

# LITERATURE AND THE INTERCARDINAL AXIAL COMPASS



**JOHN  
O'LOUGHLIN**

Centretruths Digital Media

**LITERATURE AND THE INTERCARDINAL  
AXIAL COMPASS**

By

**JOHN O'LOUGHLIN**  
Of Centretruths Digital Media

CDM Philosophy

This edition of *Literature and the Intercardinal Axial  
Compass* 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: 978-1-4466-8605-8

# CONTENTS

## WEBLOGS 1 – 10

1	Defining What I Write
2	Bootlegs and Shoelegs
3	Never Simply Black and White
4	The Ratios of Positivity to Negativity according to Class and/or Element for each Gender
5	Examining Play and Work in relation to Freedom and Binding
6	Freedom and Determinism – A False Dichotomy
7	The Truth about <i>Being</i>
8	The Distinction between Beauty and Truth
9	An Axial Dichotomy Examined
10	The Relationships of Psychology to Physiology and Vice Versa

## WEBLOGS 11 – 20

	11
Problem with ‘the People’	
	12
Choppers and Jump Jets	
	13
Philosophers and Artists in Proper Perspective	
	14
St George and the Dragon	
	15
Sartorial Parallels to St George and the Dragon do not Change Places	
	16
Metachemical Morality and quasi-Metachemical Immorality	
	17
Metaphysical Morality and quasi-Metaphysical Immorality	
	18
Chemical Morality and quasi-Chemical Immorality	
	19
Physical Morality and quasi-Physical Immorality	
	20
Life as Self-Overcoming	

## WEBLOGS 21 – 26

	21
From Hell’s Angels to Heaven’s Demons	

	22
Why Crime conditions Evil and Grace conditions Wisdom	23
Ale and Stout	24
Stout and Brown Ale vis-à-vis Light Ale and Lager	25
On the Subject of Blessedness	26
Literature and the Intercardinal Axial Compass	

[Biographical Footnote](#)

# WEBLOGS 1 – 10

## 1: DEFINING WHAT I WRITE

Although I have a number of weblog sites, including at searchwarp.com, blogger.com, myspace.com, and yuwie.com [from which most of this material was originally drawn], much of my writing tends to revolve around philosophy or, at least, my philosophical ideas and ideals. Frankly, I don't much like the term 'philosophy' because it suggests a knowledge-orientated shortfall from the sort of Truth-orientated material I normally write and should therefore be taken provisionally, as a concession to common usage rather than as an accurate definition for my type of writing.

If one were to be pedantic about it, I suspect that philological knowledge vis-à-vis philosophical pleasure would suffice for a kind of ego/soul distinction in physics, or the vegetative realm of man, whereas theological truth vis-à-vis theosophical joy would suffice for a kind of ego/soul distinction in metaphysics, or the airy realm of God.

Therefore, since most of my mature writings happen to be metaphysical, a better definition of them would be theological/theosophical, with but a smattering of philology/philosophy, as and when I stoop to something physical and merely humanistic.

Most of the time, thank God, I am transcendentalistic,  
and therefore anything but earthy.

## 2: BOOTLEGS AND SHOELEGS

If 'bootlegs' are illicit recordings usually of a low calibre simply because they were done independently of the record company by someone in the audience or whatever using a hidden microphone, then one could infer that recordings made officially, whether live or in the studio, were 'shoelegs' by comparison, since less crude and correspondingly more refined, standing higher in the social scale than those who normally wear boots or make what are called 'bootleg' recordings.

But even if such a term implies a boot-like lowness and/or crudity compared to professionally-made recordings, it could be argued that all so-called heavy metal recordings are effectively bootleg whether official or unofficial, since how can anything so heavy and 'low', in the sense of weighted down, be equated with 'shoelegs'?

I am of course being facetious, but then why should one always believe that professional recordings are 'shoeleg', or something of the sort, just because illicit ones are 'bootleg'? I am confident there are occasions when such descriptions could be comfortably reversed, so to speak.

### 3: NEVER SIMPLY BLACK AND WHITE

It is always tempting to see things in black and white or, shall we say, bright and dark, light and shade, but unfortunately things are rarely that simple! For a start, there are two axes, one dominated by free soma in female fashion and stretching from north-west to south-east points of the intercardinal axial compass, and the other led by free psyche in male fashion and stretching from south-west to north-east points of the said compass, and therefore there are fundamentally two kinds of bright and dark, or light and shade, even without class complications.

