

JESUS – A SUMMING UP!

John O'Loughlin



Social Theocratic emblem.10
(C) 2006 John O'Loughlin

JESUS – A SUMMING UP!

By

JOHN O'LOUGHLIN

Of Centretruths Digital Media

CDM Philosophy

This edition of *Jesus – A Summing Up!* 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: 978-1-4466-8439-9

CONTENTS

PREFACE

01 – 10

11 – 20

21 – 32

APPENDIX

BIOGRAPHICAL FOOTNOTE

PREFACE

As suggested by the title, this is my final formal book of aphoristic philosophy and one that brings my philosophizing-cum-theosophizing, if not philologizing-cum-theologizing, to a cumulative head, as I restate some of the conclusive Social Theocratic theories of my previous books and modify, expand, and refine upon various of the more characteristic theories of the recent past.

Also, not altogether usual for me, I have allowed these theories to be invaded by a degree of autobiography which I needed to get out of my system and which, in any case, provided a springboard, as it were, for an enhanced approach to my regular writing and thinking. As also noted in this book, much of the writing is more weblog-like than has usually been the case, and that doubtless owes something to the fact that I now blog on the Internet and regard blogging (dreadful term!) as the electronic successor to my eBooks.

However that may be, blogging is gradually taking over from book-writing in my literary predilections, and therefore it is fitting if my conclusive formal text happens to be more blog-like than book-like. Also, now that I have so many web sites, I find it laborious, to the point of exasperating, to add a new short text to each directory, especially since this requires an updating if not replacement of any lists and synopses which may

already be there, in order to incorporate the new work.
Frankly, even my synopses are now something of a
major work in their own right!

That said, I am first and foremost a writer of literary texts, and have progressed, over the years, from philology to theology and from philosophy to theosophy, sacrificing knowledge to truth and pleasure to joy. My work is its own vindication, and anyone with enough intelligence who reads it will sooner or later come to the conclusion that it both adds up to and provides a basis or blueprint for what has been colloquially described as ‘Kingdom Come’, a radically progressive alternative to either regressive or sensually-based structures of society that should lead, amongst other things, to the salvation of ‘the world’, as defined in this and other texts, and to eternal peace (for males) in the transcendent Beyond which it has been the privilege of this self-styled theologian (the suffix is intentional) and theosophist to delineate for the benefit of those who come after him and may well inherit, if all goes according to plan, the ‘Kingdom of God’ in question, such an inheritance being anything but a kingdom in the usual autocratic sense but, in actuality, the theocratic antithesis to anything fundamentally autocratic.

John O’Loughlin, London 2005 (Revised 2022)

01. Anyone who has read my recent texts, not least those dealing with the Social Theocratic Centre, will realize that I am hardly a republican in the conventional or, indeed, radical Irish Republican sense. For the ideology to which I subscribe would deliver the Irish people, in the event of a majority mandate for religious sovereignty in a paradoxical election commensurate, so far as I am concerned, with ‘judgement’, from the sorts of axial dichotomy and exploitation which the tricolour would appear to signify. For the Irish tricolour is green, white, and gold and/or orange (depending on one’s ethnic and/or geopolitical orientation) and therefore symptomatic, it seems to me, of the distinction between the three main bodies of ethnic tradition in Ireland as a whole – namely, Catholics, Anglicans, and Puritans (which latter term embraces Presbyterians as well as Methodists, Baptists, Unitarians, etc.). But that is reflective of the axial distinction between British state-hegemonic/church-subordinate criteria in which Anglicanism and Puritanism are subordinate to Monarchism and Parliamentarianism respectively, and Irish church-hegemonic/state-subordinate criteria in which the Roman Catholic Church is primary and the republican state secondary. Therefore the tricolour would appear to endorse, despite its associations with the Republic of Ireland, the exploitation of

Catholics by Anglicans and Puritans in typically British and effectively heathenistic vein. It is as though the white and the gold and/or orange parts were symptomatic of British state-hegemonic/church-subordinate criteria and the green part, or segment, alone commensurate with Irish Catholics and, in a cultural sense, Gaels. But this is only too symptomatic of the Anglo-Irish nature of conventional republicanism and the satellite-like status which the Irish Republic enjoys, complements of Great Britain. I cannot and will not endorse this republic, which flies in the face of the deliverance of the Irish people, specifically Catholics, from commercial and social exploitation at the hands of persons who, in Britain, would be affiliated with Monarchic and/or Parliamentary positions. That is why the inverted CND-like emblem which I have customarily identified with Social Theocracy could not be juxtaposed with or superimposed upon the Irish tricolour. It is symbolic of a refutation of heathenistic exploitation through a more than Christian disposition which could only take the place of republican values in the event of the aforesaid majority mandate for religious sovereignty at the crossroads to or, better, upon the threshold of 'Kingdom Come'. Yet the emblem of the Centre, and hence of Social Theocratic Centralism, would not be symptomatic of a reversion to autocracy or monarchy or anything pre-republican in character but, on the contrary, of the transcendence of republican values through a new and ultimate order

