

THE YANG AND ANTI-YIN QUARTET

John O'Loughlin



YANG & ANTI-YIN
OF THE YANG QUARTET



YANG & ANTI-YIN
OF THE ANTI-YIN QUARTET



THE YANG AND ANTI-YIN QUARTET

By

JOHN O'LOUGHLIN

Of Centretruths Digital Media

CDM Philosophy

This edition of *The Yang and Anti-Yin Quartet* 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

CONTENTS

Preface

Yang and Anti-Yin

Lamb and Anti-Lion

'Celestial City' and Anti-'Vanity Fair'

Jesus – A Summing Up!

Appendix

Biographical Footnote

PREFACE

This is the last in the series of aphoristic philosophy quartets stemming from *The Ethnic Universality Quartet* (2002), and, like its predecessors, including one notable recent departure from the quartet mould, namely *The Father Omega Sextet* (2004), it continues with the task of expanding the ideological frontiers of Social Theocracy towards their ultimate culmination in a structure which is both metaphysical and, in the case of what has been termed anti-metachemistry, less than metaphysical but equally crucial to the viability of what the author regards as an ultimate solution to the existence of the world considered as a female-dominated phenomenon partial to greed and exploitation, such that can only be opposed from a standpoint favouring the aforementioned metaphysical and anti-metachemical structure in relation to the possibility of some equivalence not only of the proverbial Saint and neutralized Dragon of Catholic legend but, no less significantly, of 'Kingdom Come', rendered all the more imperative in view of the current parlous situation of the world and, more particularly, of those who suffer from the powerful oppression of greed-motivated exploiters the most!

Thus with this quartet, dating from 2004–5, a phase of John O'Loughlin's writing comes to an end as a kind of consummation of his philosophical endeavours to-date, and this is especially so of the final book in this quartet,

'Jesus – A Summing Up!', the appendix to which paves the way for the weblogs that were to ensue from 2005 onwards through a succession of blog hosts and, following due revision and reformatting, a new approach to eBook creation that has continued to the present time, with further refinements of and modifications to the philosophy outlined both here and in previous titles.

John O'Loughlin, 2012 (Revised 2022)

YANG AND ANTI-YIN

(The Dialectics of Noumenal Sensibility)

001. If one were to characterize the state-hegemonic axis descending from noumenal sensuality to phenomenal sensibility and, contrariwise, the church-hegemonic axis ascending from phenomenal sensuality to noumenal sensibility in terms of different numbers, I think the female orientation towards soma of the former axis and the male orientation towards psyche of the latter axis would encourage us to differentiate between 0 and 8 in connection with the one and 6 and 9 in connection with the other, though only as a preliminary to a more comprehensively exacting distinction between the primary aspects of each axis and their secondary, or subordinate, complements.
002. For what has been called the state-hegemonic axis is no more reducible to a distinction between fire and water in respect of the descent from noumenal sensuality to phenomenal sensibility than its church-hegemonic counterpart can be reduced to a distinction between vegetation (earth) and air in respect of an ascent from phenomenal sensuality to noumenal sensibility, and therefore we can no more settle for a pat distinction between 0 and 8 in relation to the one axis than between 6 and 9 in

relation to the other.

003. Rather it seems to me that just as the state-hegemonic axis descends in primary terms from metachemistry to anti-chemistry, fire to anti-water, and in secondary terms from anti-metaphysics to physics, anti-air to vegetation (earth), so it could be said to numerically descend from 0 to -8 or, in view of the relativity of the phenomenal, -88 in primary state-hegemonic terms and from -9 to 66 in secondary state-hegemonic terms, the former of course female and the latter male.
004. Conversely we shall argue that just as the church-hegemonic axis ascends in primary terms from anti-physics to metaphysics, anti-vegetation to air, and in secondary terms from chemistry to anti-metachemistry, water to anti-fire, so it could be said to numerically ascend from -66 to 99 or, in view of the absolutism of the noumenal, 9 in primary church-hegemonic terms and from 88 to -0 in secondary church-hegemonic terms, the former of course male and the latter female.
005. Therefore far from a simple polarity between 0 and 8 on the state-hegemonic axis, one would have a polarity between 0 and -88, metachemical and anti-chemical, upper class free soma and anti-lower class bound soma on the one hand, and between -9 and 66, anti-metaphysical and physical, anti-classless bound psyche and middle class free

psyche on the other hand, taking the more representatively characteristic aspects of each gender separately, irrespective of to what extent everything male in state-hegemonic society is obliged to defer to criteria dominated, in female fashion, by soma, whether free in noumenal sensuality or bound in phenomenal sensibility.

