

THE BEST OF ALL POSSIBLE WORLDS

John O'Loughlin



THE BEST OF ALL POSSIBLE WORLDS

By

JOHN O'LOUGHLIN

Of Centretruths Digital Media

CDM Philosophy

This edition of *The Best of All Possible Worlds* 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: 978-1-4466-8794-9

CONTENTS

Preface

Part 1

Part 2

Part 3

Part 4

Appendix I

Appendix II

Appendix III

Appendix IV

Biographical Footnote

PREFACE

I wrote the greater part of this aphoristic philosophy during the better part of a wet and windy week in my birthplace of Salthill, Galway, Ireland, when my health, bad as it had been back in London, was at an all-time low and every page was an immense struggle with my physical condition. Not having systematically undertaken any such project for several years, I was a little unsure that I would be able to proceed with any confidence anyway, but, as things turned out, my old habits of scrawling in a notebook with a pen were soon resurrected, and I found, in spite of my poor health, that ideas came in no short supply – indeed, that the spirit was willing but the flesh decidedly weakened by illness.

Nonetheless, much of the work turned out to be less of a resumé of my philosophy, including what had already been committed to weblogs, than an exploration of new territory, in which I had to struggle with a variety of conflicting possibilities and strive to reach as coherent an assessment and conclusion as possible. In retrospect

I can say that without subsequent revision back in London and some additional appended material, the results would have been inconclusive, if not misleading. But, as things turned out, much of this newer material has now passed a closer examination and will, I believe, stand the test of time as further evidence of philosophical truth, adding a veneer of certitude to my finished product.

In this title, a conclusive account of morality, in all its various permutations, has been undertaken and resolved; though only that morality which is logically likely to lead to or encompass 'the best of all possible worlds' (no reference to Voltaire intended) has been ideologically endorsed, together with its corresponding unmorality, a term which aptly describes the correlative, if subordinate, gender position in this ideal world dominated if not dome-inated, so to speak, by metaphysics.

John O'Loughlin, London 2008 (Revised 2022)

PART 1

The intercardinal axis stretches from the north-west to the south-east on the state-hegemonic/church-subordinate axis, and from the south-west to the north-east on the church-hegemonic/state-subordinate axis.

Therefore it bisects two diametrically opposite class positions on the state-hegemonic axis, namely the upper-class position of the metachemical north-west and the middle-class position of the physical south-east, the former female (diabolic or superfeminine) and the latter male (masculine).

Likewise it bisects two diametrically opposite class positions on the church-hegemonic/state-subordinate axis, namely the lower-class position of the chemical south-west and the classless position of the metaphysical north-east, the former female (feminine) and the latter male (divine or supermasculine).

Coupled, however, to each hegemonic position are subordinate positions relative to the upended gender, and these under-plane positions, as I have on occasion called them, correspond in pseudo-supermasculine male vein to pseudo-metaphysics (from out of anti-metaphysics) at the north-west point of the intercardinal axial compass, which exists under metachemistry as sequential time (pseudo-time) under spatial space; in pseudo-feminine vein to pseudo-chemistry (from out of

anti-chemistry) at the south-east point of the said compass, which exists under physics as voluminous volume (pseudo-volume) under massive mass; in pseudo-masculine vein to pseudo-physics (from out of anti-physics) at the south-west point of the said compass, which exists under chemistry as massed mass (pseudo-mass) under volumetric volume; and in pseudo-superfeminine vein to pseudo-metachemistry (from out of anti-metachemistry) at the north-east point of the said compass, which exists under metaphysics as spaced space (pseudo-space) under repetitive time.

Therefore metachemistry coupled, at the north-west point of the intercardinal axial compass, to pseudo-metaphysics is polar to physics or, more correctly in relation to the same gender, pseudo-chemistry coupled, at the south-east point of the said compass, to physics, while across the overall axial divide chemistry or, more correctly in relation to the same gender, pseudo-physics coupled, at the south-west point of the intercardinal axial compass, to chemistry is polar to metaphysics coupled, at the north-east point of the said compass, to pseudo-metachemistry.