of sovereignty which, though of the masses, could not be described as republican, in the party-political sense, but as profoundly religious and therefore beyond any such political and economic means or ties as the Irish Republic, acting under duress of Anglo-American pressures, increasingly comes to signify at the expense not merely of traditional religious values but of religion in general. If in the past I described Social Theocracy as signifying a new order of mass sovereignty, such sovereignty is profoundly centric, not republican, in character, and therefore the refutation of a system of governance which leaves the majority of Irish people open to exploitation not merely at the hands of 'Anglican' and 'Puritan' elements but, these days more than ever, of their more secular and Americanized, if not American, counterparts. Therefore a majority mandate for religious sovereignty would signify the death knell of the Irish Republic, together with its Tonean tricolour, and the birth, no matter how painfully, of the Irish Social Theocratic Centre, with its own completely independent ideological emblem.

02. Authoritarianism is a pretty dirty word these days, and one can understand why persons of both republican and post-republican sentiment should take a poor view of a political stance which is rooted in monarchy of an overly autocratic and even absolutist nature. But looked at from a more etymological point of view, such a word is surely synonymous with authority, which is no bad thing,

and even with the concept of the ‘author’, who is no better or worse than the book or document he writes. If I am the ‘author’ of a particular text, say a philosophical thesis, then I can be regarded as being something of an ‘authority’ on the subject to which I have dedicated my pen or, increasingly these days, word processor and/or personal computer. But is not an ‘authority’ in the above sense also, by definition, ‘authoritarian’, since one cannot be an ‘authority’ on any given subject, still less an ‘author’, without being ‘authoritarian’, that is to say, without having authority derived from much study and/or practice in one’s art. In this sense ‘authoritarian’ is merely adjectival, for what ‘author’, being something of an ‘authority’, is not ‘authoritarian’? One could of course say ‘authorial’, but that is rather lame and something of a cop-out. Let us not mince words, but simply acknowledge that the word ‘authoritarian’ can be divested from overly autocratic association and used in a more politically acceptable way which, after all, is no bad thing, since few if any people would trust someone who lacked authority to author a work that claimed to be true or in some sense philosophically or intellectually valid. Authors are or should be ‘authoritarian’, and therefore reliable authorities on the subjects to which they dedicate their creative zeal.

03. One could describe both Nazism and Sovietism as having been totalitarian with an authoritarian bias, since the rule of one man over a party is less

totalitarian than authoritarian in character, and Hitler and Stalin were nothing if not authoritarian dictators who stamped their image on the totalitarianism of one party rule, Hitler doubtless more than Stalin, since Nazism was the beginning of global civilization rather than the culmination, social democratically, of Western civilization, and would have had more of an alpha than an omega tendency in consequence. Stalin, after all, was an infringement of the Bolshevik concept of collective leadership and therefore something of a quasi-fascist departure from communist 'idealism', but, in the circumstances, hardly fatal to the survival, into the immediate post-war era, of the Soviet Union and to its return to something like collective responsibility.

04. Collectivism is always more phenomenal and worldly than netherworldly or otherworldly in character, a symptom of the masses and of mass-participatory democracy and/or bureaucracy in the face of autocratic or theocratic alternatives. Individualism, on the other hand, requires either of the latter dispositions for its full realization, since one must be absolutist on either an objective (autocratic) or a subjective (theocratic) basis to pass muster as a ruler or a leader, a devil, as it were, or a god. The collectivism that fights shy of individualism is one thing, the individualism that strives to incorporate and transmute the collective is quite another. All the difference, in short, between state-hegemonic/church-subordinate and church-

hegemonic/state-subordinate criteria.

05. Communalism of a transcendentalist and/or anti-fundamentalist order should be regarded as the endeavour to transmute the collectivistic masses into an individualistic godhead and/or anti-devil, not simply as the glorification or confirmation of a collectivistic ethic. Herds and flocks are collectivistic, but so what? They are preyed upon by lone wolves and led to higher pastures by lone shepherds.
06. Whereas the diabolic individual, effectively barbarous, exploits the crowd, the divine individual, his cultural adversary, seeks to deliver it from itself to an individualistic destiny of perfect self-realization. Crowds are simply there to be overcome, not endorsed. For that which is ethereal and absolute is always at an individualistic distance from the relativity of the corporeal, whose collectivism is the product not of noumenal transcendence but of all too phenomenal gravity and somatic want of psychic courage.
07. I spoke in the past of four points of an axial compass stretching from North West to South East on state-hegemonic/church-subordinate terms, and from South West to North East on church-hegemonic/state-subordinate terms, and conceived of such intercardinal points as being divisible into two positions in accordance with the gender

