

STATIONS OF THE SUPERCROSS



JOHN
O'LOUGHLIN

STATIONS OF THE SUPERCROSS
Attraction and Reaction in Gender Perspective

JOHN O'LOUGHLIN

This edition of *Stations of the Supercross* first published 2015 and
republished (with revisions) 2022 by Centretruths Digital Media

Copyright © 2015, 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-978-1-326-17614-3

CONTENTS

Preface

First Station
Second Station
Third Station
Fourth Station
Fifth Station
Sixth Station
Seventh Station
Eight Station
Ninth Station
Tenth Station
Eleventh Station
Twelfth Station

PREFACE

Those familiar with my work, particularly my writings of the past few years, will know that I like to combine philosophy, or a logically structured way of writing derived from years of abstract thought, with other approaches to text, including autobiographical, psychological, poetical (to a degree), historical, political, religious, and analytical, so that the results, sometimes confusing, are rarely predictable, but can take you by surprise, as when you pass from an autobiographical sketch or a political observation straight into an intensely analytical or philosophical section, though usually not without some forewarning or a lacuna of some sort in the layout of the text.

So it is here, in this remarkable collection of structured aphorisms and maxims and what might appear to be essays but are, in fact, aphorisms of a more discursive nature within a title-shunning format that eschews paragraphs in keeping with its aphoristic bias – rather Nietzschean in a way – that I long ago identified with the concept of 'supernotes', or notes that have been copied from a notebook and reworked and refined and expanded upon until they resemble short essays, without, however, conceding much else to essayistic tradition.

In such a mainly metaphysical fashion I have consistently advanced the theoretical breadth and depth of my work, derived, naturally, from habitual thought

processes, and the results should speak confidently and credibly enough for themselves without my having to say very much about them, other, of course, than that they continue, in the vein to which I have become accustomed, the struggle for truth, or philosophical credibility and metaphysical insight, and have continued the process to a new and hopefully final level or stage of completion which it would be difficult if not impossible for me or, for that matter, anyone else to reasonably surpass, bearing in mind the complexities that so exactly comprehensive an approach to logic, as I have fathered both here and in the past, inevitably entail. So maybe the job, or task, which I humbly and somewhat naively set myself over four decades ago, is now completed, and with such a degree of structural credibility that I have even been able to bend the rules and invent one or two new words and new ways of thinking about old words or subjects or categories that, frankly, should stand up to scrutiny and any amount of analytical attention.

But, of course, a book of mine is an adventure, never quite knowing where it is going or where, eventually, it will get to, and this one is no exception, since the sheer eclecticism of my writings makes it difficult to nail it down to a specific title, even if the subtitle I have chosen, viz. 'Attraction and Reaction in Gender Perspective', is certainly quite well-represented in the text, albeit by degrees and not at all at the beginning.

Certainly a number of other specific titles came to mind,

but none of them would have adequately represented anything but a fraction of the overall text, and so, in the end, I wisely and I think correctly opted for a title that would be both sufficiently abstract and sufficiently ambiguous (for it actually is, if you ponder it for a moment) as to do general justice to a style of writing that refuses to follow the usual linear patterns of composition of the 'straight press', including essayists, but gives you so many strands of thought to follow or think about that no single strand, be it philosophical or autobiographical or anything else, could possibly do justice to the entirety of the text, which, as intimated above, is of an intensely eclectic character.

That is how I write, how I prefer to write, and I make no apologies. You can take it or leave it. But those who persevere with my work – and not only here but in previous books – will, if they are sufficiently intelligent and of the right turn-of-mind, be rewarded to a degree that few other books, I venture to assert, would reward them, since few other authors could possibly claim to have achieved as much or to have brought their philosophy to such a conclusively logical pass, and you would have to be a fool or scoundrel not to see that or profit from it.

John O'Loughlin, London 2015 (Revised 2022)

FIRST STATION

When his epitaph comes to be written, let it be stated that he was considerably ignorant, but only in the sense that he spent the greater part of his life ignoring fools and scoundrels.

