

JOHN O'LOUGHLIN



THE 'LIVING GOD' LIE

An Essay in loosely Aphoristic Form

Centretruths Digital Media

THE 'LIVING GOD' LIE

An Essay in loosely Aphoristic Form by

JOHN O'LOUGHLIN

Of Centretruths Digital Media

CDM Philosophy

This edition of *The 'Living God' Lie* first published 2024
Centretruths Digital Media

Copyright © 2024 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: 978-1-4461-0433-0

* * * *

CONTENTS

PREFACE

BOOK 1A

UNHYPHENTATED VERSION
UNHYPHENATED ADDENDUM

BOOK 1B

HYPHENATED VERSION
HYPHENATED ADDENDUM

* * * *

PREFACE

Continuing from where my previous title, *The Unparalleled Logic of Om-niscience* (1923–24) leaves off, almost literally so, in that I have utilized its appendix as the starting-point, albeit on much-overhauled revisionary terms, for this project, and then added a considerable amount of fresh material to create a new one, this title is further divided, with 'Books 1A/B', into two versions, the first of which, dubbed 'Unhyphenated Version', is followed by an 'Unhyphenated Addendum', whilst the second of which, dubbed 'Hyphenated Version', is likewise duly followed by a 'Hyphenated Addendum', both of them being the exact thematic replica of the preceding book except for the fact that all the terms (usually fairly unique to my philosophy) which I preferred not to hyphenate in the one have, as noted, been duly hyphenated in the other, thereby providing a more or less conventional text for those readers who would struggle with the unhyphenated version and its addendum, which, so far as I am concerned, is the main book, that being 'Book 1A', intended for the 'radically tight' rather than for the 'conventionally loose' who, even if not invariably female, nonetheless deserve access, via 'Book 1B', to a relatively more accessible text.

That much established, there is nothing to prevent one from proceeding from the unhyphenated to the hyphenated version, together with their more

structurally-intensive and thematically-comprehensive addenda, as a matter of linear course, since, whatever one may think of the former, having the opportunity to reread it on a looser basis can only enhance one's understanding of the overall philosophy and, hopefully, conduce towards a better grasp of its structures, designed to accommodate as comprehensive an overview of all the components and of how they interrelate or don't interrelate, as the case may be, to the advantage of a deeper insight into the complexities of what must surely be the apotheosis of logic and, hence, the true end of philosophy.

As to its subject-matter, I can only add that, unlike most of my recent writings, this project largely focuses on Upper-order and, hence, Ecclesiastic criteria in view of the nature of its title, with only passing references (except in the well-nigh thematically exhaustive addenda) to what is secular and, hence, lower order in character. For that reason, I have chosen to utilize initial capitals to an extent rarely encountered in writings of a philosophical order, the better to emphasize what, in general parlance, would correspond to 'God' and the 'Devil' as opposed, in lower-order vein, to 'man' and 'woman', notwithstanding the maintenance, in all contexts, of a hegemonic/subordinate pairing between what I term 'Representative' and 'pseudo-Representative' positions, together with their respective hegemonic and subordinate 'Extrapolations', as described in the text. In that respect, and for that matter certain others, this project has achieved what I regard as

a definitive presentation of my logic in relation to certain issues that were formerly less logically developed but still, for all that, of a character well beyond the parameters of what usually passes, with academic pedants and even some artist-philosophers, for philosophical truth when, in point of fact, they are not even remotely close to it!

John O'Loughlin, 2024

* * * *

BOOK 1A

UNHYPHENATED VERSION

1

The distinction between Science and Religion in its various positive permutations, hegemonic and subordinate, representative and extrapolative, is actually one between the Immorality of Life and the Morality of Death, as (generalizing non-ratio specifically in relation to atomic dichotomies) between Power and Contentment, War and Peace, Particles and Wavicles, Beauty and Truth or, more fulcrum-specifically, Joy, even if the Joy of being released from the burden of the flesh can't, by its very transient nature, last for ever but, as even Schopenhauer would likely have agreed, must give way, by and by, to the peace that follows less from being freed from the flesh than from being at One with the Soul, that is, more specifically, with the Supersoul of One's Spinal Fluid, which, contrary to Sartre's insistence upon Existence preceding Essence, is the Essence that precedes Existence or, more correctly (since 'existence' is a vague term that covers a multitude of existing possibilities including – to generalize

– the Will, the Id, the Ego, and even the Soul, all of which indubitably *exist*, whether or not acknowledged by Sartre), that precedes the Apparent Nature (from an active standpoint) of the Spinal Cord, which stands in an Inferior relationship to the Supersoul as, in overall terms, a Subwill (pretty much as Cardinals to the Pope) in the dichotomous Superreligious/Subscientific relationship of the Positive Atom in question, which I would tend to identify with Supermetaphysics/Submetachemistry as an antithesis to Supermetachemistry/Submetaphysics, wherein it could be maintained, in fairly Sartrean vein, that Existence precedes Essence, as, on positive terms, the Heart preceding the Blood.