differential that must exist at any given point. Let us now do compass-like justice to each of these positions, starting with the North-West point which we contend to be divisible between metachemistry and anti-metaphysics, the former diabolically female and the latter anti-divinely male, the former accordingly North-North West and the latter West-North West, whereas down that axis of state-hegemonic/church-subordinate criteria we have a point, duly South East, which is divisible between physics and anti-chemistry, the former masculinely male and the latter anti-femininely female, and therefore the one effectively East-South East and the other South-South East. Across the axial divide, the South-West point is divisible between chemistry and anti-physics, the former femininely female and the latter anti-masculinely male, the one accordingly West-South West and the other South-South West, while up this axis of church-hegemonic/state-subordinate criteria we shall find a point, duly North East, which is divisible between metaphysics and anti-metachemistry, the former divinely male and the latter anti-diabolically female, the one North-North East and the other East-North East. Confusing? Some may think so, but I am sure that the axial compass looks more comprehensively readable, and hence intelligible, on such a secondary intercardinal basis than would otherwise be the case. At no point, however, does this axial compass embrace cardinal points, since we are not concerned with a cross but with a diagonal axis between antithetical

intercardinal points and, as noted above, their secondary extrapolations. Hence what was characterized as the North-West point is now divisible, on a metachemical/anti-metaphysical basis, between North-North West and West-North West, and what was characterized as the South-East point is now divisible, on a physical/anti-chemical basis, between East-South East and South-South East, with a state-hegemonic/church-subordinate axial link, female gender to female gender, between metachemistry and anti-chemistry on the one hand and, male gender to male gender, anti-metaphysics to physics on the other hand. Contrariwise, what was characterized as the South-West point is now divisible, on a chemical/anti-physical basis, between West-South West and South-South West, and what was characterized as the North-East point is now divisible, on a metaphysical/anti-metachemical basis, between North-North East and East-North East, with a church-hegemonic/state-subordinate axial link, male gender to male gender, between anti-physics and metaphysics on the one hand and, female gender to female gender, chemistry to anti-metachemistry on the other hand – the former in each case primary and the latter secondary.

08. The word 'valuation' is effectively a root word that can be divided into four different categories, viz. the metachemical category of devaluation, which is noumenally objective, and the chemical category of evaluation, which is phenomenally objective, both of

which fundamentally appertain to the free female side of life and contrast with the physical category of revaluation, which is phenomenally subjective, and the metaphysical category of transvaluation, which is noumenally subjective, each of which essentially appertain to the free male side of life in what is, by comparison with its female counterpart, a secondary order of valuation. For valuations are primarily objective and only secondarily subjective, and therefore devaluation and evaluation, being objective, will be primary and revaluation and transvaluation, their subjective counterparts, secondary. But this is in effect to distinguish sensuality from sensibility and *vice versa*, and therefore to contrast barbarity and philistinism with civility and culture, the latter of which require a male lead of society at the expense of female freedom, which tends towards devaluation and evaluation in patently barbarous and philistine terms. But just as the male must be upended if the female side of things is to be hegemonically free, so the development of male freedom requires the correlative upending, or subordination, of female freedom, without which no lasting sensibility can be maintained in the face of sensuality. Therefore if we speak of devaluation in connection with metachemistry, which is noumenally objective, we must speak of its male corollary in terms of anti-transvaluation in connection with anti-metaphysics, which is anti-noumenally subjective or, better, noumenally anti-subjective. Likewise if we speak of

evaluation in connection with chemistry, which is phenomenally objective, we must speak of its male corollary in terms of anti-evaluation in connection with anti-physics, which is phenomenally anti-subjective. Contrariwise, if we speak, in relation to sensibility, of revaluation in connection with physics, which is phenomenally subjective, we must speak of its female corollary in terms of anti-evaluation, which is phenomenally anti-objective. And finally, if we speak of transvaluation in connection with metaphysics, which is noumenally subjective, we must speak of its female corollary in terms of anti-devaluation, which is noumenally anti-objective. Therefore we have to distinguish between the devaluating of metachemistry and the anti-transvaluating of anti-metaphysics in relation to upper-class and anti-classless criteria germane, in general terms, to the Devil and Anti-God, and contrast this, down the state-hegemonic/church-subordinate axis, with a distinction between the revaluating of physics and the anti-evaluating of anti-chemistry in relation to middle-class and anti-lower-class criteria germane, again in general terms, to man and anti-woman. Crossing to the church-hegemonic/state-subordinate axis, we shall have to