Take metachemistry over anti-metaphysics at the north-west point of the intercardinal axial compass. Free soma, the female ideal, is a brightness, whilst its bound psychic counterpart is somewhat of a dark shadow, trailing behind the leading string, as it were, like ugliness and hatred behind, or in back of, beauty and love.

Therefore a somatic brightness has to be contrasted, in each gender case (though I have concentrated solely on metachemistry), with a psychic darkness.

The same is true of chemistry over anti-physics at the south-west point of the intercardinal axial compass, free soma being bright and bound psyche dark, like strength and pride vis-à-vis weakness and humiliation (at least where chemistry is concerned).



But on the sensible side of the moral divide things are quite otherwise! There free psyche is bright and bound soma dark, whether in terms of physics over anti-chemistry at the south-east point of the intercardinal axial compass, where the one corresponds to knowledge and pleasure and the other to ignorance and pain (to concentrate on physics alone) or, up above, of metaphysics over anti-metachemistry at its north-east point, where truth and joy correspond to what is bright and illusion and woe to the shadow of that metaphysical brightness (excluding once again the subordinate gender position from fear of over-complicating the text). The bright side of a male hegemonic coupling is certainly psychic, whilst its dark side, corresponding to the bound, is somatic.

This has some interesting, if quite unconventional, moral ramifications, but I don't wish to enlarge upon that now. Suffice it to say that things are never simply black and white, least of all in terms of crime being somehow dark and punishment bright (the reverse is actually the case, since the one corresponds to metachemical free soma and the other to anti-chemical bound soma).

A distinction between the dark and the bright most certainly exists, and at all points of the intercardinal axial compass, but it is not simply in terms of soma being dark and psyche bright, or vice versa. That is why, with both the female ideal of free soma and the male ideal of free psyche corresponding to the bright side of

things, one has a moral incompatibility between them which is no mere black/white dichotomy but a competition between alternative kinds of brightness that is likely to lead to different types of society, depending on which kind is officially encouraged and regarded as alone right, and to keep those who believe in the one kind quite separate from those who believe in the other, both within and without their particular society.

For mutually incompatible, as free females and free males, they indubitably remain, as, in a corresponding sense, does Britain and Ireland, or the United Kingdom and the Republic of Ireland.

#### 4: THE RATIOS OF POSITIVITY TO NEGATIVITY ACCORDING TO CLASS AND/OR ELEMENT FOR EACH GENDER

People speak rather glibly of 'bitches' as something bad, but fail to appreciate that life could not prevail if people were wholly negative and of a character likely to bitch. Arguments tend to be the exception to the rule and so, too, do wars. People are more positive than negative, for how else could life survive and continue to prosper?

Exceptions to the general rule notwithstanding, we cannot even contend with any credibility that females are more negative than males, at least not in terms of the ratio of positive to negative factors. What does seem to

be the case is that there are female elements, viz. metachemistry and chemistry, or, in simple parlance, fire and water, and male elements, viz. physics and metaphysics, or, again, earth (vegetation) and air, the former pair primary and the latter secondary, and that the ratio of positive to negative tends to remain fairly consistent with a given class or elemental position, be it female or male.

To generalize in terms of 'upper' and 'lower', or noumenal and phenomenal, class and/or elemental positions is to allow for a distinction, whether in sensuality or in sensibility, between the absolute and the relative, the former having a 3:1 ratio of positive to negative, and the latter a  $2\frac{1}{2}:1\frac{1}{2}$  ratio of positive to negative, whether in soma or psyche, with regard to particles or wavicles.

So in metachemistry, for instance, there will tend to be three times as much positive as negative or, in other words, three times as much beauty and love in free soma as ugliness and hatred in bound psyche. Conversely, in metaphysics, which is a male noumenal element, there will tend to be three times as much truth and joy in free psyche as illusion and woe in bound soma.

For positivity is free and negativity bound, whether in soma or psyche, and freedom is invariably brightly supreme rather than darkly primal.

Likewise in chemistry, which is a female phenomenal

element, there will tend to be two-and-a-half times to one-and-a-half times as much positive as negative, with, say, strength and pride corresponding to the former and weakness and humiliation to the latter. Conversely, in physics, which is a male phenomenal element, there will tend to be two-and-a-half times to one-and-a-half times as much positive as negative, with knowledge and pleasure corresponding to the former and ignorance and pain to the latter.

Therefore whether one is a sensual bitch or indeed a sensible bastard, the positive tends, other factors notwithstanding, to prevail over the negative, and one has to admit that even the most committed of bitches can be three times as much beauty and love as ugliness and hatred, the most committed of bastards three times as much truth and joy as illusion and woe.