The sun looked so pallid, as it lay hidden behind a thick veil of dense grey cloud, that I thought for a moment it was the moon, only to realize an instant later that the day had not turned into night, but was still the same sad affair it had been all along. Later that same dreary day, we were suddenly and quite unexpectedly compensated by a quite marvellous sunset, the deep orange glow of which hovered in the air like a majestic halo of enraptured cloud – the sun having got its own back, as it were, on the cloudiness that had earlier obscured it, as though it had been engulfed, isolated, and humiliated by a conspiracy of jealous rivals. What sank in the west like an orange would rise in the east like a lemon, or so I supposed.

When it comes to the hatred of the inferior for the superior vis-a-vis the contempt of the superior for the inferior, I know full-well which side I stand on!

Women love fools and hate the wise.

Liberals, being synthetically androgynous, adhere to a concept of sanity that is middle-of-the-road and therefore

a combination, in effect, of female and male types of sanity, the former being outer and, hence, somatic; the latter inner and, hence, psychic. There is no taste for an outer/inner sanity dichotomy with them such that would imply a thesis/antithesis opposition or, more correctly, partnership in which either alpha dominated omega (as pseudo-omega), whether in terms of metachemistry over pseudo-metaphysics or chemistry over pseudo-physics, or omega dominated alpha (as pseudo-alpha), whether in terms of metaphysics over pseudo-metachemistry or physics over pseudo-chemistry. An atomic split, or cleavage, between left-wing outer sanity, or 'outsanity', and right-wing inner sanity, or 'insanity', even given the fact that, in practice, the division between the two types of sanity follows the 'partnership' options noted above, is not acceptable to the liberal mindset, which is about a worldly synthesis favouring either the left-leaning liberal (in republican socialism) or the right-leaning liberal (in parliamentary democracy), with mainstream liberalism striving, in an almost androgynous manner, to strike a balance between the two. Even the worldly (phenomenal) alternatives can be divided between so-called moderate forms of thesis and antithesis, whether favouring the left (in chemistry over pseudo-physics) or the right (in physics over pseudo-chemistry), so that, as with the extreme (noumenal) forms of such a dichotomy, one finds either an alpha/pseudo-omega distinction or, across the axial divide at the south-east point of what I like to call the intercardinal axial compass, an omega/pseudo-alpha one, with the Conservative Party in Britain typifying the omega, or physical, right-wing

position, and the Labour Party the pseudo-alpha, or pseudo-chemical, left-wing or, more correctly, pseudo-left-wing position in a type of worldly dichotomy that, in its corporeal phenomenality, has to be distinguished from any right-wing-orientated liberal centrism whose synthetic approach to politics, as to society, necessarily rules out such a thesis/antithesis dichotomy, as would the formation of a coalition government at the expense of an outright victory by one of the contending parties, including, ironically, the Liberals. Of course, such a dichotomy is, in practice, more thesis/pseudo-antithesis in its *seeming* partnership than anything else, and the same holds good of any *apparent* dichotomy encouraging, in broadly republican socialist fashion, the hegemony of chemistry over pseudo-physics, of alpha over pseudo-omega, where the purgatorial outer sane tend to dominate the pseudo-earthly pseudo-inner sane within a dichotomy characterized by a left-wing political (republican) bias. And the same holds true, of course, of the extreme, or noumenal, forms of such a dichotomy, as in the case of metachemistry over pseudo-metaphysics, where not politics but science is hegemonic, a plane up (in space over pseudo-time) from pseudo-metaphysics, over not pseudo-economics, with its pseudo-right-wing bias, but pseudo-religion, the converse of the religious dominance of pseudo-scientific pseudo-metachemistry by metaphysics at the north-east point of the intercardinal axial compass, where an absolute form of inner sanity, or 'insanity', has the better, lamb over (neutralized) lion and/or wolf-like, of a pseudo-absolute form of pseudo-outer sanity, or 'pseudo-outsanity', and one could speak,

