

RADICAL PROGRESS

The Only Way Forward

JOHN O'LOUGHLIN



RADICAL PROGRESS

The Only Way Forward

By

JOHN O'LOUGHLIN

Of Centretruths Digital Media

CDM Philosophy

This edition of *Radical Progress* 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: 978-1-4709-9711-3

CONTENTS

PREFACE

001 – 025

026 – 050

051 – 075

076 – 100

101 – 125

126 – 129

BIOGRAPHICAL FOOTNOTE

PREFACE

As suggested by the title, this aphoristic philosophy project has a concept of progress which is radical and far-reaching in its social implications, albeit in relation to the sphere of religion rather than economics, which is the only sphere, so far as I am concerned, which can be genuinely progressive, provided, however, that the religion itself is genuine and therefore transcendentalist, stemming, as I have argued in the text, from an anti-humanist precondition.

But that is only one axis, or diagonal plane, in the totality of axial factors at work in different kinds of societies, whether on a primary or a secondary basis, and in *Radical Progress – The Only Way Forward* I have gone into the distinctions between church hegemonic/state subordinate and state hegemonic/church subordinate societies in no uncertain terms, outlining the different ideals and fates which appertain to them with a logical consistency that leaves one in no doubt as to the relative value of each type of society, whether rising diagonally or falling diagonally, and making a conclusive case for that society which has the capacity to lead people higher, as though to something posterior to the world, rather than simply to rule over them from an anterior height in polar opposition to something lower that is nevertheless distinct from the kind of lowness obtaining across the great axial divide of 'the world', or worldly society, as

explained in this my most definitive and outstanding text
to-date.

John O'Loughlin, London 2003 (Revised 2022)

001 – 025

001. The world, in general terms, is characterized by both the rising axis of bureaucracy–theocracy, of anti-self sin and pro-self grace in respect of a male hegemony which, by its very nature or, rather, nurture can only esteem psychic freedom, and the falling axis of autocracy–democracy, of pro-notself crime and anti-notself punishment in respect of a female hegemony which, by its very nurture or, rather, nature can only esteem somatic freedom.
002. Therefore the world is divisible between the self-orientated relativity of bureaucracy–theocracy and the notself-orientated relativity of autocracy–democracy – the former omega-aspirant in terms of grace, the latter alpha-stemming in terms of crime.
003. There are, however, two extreme possibilities beyond the world of, what in general terms one could call, liberal compromise between conservative and radical alternatives, as between the sinful conservatism of bureaucracy and the graceful radicalism of theocracy or between the criminal conservatism of autocracy and the punishing radicalism of democracy, and these are the people's extremes of Social Theocracy on the one hand and Social Democracy on the other, the former aimed at a more absolute gracefulness, the latter tending to result in a more absolute

punishingness.

004. But such extreme radical movements or developments tend, sooner or later, to invite an equally extreme conservative backlash in the form of what may be called either Social Bureaucracy on the one hand or Social Autocracy on the other, the former tending to result in a more absolute sinfulness, the latter aimed at a more absolute criminality.
005. One can generically distinguish between that which, in people's radicalism, is extreme left-wing and that which, in people's conservatism, is extreme right-wing in terms of Communism and Fascism, with what may be called the religious form of Communism that, in theocratic vein, has been identified with Social Theocracy inviting a reactionary backlash from what may be called the political form of Fascism that, in bureaucratic vein, has been identified with Social Bureaucracy on the one hand, and what may be called the economic form of Communism that, in democratic vein, has been identified with Social Democracy inviting a reactionary backlash from what may be called the scientific form of Fascism that, in autocratic vein, has been identified with Social Autocracy on the other hand.
006. Hence, in straightforward terms, an extreme graceful/sinful distinction between the religious

communism of Social Theocracy and the political fascism of Social Bureaucracy on the one hand, that of a polarized bureaucratic–theocratic axis, and an extreme punishing/criminal distinction between the economic communism of Social Democracy and the scientific fascism of Social Autocracy on the other hand, that of a polarized autocratic–democratic axis.

007. Whenever the world of liberal relativity is split asunder in consequence of a departure from radical/conservative compromise to a situation in which either theocratic or democratic absolutism communistically proclaims its right not merely to exist but to triumph over the world and effectively replace it in the interests of one form or another of people's paradise, an extreme conservative backlash ensues in which either bureaucratic or autocratic absolutism fascistically opposes such an ambition on the part of radical extremists less, be it noted, in the names of either sin or crime than in order to 'save' the world from the threat posed to it by an undue emphasis, an extremist or absolutist emphasis, upon either grace or punishment which would threaten the very existence not merely of relative grace or punishment but also of relative sin or crime, thereby justifying recourse to absolute sin or crime, depending on the type of fascism, as the necessary counterpoint to communist intentions.
008. In such contrary fashions, stemming from different

axial orientations, the people are split asunder to confront one another more absolutely from contrary standpoints of extreme radicalism and extreme conservatism, communism and fascism, which are what transpire when once liberal relativity is undermined and the world finds itself under threat from those who would radically supersede it one way or another on the one hand, and those who oppose such action from extreme reactionary standpoints on the other hand.