006. Likewise, if from a contrary standpoint, far from a simple polarity between 6 and 9 on the church-hegemonic axis, one would have a polarity between -66 and 9, anti-physical and metaphysical, anti-lower class bound psyche and classless free psyche on the one hand, and between 88 and -0, chemical and anti-metachemical, lower class free soma and anti-upper class bound soma on the other hand, once again taking the more representatively characteristic aspects of each gender separately, irrespective of to what extent everything female in church-hegemonic society is obliged to defer to criteria dominated, in male vein, by psyche, whether bound in phenomenal sensuality or free in noumenal sensibility.

007. For the genders remain more or less what they are by nature (in soma) or nurture (in psyche) irrespective of contrary pressures being applied by the hegemonic or subversive gender, as the case may be, and will still be fundamentally at cross-purposes with one another despite an appearance of complementarity and seeming unanimity in

partnership. A male emphasizing, under sensual female pressures, soma contrary to his gender actuality (of psyche preceding and predominating over soma) and a female emphasizing, under sensible male pressures, psyche contrary to her gender actuality (of soma preceding and predominating over psyche) will still be fundamentally what they are by nurture or nature, and therefore at cross-purposes with their fundamental dispositions and always capable, if insufficiently subordinated, of revolting against their upended predicament, be it psychically oppressive or somatically repressive, bad from a male standpoint or, no less certainly, bad from a female standpoint.

008. That said, the struggle by virtuous males to achieve and maintain a sensible hegemony over females duly upended and rendered somewhat at cross-purposes with their underlying gender actuality is an honourable and even noble one, and there would not be much civilization or, more specifically, culture and civility in existence, whether at a human or, in anticipation of the future, post-human and effectively cyborg stage of existence were males of a sensible stamp not disposed to such a struggle, whether on the phenomenal basis of Puritanism or on the comparatively noumenal basis of Roman Catholicism and, hopefully to a greater extent in the decades and centuries to come, of what I call Social Theocracy and view as an

altogether higher and psychically freer form of religious sensibility to either what precedes it on the church-hegemonic axis or, indeed, to what exists as the sensible resolution of the state-hegemonic axis when such an axis is disposed, as in Britain traditionally, to descend from noumenal sensuality to phenomenal sensibility, as from Monarchy to Parliament in political terms and from Anglicanism to Puritanism in religious terms, terms which, with Britain, tend to confirm a church-subordinate complement to what, certainly since Henry VIII, has been a state-hegemonic mean.

009. However that may be, the 'enemy', if I may so put it, from any male-led sensible position is always that which appertains to sensuality; for it is the outer and in some sense darker manifestation of life which, in its barbarism and/or philistinism, stands closer, in effect, to death, to the negation of civility and, above all, culture in terms of the denial of psychic freedom from standpoints rooted in free soma. And such standpoints can only be, now as before, the product of a female hegemonic and subversive dominance of society such that is naturally disposed to everything barbarous and philistine, everything inveterately of nature and, behind nature, of the Cosmos.

010. Therefore our choice of numerical symbols like 0 and 88 is not arbitrary but significant, it seems to me, of the vacuous nature of things female which,

appertaining to a XX-chromosomal cosh, wages a seemingly unceasing and merciless war against the male side of life, not least on ego and soul, in the interests of freedoms which objectively pertain to the will and the spirit in their somatic quest for sensual dominion.