Down below, in the phenomenal realms of men and women generally, things are, admittedly, less clear-cut and corresponding less positive. But positivity still generally and even naturally prevails over negativity, and strength and pride do consequently prevail over weakness and humiliation, their male counterparts knowledge and pleasure likewise generally prevailing over ignorance and pain.

Normally, people are perceived as this or that, bitch or bastard, according to a momentary circumstance, a show of negativity in one form or another. But that fails to take account of the general picture, just as the ascription

of 'tramp' to someone who is perceived on their feet fails to take into account the necessity of his being, at other times, someone who sits on his backside and could be regarded, in consequence, as a 'bum'.

Therefore just as people tend, when down on their luck, to be both tramps *and* bums, so they are both positive and negative, free and bound, whether in or out of luck. In fact, beauty and love are no less characteristic of the noumenally free 'bitch' than ugliness and hatred of the noumenally bound one, who in any case is likely to be the same person under different circumstances.

And what applies to the metachemical female applies no less to her chemical counterpart, whose strength and pride will naturally take precedence over or have the better of weakness and humiliation. The 'dark side', which always corresponds to binding, is less prevalent than the brightness that normally – and supremely – obtains, for males no less than females, and we simply do an injustice to ourselves, and thus to life, when we fail to appreciate this fact.

Few men would prefer ignorance and pain to knowledge and pleasure, and yet we live in times when, through ignorance or commercial expedience, darkness is treated as though it were entirely independent of the brightness which more generally obtains and is even, in some sense, more influential and pervasive than the latter.

But the 'dark side' is even less prevalent in metaphysics,

and hence with noumenal males, than with their phenomenal counterparts, and truth and joy are likely to get the better of illusion and woe, as free psyche of bound soma, to a near absolute degree, which is to say, on something approaching a 3:1 ratio.

There are, however, two sets of paired elemental contexts, axially conditioned and both phenomenal, where the dark is traditionally granted more emphasis than the light or the bright side, and these are with physics over anti-chemistry at the south-east point of the intercardinal axial compass and with chemistry over anti-physics at its south-west point, and all because, in the first instance, the subversion of physics to somatic emphasis by anti-chemistry at the behest, in parallel gender terms, of a degree of metachemistry over anti-metaphysics back up the axis at the north-west point of the compass in question ensures that the darkness of anti-chemical bound soma (corresponding to punishment) remains or becomes polar to the brightness of metachemical free soma (corresponding to crime) on primary state-hegemonic terms, while the darkness of physical bound soma (corresponding to pseudo-wisdom) remains or becomes polar to the brightness of anti-metaphysical free soma (corresponding to pseudo-folly) on secondary state-hegemonic terms which, in general parlance, are male rather than female, whilst, in the second instance, the subversion of chemistry to psychic emphasis by anti-physics at the behest, in parallel gender terms, of a degree of metaphysics over anti-metachemistry back up the axis at the north-east point of

the compass in question ensures that the darkness of anti-physical bound psyche (corresponding to sin) remains or becomes polar to the brightness of metaphysical free psyche (corresponding to grace) on primary church-hegemonic terms, while the darkness of chemical bound psyche (corresponding to pseudo-evil) remains or becomes polar to the brightness of anti-metachemical free psyche (corresponding to pseudo-goodness) on secondary church-hegemonic terms which, in general parlance, are female rather than male.

Therefore whereas the male and anti-female masses at the south-east point of the intercardinal axial compass are more conditioned, through somatic emphasis, to the darkness of bound soma than to the church-subordinate light, or brightness, of free psyche (and this contrary to the natural ratio of positivity to negativity, freedom to binding, for the equivocally hegemonic gender), their female and anti-male counterparts at the south-west point of the said compass are likewise more conditioned, through psychic emphasis, to the darkness of bound psyche than to the state-subordinate light, or brightness, of free soma (contrary, once again, to the natural ratio of positivity to negativity, freedom to binding, for the equivocally hegemonic gender), and all because freedom for the masses of either axis would not only be bad, being of a contrary order, for the ruling elites, but bad for the masses themselves through want of axial guidance, continuity, stability, consistency, integrity, and the avoidance of phenomenal strife between the contrary orders of freedom obtaining in soma and psyche.

Incidentally, the total want of a God-the-Father parallel in physical free psyche (Man the Father) to the Son-of-Man concept correlative with physical bound soma (as a secondary state-hegemonic parallel vis-à-vis