One can also have – and sometimes finds – quasi-metachemistry (from out of anti-metaphysics), quasi-physics (from out of anti-chemistry), quasi-chemistry (from out of anti-physics), and quasi-metaphysics (from out of anti-metachemistry), but these ‘quasi’ positions tend to be the immoral exception to the unmoral (‘pseudo’) rule, as are the amoral ‘bovaryizations’, so to

speaking, of the hegemonic positions coming down from above, a plane up in each class case, in defiance of their moral advantages in relation to the normally unmoral subordinate gender position.

For morality, whether metachemical, physical, chemical, or metaphysical, exists over unmorality, as the clear in relation to the unholy where female-dominated gender pairings are concerned, and as the holy in relation to the unclear where their male-dominated – and sensible – counterparts are concerned.

Therefore anything amoral, coming down from above (a plane up) will be as morally undesirable from the hegemonic gender's standpoint as anything immoral coming up from below (a plane down) from the standpoint of the subordinate gender, which will normally be that of pseudo-metaphysics under metachemistry and of pseudo-chemistry under physics on the state-hegemonic/church-subordinate axis, and of pseudo-physics under chemistry and of pseudo-metachemistry under metaphysics on the church-hegemonic/state-subordinate axis.

Examples, in literature, of literary immorality, coming up from below, include drama (of which there is a considerable amount) written by males and of philosophy (of which there is comparatively little) written by females, whereas examples of literary amorality (coming down from above) include poetry (of which there is comparatively little) written by females

and of fiction (of which there is a great deal) written by males.

For fiction is no less pseudo-female than poetry is male or, rather, pseudo-male, while drama is no less female than philosophy is male, which, transposed to our respective axes on the intercardinal axial compass, will give us drama over pseudo-poetry vis-à-vis pseudo-philosophy over fiction on the state-hegemonic axis, but pseudo-drama over poetry vis-à-vis philosophy over pseudo-fiction on the church-hegemonic axis.

The difference between the metachemical and chemical forms of drama, however, is that whereas the former, corresponding to absolute (noumenal) criteria is 'short', the latter, corresponding to relative (phenomenal) criteria, will be 'long' – the difference, in a word, between elemental particles and molecular particles, the concrete ethereal and the concrete corporeal.

Likewise, the subordinate gender positions, or literary genres, will reflect these absolute/relative distinctions, being, in poetic terms, either 'short' or 'long', though less in relation to will and spirit than to pseudo-soul and pseudo-ego, their gender-representative attributes.

Similarly, the difference between the physical and metaphysical forms of philosophy is that whereas the former, corresponding to relative (phenomenal) criteria, will be 'long', the latter, corresponding to absolute (noumenal) criteria, will be 'short' – the difference, in a

word, between molecular wavicles and elemental wavicles, the abstract corporeal and the abstract ethereal.

Likewise, the subordinate gender positions, or literary genres, will reflect these relative/absolute distinctions, being, in prosaic terms, either 'long' or 'short', though less in relation to ego and soul than to pseudo-spirit and pseudo-will, their gender-representative attributes.

For no less than pseudo-soul and pseudo-ego in the pseudo-metaphysical and pseudo-physical forms of poetry will be germane, under female hegemonic pressures, to bound psyche, pseudo-spirit and pseudo-will in the pseudo-chemical and pseudo-metachemical forms of fiction will be germane, under male hegemonic pressures, to bound soma.

Males, if left to their own devices, will no more opt for bound psyche (coupled to free soma) than females for bound soma (coupled to free psyche). In either case, all such gender paradoxes, which we have equated with the 'pseudo', are a consequence of hegemonic pressure from the opposite gender, whose existence, a plane up from their subordinate complements, ensures the paradoxical outcome described, an outcome which, despite a superficial emphasis on soma in the female-dominated cases and on psyche in the male-dominated ones, cannot change the basic gender ratio of the subordinate gender, whether in relation to male psyche or to female soma, and whether with an absolute (3:1) or

a relative ($2\frac{1}{2}:1\frac{1}{2}$) bias.

Thus although the subordinate gender can be obliged to emphasize free soma (if pseudo-male) or free psyche (if pseudo-female), their respective gender bias towards