2

But I digress! This dichotomy between Science and Religion, whether favouring Science in the Alpha-based contexts or, antithetically, favouring Religion in the Omega-centred ones, is none other than a distinction between Life and Death, Immorality and Morality, War and Peace, which,

of course, co-exist on either Superlative (+3:1, most:least) or, by Extrapolation, Comparative (+2½:1½, more:less) terms, across all of the possible permutations appertaining to what are, in effect, the Representative Atoms of either Supermetachemistry/Submetaphysics or Supermetaphysics/Submetachemistry (+3:1, most:least superlative) and, by Extrapolation, either Metachemistry/Unmetaphysics or Metaphysics/Unmetachemistry (+2½:1½, more:less comparative), to say nothing of their respective Subordinate, or pseudo-Atomic, counterparts whereby either pseudo-Submetachemistry/pseudo-Supermetaphysics or pseudo-Submetaphysics/pseudo-Supermetachemistry (+1:3, pseudo-least:most pseudo-superlative) and, by pseudo-Extrapolation, either pseudo-Unmetachemistry/pseudo-Metaphysics or pseudo-Unmetaphysics/pseudo-Metachemistry (+1½:2½, pseudo-less:more pseudo-comparative) tend to exist pseudo-antithetically with one another.

3

So, when one realizes the contrary natures of Science and Religion, corresponding to the Devil and God (to generalize non-ratio specifically), with the one fundamental to Life and the other transcendentally beyond it in the so-called Afterlife of or following ... Death, then one will know that the concept of a 'Living God' is fundamentally false, since Life and God are as incompatible as the Devil and Death, or Fundamentalism and Transcendentalism, or Hell and Heaven, or, as noted above, Beauty and Truth.

4

This concept of the 'Living God' is germane to the Lie of State Religion, whereby Religion exists in the shadows of the Light of Science, as of Life, on the Inferior side of a Superior/Inferior ratio dichotomy. Moreover, the hijacking, under State auspices, of Religion by Science, of God, to put it bluntly, by the Devil (so that the State effectively eclipses the Church and takes on, as it were, the

role of Science under the guise of Religion), leads, as a matter of course, to the affirmation of Life, as of the Light, at the expense of Death, as of the Shade (which is no less antithetical to Light on Primary Superior terms than Darkness to Brightness on Secondary Superior terms, excluding, in this instance, their polar Superior and Inferior ratio-specific Primary and Secondary interrelationships within any given atomicity), and to an ethos which insists that one should not kill but, rather, 'increase and multiply', since that is precisely what Nature, Science, the Devil, and anything else predominately on the female side of things, normally wants.

5

And yet, despite such Old Testament, Judaic-inspired injunctions to breed, which appertain more, originally, to the Mosaic 'Thou Shalt Not' negative preconditions of positivity than to anything overtly positive and reproductively circumspect, Western civilization has, in its various manifestations, largely under first Greco-Roman and then Christian leadership, defied

most such injunctions, including, not least, the one forbidding man to kill, as the hideous wars, only too well-documented by Western historians, amply attest. They have often claimed, particularly in the Christian West, to have had God on their side in the various battles and military campaigns being waged down the centuries. But can one have had the God of Death, Christ, nailed to His Cross and evidently in the Afterlife (of paradisaical peace), on one's side when one was endeavouring to further Life through Empire-building and/or territorial expansion?

6

Surely not! For how could it profit one to identify with Death, and thus send one's armies – assuming one could then raise any – to the slaughter as a matter of principle? Is it not, rather, that these warring armies have identified with the Lie of the 'Living God', as with Science, and thus regarded their imperial aggrandisements as being justified, if not literally sanctified, by Religion? It is State Religion which has

conveniently permitted them to claim allegiance to 'God' when, all or most of the time, the warring factions have done a deal with the 'Devil', as with that which is fundamentally behind Life and hell-bent, in consequence, not merely on surviving (though that is obviously important) but on thriving, and on thriving, moreover, at other peoples' expense, whereby the necessity to kill comes all-too-bloodily into play.

7

It is mainly under male auspices that this overturning of the Mosaic commandment not to kill has come into effect; for males, believe it or not, are often if not usually more partial to Death in one form or another, including a number of its cultural manifestations, than to Life, and will willingly kill others if it allows them to serve the Life-affirming dominating dispositions of females, with whom the great majority of them are fated to have intimate relations, and all the more so as they appertain to the triumph, Quasar and Black Hole-like, of Science over Religion in due negative fashion, quite apart from its Heart

and Blood-like positive counterpart to which many in the Christian West may have theoretically subscribed before things got brutally out-of-hand, not least (though by no means exclusively) in relation to the non-Christian East and also, to some extent, as a consequence of Heresy.