011. These days it could be said that civilization, certainly in the West and especially in America, is more characterized by barbarity and philistinism than by civility and culture, in reflection of what has been a drift from traditions dominated by males to more open and even – for this is almost inevitable – alpha-orientated heathenistic norms the product, in no small part, of female domination in respect of secular values generally. For if you give a creature whose underlying chromosomal structure corresponds to XX, to a double negative in photonic and electronic terms, an inch, it won't be long before, lacking a 'Y' dimension, she will take a proverbial mile, and what has the appearance of greater democracy will in fact amount to a covert if not in the more wildly Western examples overt autocracy, in which females effectively 'call the shots', whether or not from the openly vacuous vantage-point of cathode-ray tube technology. And the result, not surprisingly, is the height and depth of superficiality, of banality, of crudity and cruelty and immorality, as vice openly parades its freely somatic darkness all over the place with seeming impunity and increased opportunity. The result, in

other words, is anything but desirable from a male standpoint! For the male that is under female domination is no male at all but effectively anti-male, whether as an anti-god under the Devil, like the Anti-Son of Anti-God under Devil the Mother, or as anti-man under woman, like the Anti-Son of Anti-Man under Woman the Mother, to take the somatic, and therefore more prevalent, examples from each context.

012. He will, in fact, be dancing to a female tune, call it anti-metaphysically somatic in the anti-godly context or anti-physically somatic in the anti-manly context, the former more to be pitied than the latter, since the latter will, at least traditionally, have had the benefit, no matter how imperfectly, of a metaphysical hegemony over anti-metachemistry to axially link with and thus have the female-dominated criteria of phenomenal sensuality switched from what would otherwise be a heathenistic – and unregenerately black – emphasis on free soma to one favouring, albeit as the product of female conditioning, bound psyche, and thus have the possibility of some degree of salvation in relation to an accommodation with free psyche of a metaphysical, not to mention in the female case anti-metachemical, order, whereas the anti-metaphysical male is simply a 'fall guy for infinite slag' who has no possibility of salvation whatsoever and is fated to remain in noumenal subordination to a metachemical hegemony more interested, in

traditional state-hegemonic fashion, in axially linking with its gender counterpart in the phenomenally sensible 'below' in order both to protect its own free soma and guarantee to the axis in question a somatic consistency and continuity which would not otherwise be guaranteed, in the event of the physical hegemony over anti-chemistry being free from anti-chemical subversion at the behest of metachemistry and able to pursue a more rigorously-determined freely psychic course at the puritanical expense, needless to say, of bound soma, not least the anti-chemical soma that, with metachemical backing, is able to 'turn the tables' on such male-conditioned criteria to the extent that a somatic emphasis becomes the phenomenally sensible mean, whether physical or anti-chemical, with consequences already described.

013. Therefore being a man, as opposed to a phenomenally sensual anti-man, is not as advantageous a position as it might at first appear; for all such men are fated, sooner or later, to be subverted by anti-women to the lasting advantage of the devils who rule a noumenally sensual roost from a metachemical hegemony over anti-metaphysics, as over anything anti-metaphysical and, as noted above, anti-godly, with consequences that make for a profoundly cynical attitude to psychic freedom when such freedom is not, as in phenomenal sensibility, co-opted to the service of bound soma, as in the application of knowledge to

strength. Frankly, the puritanical are not much use to the struggle for culture against philistinism when, as physical or masculine males, they have been co-opted to the struggle of civility against barbarity, of bound soma against free soma, and such a struggle is for ever in the pocket of that which, as barbarity, makes its civility possible in the first place, being the axial guarantor, as already noted, of state-hegemonic consistency and continuity. Such a 'struggle' is indeed a very relative and conditional affair, since it is fundamentally part-and-parcel of the axial integrity which makes for the aforementioned stability and dare not or, more to the point, cannot oppose such stability, no matter how much it might see itself as standing in opposition to autocracy and as, in some sense, the guarantor of constitutionality if not, in the estimation of radical parliamentarians, democratic freedom and progressive change!