009. Because the modern world, the world of Protestant-derived secularity, has tended to be characterized, in autocratic–democratic axial fashion, more in relation to different approaches to the notself than to the self, it has been the economic mode of communism, necessarily Marxist, and the scientific mode of fascism, avowedly anti-Marxist, which has tended, in the West and indeed wider afield, to typify the contrary approaches to radicalism and conservatism which we have identified, in people's terms, with Social Democracy on the one hand and with Social Autocracy on the other, a clash which came to a head with the opposition of Nazism in Germany to Bolshevism in the Soviet Union, and which duly resulted in some of the worst atrocities and/or most savage battles of the Second World War.

010. As yet we have not really seen a Social Bureaucratic opposition to Social Theocracy in the

West or indeed anywhere else, for the simple reason that Social Theocracy has not as yet, in 2003, come to pass, and there has consequently been no pretext for a politically-orientated fascist opposition to a religious form of communism that, besides being decidedly un-Marxist, was somewhat radically pro-self and therefore likely to engender a correspondingly extreme form of anti-self conservatism in certain countries which, for whatever reasons, were not 'up to' the kind of absolute grace which Social Theocracy would be determined to encourage and thereby reacted from such a prospect in terms of a deeper or more absolute commitment to sin, as though to save 'the world' from the threat of Heaven and re-affirm mundane values.

011. Of course, there is no guarantee that any such opposition of extreme bureaucratic conservatism to extreme theocratic radicalism would lead to war, since the axis of the self is quite distinct from that of the notself, and grace is hardly likely to provoke conflict with sin the way, say, crime provoked conflict with punishment during World War II, even if the opposition of sin to grace, of conservative bureaucracy to radical theocracy, might lead those in the fascist camp to politically challenge the religious idealism of their communist counterparts and to oppose it however they could, not least within their own sphere of influence.

012. For if it is one thing to root out opposition within one's own country in the interests of societal stability and the avoidance of civil war, it is quite another thing to actively oppose those in other countries who may be interested in developing precisely what one feels or knows to be of little or no practical relevance domestically, particularly if and when such developments are acceptable to the countries concerned and one could not reasonably oppose them in consequence. The only instance in which conflict between two or more polarized countries would be justified, no matter how regrettably so, would be in the event of one of the countries unreasonably provoking conflict with the other and obliging the other to defend itself from outside interference which, in the circumstances, it would be justified in doing.
013. Needless to say, the prospects of a religiously communist country or society attacking a politically fascist one must be somewhat slim in view of the incompatibility of grace and war, the latter of which is rather more criminal than even sinful in character, given its objective nature which owes more to a free female hegemony in autocracy than to a bound female hegemony in bureaucracy which, provided there is a deference to theocracy, paradoxically plays second-fiddle to male sin and is not in a position, short of theocracy being heathenistically renounced, to resort to a relative approach to crime which may or may not lead to a

correspondingly objective approach to freedom in terms of war, if with a bureaucratic rather than an autocratic bias such that could lead one to infer lower- rather than upper-class criteria.

014. In fact, the heathenistic renunciation of theocracy, and thus of a theocratic subversion of bureaucracy in favour of criteria having reference, in male vein, to a secondary order (compared to females) of somatic freedom, would more likely correspond to the sort of state-hegemonic situation in which not sin but crime became the principal characteristic, and the possibility, if not inevitability, of war grew ever greater in response to a most virulent form of political fascism, a form not merely anti-communist but anti-church and effectively pro-state to a degree not far short of bureaucratic absolutism.
015. Clearly, such a degree of extreme political conservatism could well provoke a war with any nation whose extreme religious radicalism was regarded, no matter how falsely, as a threat to its own, if not the world's, mundane integrity, and one would then be beneath the realm of a more sinful approach to life in reaction to enhanced gracefulness coming to pass elsewhere to one that, in state-hegemonic vein, was openly criminal and thus disposed to war or state-sponsored violence in blatantly fascist terms, which would be prepared to ride roughshod over church opposition to any such stratagem allegedly for the defence of the

status quo but, in reality, at the behest of a 'new order' of state freedom analogous to that which existed above in the scientifically fascist realm of Social Autocracy.

016. Such a scenario may seem somewhat fanciful, and I hope and pray it is and continues to be. But one cannot rule out the possibility of something analogous in relation to Social Bureaucracy, if only because a bureaucratic eclipse of meritocracy is always likely to happen whenever free female criteria break loose of theocratic guidance and conditioning 'from above' and crime accordingly thrives at the expense of sin, pretty much as phenomenal objectivity at the expense of phenomenal subjectivity or, in elemental terms, chemistry at the expense of physics or, rather, anti-physics.
017. For the distinction between chemistry and anti-physics in respect of state bureaucracy and church meritocracy is paralleled above by the distinction between metaphysics and anti-metachemistry in respect of church theocracy and state technocracy where what we have called the bureaucratic–theocratic axis is concerned; though meritocratic–theocratic would more typify the church-hegemonic actuality of sin and grace in which the prevalence of sin at the expense of bureaucratic crime 'down below' is only sustainable on the basis of the free influence of grace theocratically obtaining 'up

above', which effectively upends, in paradoxical vein, the terms of reference at the expense of the nominal female hegemony which would otherwise favour relative crime and ensure that such crime was the characteristic aspect of bureaucratic freedom.

018. Contrariwise, the distinction between physics and anti-chemistry in respect of church democracy and state plutocracy is paralleled above by the distinction between metachemistry and anti-metaphysics in respect of state autocracy and church aristocracy where what we have called the autocratic–democratic axis is concerned; though autocratic–plutocratic would more typify the state-hegemonic actuality of crime and punishment in which the prevalence of punishment at the expense