordinate pseudo-females, was taken to a whole new level of suprahuman unfolding under the aegis of a leadership that knew the difference between upper-middle-class and upper-class criteria and, what's more, also knew what needed to be done in order to implement a kind of futuristic parallel to Medieval Christendom and the relationship, in consequence, between Church and State – one in which the Church was hegemonic over the State and secular criteria, as appertaining to the political and economic norms of lower-order societies, was accordingly overcome or, at any rate, rendered largely irrelevant, never to continue with anything even remotely resembling a totalitarian disregard, premised upon secular values, for genuine authority, whether its ecclesiastic mandate stems from the 'Devil' or from 'God' (to generalize).

They claim, the simple, that God or a God equivalence made the world. But the world is such an evil place that one can only suspect that its so-called Maker was – or is – just as if not more evil Himself, and therefore anything but properly or genuinely godly, as with the concept of 'God in Heaven', in which 'Heaven' is the fulcrum and 'God' a mere concomitant. And this Creator-God of theirs ... who ostensibly made man in his own image ... with knowledge of physical factors that I shall refrain from elaborating upon, this Monster of theirs, which is only a glorified take on Nature, both celestial and mundane, knew a thing or two about evil and, what's more, the criminality underlying it, since it turns out that He also had a hand in fashioning woman, man's antithesis and, more usually, nemesis. Ah, how I detest all this Creator-oriented rubbish, to which the Old Testament pays enough testimony to warrant its expulsion from the world and effective return, along with the rest of the so-called 'Holy Bible', to something approximating its cosmic origins, thereby allowing society to be saved from it and encouraged along the path of true spirituality, which can only be antithetical to anything cosmic!

They speak of 'closed societies' and of 'open societies', usually in regard to political distinctions. But such considerations can also be applied to religion, where the closed societies are given, unequivocally, to Creator-Gods, or so-called Gods, while their open-society counterparts, though allowing for an attenuated Creator (in the form of the so-called Father), also embrace a Son and a Holy Ghost, not to mention a Mother, in what has the appearance of being a kind of worldly – or Christian – intermediate stage of religion coming in-between the unequivocal Creatorism of the ancient closed societies and the coming unequivocal spirituality, or Holy Spirituality, of the future closed society, which will be closed to everything preceding itself, including the Trinitarian relativity of Christianity and its simultaneous accommodation of a Mother (of God ... in the sense of Christ) that at least has the merit of intimating of future possibility in terms of a Second Coming, Who'll 'finish the job' that the

First Coming could be said, willy-nilly, to have started. So this Kingdom Come-like possibility, if it's to bear tangible fruit, will be closed to everything in the past, but almost infinitely open to its own evolutionary potential ... to expand on ever-more spiritually credible terms towards a long-term apotheosis, so to speak, which will be the Saint and (neutralized) Dragon paradigm 'Writ Large', as what I've called Supermetaphysics/Submetachemistry eternally prevails over a subordinate pseudo-Submetaphysics/pseudo-Supermetachemistry, while being served, in such gender-paired fashion, by an administrative aside to itself which will both protect and advance it, as circumstances require.

### 30

These days Arsenal (that north London football club) are to me no better than Arsenic, which it doesn't pay to swallow.

### 31

A country which has gone from the dogs of Reformation to the bogs of Deformation via the cogs of Information in the course of a few centuries. Any guesses?

### 32

If the Bolsheviks and, subsequently, the Soviet authorities had been more genuinely communistic within the context of their 'people's democracy', they wouldn't have elected to govern from – never mind live in – buildings with a noble heritage more befitting the aristocracy. They would've avoided such buildings, turned them into museums, demolished them, or whatever, in keeping with a proletarian revolutionary intent. But there'd appear to be something Orwellian (as in *Animal Farm*) about their adoption of palaces, castles, country mansions, and the like.

### 33

The so-called 'people's representatives', whether biconical or uniconical, bourgeois or proletarian, are neither enemies of the people, like autocratic authoritarians, nor friends of the people, like theocratic authoritarians, since neither ruling from an anterior upper-order position nor leading from a posterior upper-order position, but simply representing – and therefore reflecting – the people in their respective lower-order ways. Such democratic politicians are effectively plebeian, not noble, and they usually operate within the context of a republic.

### 34

How disgusted I become when I hear Russian music still being played on the BBC even during Putin's invasion of Ukraine! You'd think it would be boycotted, but somehow they remain true to their amoral, even-handed colours and carry on regardless. Shame on them!