014. But in reality the concept of democratic freedom is a misnomer; for the somatically bound are manifestly *not* free, like their noumenal counterparts in metachemistry and even anti-metaphysics, and such freedom as obtains in relation to puritanism, as to church-subordinate criteria in general, being psychic, is decidedly secondary to the bound soma which constitutes the parliamentary aspect of state-hegemonic society and ensures that the democratic, whether left, right, or centrist, remain bound, or loyal, to the reigning

monarch, whose somatic freedom is alone sovereign, if constitutionally held in check by parliamentary procedure.

015. Thus the democratic, in what remains a phenomenally sensible extrapolation from noumenal sensuality, are anything but free, being, together with their anti-bureaucratic counterparts in anti-chemistry, the bound somatic antithesis to the freely somatic autocrats and, for anti-metaphysical males, anti-technocrats who rule a state-hegemonic roost in the interests of matriarchal values, values characterized, in metachemical free soma, by the evil acquiescence of bound psyche in crime to the greater glory or, rather, power of the State, as conceived primarily in terms of its authoritarian rather than parliamentary manifestation, and therefore in relation to the reigning monarch as overall Head of State.

016. Freedom is not, nor ever could be, a principal characteristic of 'the world', whether in its phenomenally sensible or, across the ethnic divide, phenomenally sensual manifestations, since it is necessary to the wellbeing of 'the world' that it remains primarily bound vis-à-vis the relevant axial controlling emphasis towards either free soma, as in the case of the state hegemonic, or free psyche, as in the case, by contrast, of the church hegemonic. Therefore democracy is no more free than anti-bureaucracy vis-à-vis the controlling autocracy and

anti-technocracy of the noumenally sensual Behind, just as, in church-hegemonic society, plutocracy is no more free than anti-meritocracy vis-à-vis the controlling theocracy and anti-aristocracy of the noumenally sensible Beyond – theocracy linking with anti-meritocracy and anti-aristocracy with plutocracy in no-less psychically free to bound terms than autocracy with anti-bureaucracy and anti-technocracy with democracy in the free to bound somatic terms of the state hegemonic.

017. Such phenomenal freedom as exists in traditional church-hegemonic and state-hegemonic societies is ever subordinate to the prevailing binding, be it somatic in phenomenal sensuality or psychic in phenomenal sensibility, and therefore no more than the axial counterpart to the respective manifestations of bound soma and bound psyche that are themselves subordinate, at least theoretically, to the prevailing noumenal ideals, be such ideals psychic by dint of a metaphysical hegemony over anti-metachemistry in noumenal sensibility or somatic by dint of a metachemical hegemony over anti-metaphysics in noumenal sensuality.
018. Therefore, unlike its Catholic counterpart, Puritan freedom is bound, sooner or later, to be subordinated to parliamentary binding, as follows from the anti-chemical subversion of physics to a bound somatic emphasis the logical antithesis to

such freedom as somatically proclaims its triumph over the world from the netherworldly heights of the noumenally sensual Behind, with particular reference to its monarchically hegemonic manifestation in metachemistry.

019. Of course, my thinking all along has been to divide Catholicism between phenomenal sensuality and noumenal sensibility, and to contrast this with a division, in Protestantism, between Anglicanism and Puritanism, the former affiliated, in bound-psyche church-subordinate vein, to Monarchism and the latter, in free-psyche church-subordinate vein, to Parliamentarianism, so that damnation in relation to a descent from free soma to bound soma in state-hegemonic terms would have to be contrasted with counter-salvation from bound psyche to free psyche in respect of any correlative descent from Anglicanism to Puritanism.
020. Much of this I still find highly plausible and therefore no concern for revisionary alarm. Where I erred, I now believe, was in dividing Roman Catholicism itself between phenomenal sensuality and noumenal sensibility with no reference whatsoever to the place of Eastern Orthodoxy in such a division, credible as any such division must remain up to a point, and that precisely one that excludes the overall status, if you will, of Eastern Orthodoxy within not merely the Christian but, more specifically, Catholic fold. For Orthodoxy is

much older than Protestantism and certainly closer to Roman Catholicism without being, in any sense, un-Christian, or pagan. Therefore it behoves us to allot it a position at the foot of the church-hegemonic axis as though in reaction to the more idealistic standing of Roman Catholicism, a reaction which has to allow for its want of