8

So, paradoxically, most males, who usually feel inferior to females when dominated by negative Alpha-based Cosmic and/or Pantheistic criteria, will willingly kill others in battle if it serves the overriding cause of Life, to which, like so many submissive sons of an imperious mother, they voluntarily or reluctantly, depending on character and circumstance, duly submit. Inflicting Death upon others, they strive towards the victory of Life under the false narrative of their Religious delusions, fostered, as noted, by the State, which is always fundamentally on the side of Science in one way or another.

9

But even though the various Atomic permutations of Life and Death, whether hegemonic or subordinate, representative or extrapolative, either side of antithetical dichotomies, are germane to the Upper-order/pseudo-Upper-order contexts, we cannot altogether exclude the lower-order/pseudo-lower-order ones from an identification of sorts with their own equivalents to Life and Death, which, unlike those of their Ecclesiastic betters, will be neither Immoral nor Moral, neither Apparent nor Essential, Corporeal nor Ethereal, but ever somatically qualitative or psychically quantitative in relation, hegemonically, to either the id or the ego, and therefore amorally paradoxical in terms of the various permutations of 'death' (stemming from being anti-Life) and 'life' (stemming from being anti-Death) that require the use, as here, of quotation marks to highlight their incompatibility with and aloofness from what has already been unequivocally identified with the various kinds of Life and Death described above.

10

Here there is no overriding Elemental Particle vis-à-vis Elemental Wavicle distinction between Science and Religion, the Corporeal and the Ethereal (to continue generalizing non-ratio specifically) but, rather, a molecular 'wavicle' vis-à-vis a molecular 'particle' distinction between politics and economics, the somatic id and the psychic ego, as applying, more dichotomously, to either a democratic/unplutocratic rejection of Autocracy/Untheocracy (by extrapolation from Superautocracy/Subtheocracy) or, antithetically, a plutocratic/undemocratic rejection of Theocracy/Unautocracy (by extrapolation from Supertheocracy/Subautocracy), notwithstanding their own superstandard/substandard (from standard/unstandard) or, in the subordinate contexts accompanying these hegemonic atoms, pseudo-substandard/pseudo-superstandard (from pseudo-unstandard/pseudo-standard) extrapolations! Neither 'death', in the somatic molecular 'wavicles' of the id, nor 'life', in the psychic molecular 'particles' of the ego, can be compared with Life, in the Corporeal Elemental Particles of the Will, or with Death, in the

Ethereal Elemental Wavicles of the Soul (to generalize non-ratio specifically), and for that reason these secular opposites will remain amorally beneath, even by extrapolation, whatever is either fundamentally Immoral or transcendently Moral, being neither of the Devil nor God (to continue generalizing) but only of woman or man, centred, molecular wavicle-like, in naturalism or rooted, molecular particle-like, in realism, their respective antithetical primary aspects, or fulcra, on the superior side of each atomic dichotomy, divisible, as always, between primary and secondary aspects on both superior and inferior terms, elemental-particle materialism secondary to molecular-wavicle naturalism and elemental-wavicle idealism to molecular-particle realism on superior (standard $+2\frac{1}{2}$) terms, with unelemental-unwavicle unidealism secondary to unmolecular-unparticle unrealism and unelemental-unparticle unmaterialism secondary to unmolecular-unwavicle unnaturalism on inferior (unstandard $+1\frac{1}{2}$) terms, so that, overall, a hegemonic primary superior/inferior antithesis exists between molecular-wavicle naturalism/unmolecular-unparticle unrealism and molecular-particle realism/unmolecular-unwavicle unnaturalism, with elemental-particle

materialism/unelemental-unwavicle unidealism
and elemental-wavicle idealism/unelemental-
unparticle unmaterialism their respective
secondary superior/inferior counterparts.

11

Yet here, too, delusion can transpire, even if it has little or nothing to do with State Religion but solely appertains to secular values in which 'death' is more likely to have political implications and 'life' economic ones, the former usually associated with sex (not least in relation to contraception and abortion rights) and the latter with sport (more usually of a trophy-chasing competitive nature). But the persistence, overlaying this, of State Religion is a guarantor that the Life of the 'Living God' will somehow persist, and that wars will be waged the name of Religion, or God, which are actually rooted in Science, or the Devil.

We cannot get to a situation whereby the Morality of Death (and what follows in terms of Infinite Peace) can be furthered, by spiritually-inclined righteous males, on a determinedly cultural – as opposed to an unwittingly barbarous – basis so long as Religion remains in the grip of Science, and thereby kowtows to whatever is Life-affirming. Only the rejection of State Religion, as of the State which underpins it, can lead to a peaceful approach to Death, and hence to a resurrection of the 'Dead', as of 'Death', from whatever has traditionally transpired, on terms that would not only invalidate the delusions of a 'Living God' but vindicate the existence of the 'Dead God' (Christ) to such an extent that even Roman Catholicism (the Christianity of the 'True Church', as of the Church that, with its fixation on Death through the humanized Y-chromosomal wing-like upstretched-arms-intimation of Holy Spirit up yonder on the 'True Cross', is closest to ...