as with its alpha/pseudo-omega antithesis, of a superthesis/pseudo-anti-superthesis partnership or, better, pairing, albeit one less *apparent* than *seeming*. So the term 'sanity' is only relative, that is, significant of a synthetic avoidance, from either of the middle-ground centrist worldly standpoints, of the kind of thesis/antithesis distinctions, to speak in general terms, in which either 'outsanity' dominates 'insanity', whether on an extreme or a moderate, a noumenal or phenomenal basis, or, in complete contrast, 'insanity' dominates 'outsanity', likewise on either extreme or moderate, noumenal or phenomenal terms. Liberalism is an avoidance, a calculated avoidance through synthetic amorality, of the 'good fight' of psyche against soma, omega against alpha, that results in either a relative triumph, through physics over pseudo-chemistry, of omega over alpha or, more correctly, pseudo-alpha, or in an absolute triumph, through metaphysics over pseudo-metachemistry, in which, as intimated above, the omega is less economic than religious and the alpha or, rather, pseudo-alpha less pseudo-political than pseudo-scientific, with implications that suggest a transcendence of worldly criteria in terms of an otherworldly hegemony over pseudo-netherworldly criteria appropriate to a parallel with 'Kingdom Come' or, in simple metaphorical parlance, with the triumph of saint over (neutralized) dragon or, better still, with the free psychic triumph of Heaven/God over the pseudo-bound somatic Pseudo-Devil/Pseudo-Hell, where the respective major ratio factors (3 as against the minor ratio 1) of metaphysics and pseudo-metachemistry are concerned, the one

absolutely bright and the other pseudo-absolutely pseudo-dark, for ever in the divine shadow, as it were, of religious inner sanity.

* * * *

1. On the distinction which I have touched upon from time to time in my writings between italic printerly and italic writerly types of character presentation, I believe that the former should, when truly representative, be polychromatic and the latter monochromatic, as though in reflection of a centrifugal/centripetal antithesis between metachemistry and metaphysics on the noumenal (ethereal) planes of space and time, with objective (disjunctive) and subjective (conjunctive) implications.
2. When, however, italic print is monochrome and italic write, or writing, polychrome, I believe one has a paradoxical parallel with pseudo-metachemistry and pseudo-metaphysics, the former subordinate to the italic writing of metaphysics as pseudo-italic printing, and the latter subordinate to the italic printing of metachemistry as pseudo-italic writing.
3. On the distinction, by contrast, between printerly and writerly styles of character presentation, I believe that the former should, when truly representative, be polychrome and the latter monochrome, as though in reflection of a centrifugal/centripetal antithesis between

chemistry and physics on the phenomenal (corporeal) planes of volume and mass, with objective (disjunctive) and subjective (conjunctive) implications.

4. When, however, print is monochrome (as, incidentally, it usually is) and write, or writing, polychrome, it strikes me that one has a paradoxical parallel with pseudo-chemistry and pseudo-physics, the former subordinate to the writing of physics as pseudo-printing, and the latter subordinate to the printing of chemistry as pseudo-writing.

It should also be noted that the distinction between printing and writing, whether noumenal or phenomenal, italic or standard, is effectively akin to that between particles and wavicles, the objective extrapolation from a vacuum of the former contrasting with the subjective extrapolation from a plenum of the latter in a manner suggestive of a gender dichotomy between female and male, in which the somatic parallel of the one (in italic print and standard print) has to be contrasted with the psychic parallel of the other (italic write and standard write), in keeping with the overall concrete/abstract distinction between a centrifugal alpha and a centripetal omega or, in the case of the pseudo-psychic and pseudo-somatic subordinate positions, a pseudo-centripetal pseudo-omega and a pseudo-centrifugal pseudo-alpha, neither of which would be 'true' to themselves but, rather, paradoxical reflections, in