### 35

I've always had a slinking suspicion that the British tend, in spite of cultural differences, to look-up to the Russians and to treat them with the respect due to fellow imperialists of a largely heretical stamp, for whom a partiality to internationalism isn't uncommon.

### 36

Of course, one doesn't look to the British for a moral lead, since they remain rooted in autocratic immorality, and such amorality as they prefer, which is plutocratically-orientated, is given to deferring to the autocratic mode of authoritarianism, the subjects of which they remain from fear, as much as anything, of a Bolshevik-type plunge into the communistic sludge, which would suck parliamentary democracy down into its proletarian mire in a manner intimated at by the so-called levellers and

diggers of the short-lived Cromwellian republic (which lasted no longer than the Third Reich in Nazi Germany). The British – and the English in particular – would seem to have learnt their lesson and remained loyal to the Restoration (of the monarchy) back in the seventeenth century, which at least has the merit of anchoring the parliament to itself via an Oath of Allegiance to the Throne.

### 37

Most people are so base and fundamentally evil that they think nothing of interfering with the pursuit of letters – and hence truth – by dedicated intellectuals, whose writings they'd be incapable of reading, never mind appreciating and understanding! My experience of having to live in down-market rented accommodation has taught me, over the years, that the main offenders in this regard tend to be foreigners of a somewhat simplistic and altogether morally backward disposition.

### 38

I really do believe that the British tend to flatter themselves on being able to 'handle' such people as alluded to above, as if they were dealing with a species of wild animal that needed to be tamed or, at any rate, muzzled, but could only be done so by a people as tough, or fundamentally brutish, as themselves.

### 39

If Continental Catholics were more intelligent, they wouldn't make a habit of playing football (soccer), still less rugby, but would distance themselves from such 'Protestant'-derived sports as a matter of moral course, preferring, if they weren't up to Gaelic Football and/or Hurling, sports like ice hockey and basketball. But, alas, the extent to which the players of these British sports are really Catholic has to be called into question, since the majority are likely secular proletarians with either no or only a very limited capacity for thought, never mind prayer, and, in the case of so-

called football, are only too willing to put their head to the ball in a manner which would suggest it was no more than an extension of their body in what must be an exercise in physical prowess effectively germane to a plebeian disposition.

40

They speak of 'scumbags', but my experience of guttersnipes and the like, in the urban environment to which I've become painfully accustomed, would suggest that a descriptive term like 'scumslags' would be just as if not more apposite in highlighting the verbal superficiality of such commonplace persons.

41

Popular music – the music of sex, as of Rock 'n' Roll, which can't – and shouldn't – depart too far from its principal thematic concern, a factor which both defines and limits it. Progressive Rock, by contrast, is rarely if ever concerned with sex, which is surely a factor lifting it above the more prevalent popular realms, if not, on account of its persistent percussion, above popular music as such!

42

On the rare occasions when I listen to Jazz, particularly when it employs brass instruments (trumpets, saxophones, trombones, and the like), it isn't long before a connotation with rugby and, in particular, gridiron comes to mind, and I ask myself what-the-hell am I doing listening to such music when, as an Irishman of Catholic descent, anything like that – or even axially polar to it – should be taboo.

43

He may want a 'baby' to fondle, but she'll likely want babies to suckle.

The world alternates between crime and sin – the former against others, the latter against oneself; the one mainly objective (and female in character), the other mainly subjective (and male in character), with what are usually somatic and psychic distinctions. For the female is rooted in soma, whereas the male is centred in psyche – at least on upper-order (ecclesiastic) particle/wavicle antithetical terms. When we come to the lower-order (secular) positions, however, the wavicle is in soma and the particle in psyche, and therefore it could be argued that the lower-order female is paradoxically centred in soma and her male counterpart paradoxically rooted in psyche. Hence an antithesis, in the upper-order case, between the Superwill and the Supersoul (allowing for a Will and a Soul extrapolation from each Primary Superior antithesis thereof, with what are, in overall terms, Superior/Inferior dichotomies), in contrast to an antithesis, in the lower-order case, between the id and the ego (allowing for a superid and a superego extrapolation from each primary superior antithesis thereof, with what are, in overall terms, superior/inferior dichotomies), albeit only, in each class case, with regard, as noted, to the primary superior aspect of what are atomic integrities that necessarily also embrace a secondary superior aspect together, as intimated at above, with primary and secondary inferior aspects of each atom, notwithstanding ...

END OF PREVIEW