

REVALUATIONS AND TRANSVALUATIONS

John O'Loughlin



REVALUATIONS AND TRANSVALUATIONS

By

JOHN O'LOUGHLIN

Of Centretruths Digital Media

CDM Philosophy

This edition of *Revaluations and Transvaluations* 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: 978-1-4466-8260-9

CONTENTS

PREFACE

001 – 025

026 – 050

051 – 075

076 – 100

101 – 125

126 – 136

BIOGRAPHICAL FOOTNOTE

PREFACE

This book not only reevaluates [kind of 're-evaluates' – author's note.] certain positions recently postulated in my philosophical works, and therefore corrects or modifies their conclusions, but extends my transvaluating towards a totally new understanding and conception of Christianity and what logically follows it, so that the path is prepared, as it were, for the revelations concerning religion and the destiny of the phenomenally sensual 'meek' which owe more to this transvaluation than ever they do to any conventional or traditional notions concerning such subjects as the Immaculate Conception, the Crucifixion, the Resurrection, and, indeed, the entire belief system of Christianity in respect of a Second Coming and Day of Judgement.

In the end, what transpires is a revaluation of Christianity in the light of my mature philosophy and its Social Theocratic commitment to truth of an ultimate order, which exposes the errors that stem from presumption of the death of God on the Cross and lead, inevitably, towards a humanistic dead-end.

I also expose the limitations of terms like 'mankind' and 'man' in relation to the full-gamut of class and gender possibilities that actually exist and condition or characterize life from one standpoint or another, as well as show, more fully, how things actually divide into two axes, which are not only divisible in themselves but

antithetical in virtually *every* respect, even with regard to sport and sex, on both somatic and psychic, state- and church-orientated terms.

In sum, this important text not only reevaluates a number of philosophical contentions on my part, making for a new and better understanding of ideological distinctions between 'Left' and 'Right', and of how amorality factors-in to the opposition between immorality and morality in such fashion that they are never strictly polar, but extends my thinking towards a culmination-point the fruit of both a correct premise and an ability to transvaluate certain presumptions concerning God and man, which turns things around and enables one to make sense out of the historical struggles leading, as it were, from the 'Garden of Eden' to 'the world' and, hopefully, from 'the world' to 'Kingdom Come', as reinterpreted from a standpoint firmly centred in an ultimate transvaluation, the product of all previous revaluations.

John O'Loughlin, London 2004 (Revised 2022)

001 – 025

001. I wrote in an earlier book, viz. *Revolutionary Afterthoughts* (2003), of conservatism being right-wing and radicalism left, as the following extract will show: 'One could – and I'm confident many people would – identify conservatism with being right wing and radicalism with being left wing, and therefore it should be maintained that salvation from moral conservatism to moral radicalism, bound psyche to free psyche, is commensurate with a progression from the moral right to the moral left, as from the vicious morality of sin and (for females) pseudo-evil to the virtuous morality of Grace (and for females) pseudo-goodness, all of which would diametrically contrast with damnation, on the descending axis, from immoral radicalism to immoral conservatism, free soma to bound soma, as being commensurate with a regression from the immoral left to the immoral right, as from the vicious immorality of Crime and (for males) pseudo-Folly to the virtuous immorality of punishment and (for males) pseudo-wisdom.' Frankly, I do not now believe that I was correct to do so, and for the following reasons.
002. Whether one is viciously or virtuously moral or immoral is a different issue, it now seems to me, from whether one is to be adjudged left or right; for one can be vicious or virtuous in either psyche or

soma, and therefore moral or immoral according to whether one is adjudged to be psychic or somatic – something which, in any case, is not about being virtuous or vicious but, on the contrary, about being either left or right, left in psyche, right in soma, as the following paragraph will attempt to demonstrate.

003. The radical, we had established, are always free, but this is equally true of both types of hegemonic radicalism, viz. metachemical and metaphysical, and both types of subservient radicalism, viz. anti-metaphysical and anti-metachemical, except that the latter are free contrary to their respective gender actualities and therefore on the paradoxical terms of either soma for the anti-metaphysical or psyche for the anti-metachemical in consequence of the hegemonic gender's primary influence being either somatic in the case of metachemistry or psychic in the case of metaphysics.
004. But no mode of radical freedom exists independently of a subordinate mode of radical binding, whether in respect of psyche in the noumenally sensual context of metachemistry and anti-metaphysics or of soma in the noumenally sensible context of metaphysics and anti-metachemistry. For either the State is hegemonic and the Church subordinate, as in the former context, or the Church is hegemonic and the State subordinate, as in the latter context, and in neither

is the State to be associated with anything other than soma or the Church with anything other than psyche.

005. In contrast to this, the conservative, we found, are always bound, but this is equally true of both types of nominally hegemonic conservatism, viz. chemical and physical, and both types of nominally subservient but – at the behest of their respective overall hegemonic gender parallels – subversive conservatism, viz. anti-physical and anti-chemical, except that the latter are bound contrary to their respective gender actualities and therefore on the paradoxical terms of either psyche for the anti-physical or soma for the anti-chemical in consequence of the nominally hegemonic gender's primary influence being either somatic in the case of chemistry or psychic in the case of physics.
006. But no mode of conservative binding exists independently of a subordinate mode of conservative freedom, whether in respect of soma in the phenomenally sensual context of chemistry and anti-physics or of psyche in the phenomenally sensible context of physics and anti-chemistry. For either the Church is hegemonic and the State subordinate, as in the former context, or the State is hegemonic and the Church subordinate, as in the latter context, and in neither is the Church to be associated with anything other than psyche or the State with anything other than soma.

007. Granted, then, an axial disparity between an ascent from conservatism to radicalism in the case of church-hegemonic society and a descent from radicalism to conservatism in the case of state-hegemonic society, this is not, contrary to the extract from *Revolutionary Afterthoughts* quoted above, equivalent to a progression from the moral right to the moral left on the one hand and to a regression from the immoral left to the immoral right on the other hand, despite the indubitable distinctions between vice and virtue which characterize the contrary fates in such diametrically antithetical terms, but is, rather, equivalent to a progression from the conservative left to the radical left in respect of church-hegemonic criteria and, conversely, to a regression from the radical right to the conservative right in respect of state-hegemonic criteria, so that what finally determines whether something is 'left' or 'right' is not its class status in relation to radicalism or conservatism, the free few or the bound many, but its moral or immoral significance in relation to psyche or soma.

008. Thus an axial ascent, within church-hegemonic society, from the vicious morality of the psychically bound to the virtuous morality of the psychically free is commensurate with a progression from the conservative left to the radical left, as from anti-self to pro-self, anti-peace to pro-peace, whereas an axial descent, within state-hegemonic society, from

the vicious immorality of the somatically free to the virtuous immorality of the somatically bound is commensurate with a regression from the radical right to the conservative right, as from pro-not self to anti-not self, pro-war to anti-war.

009. Therefore in representatively hegemonic terms each axis is either of the Left or of the Right, psychically left in church-hegemonic terms or somatically right in state-hegemonic terms, but each of these principal positions is divisible between 'anti' and 'pro' manifestations of psyche or soma which distinguish the many from the few, the conservative from the radical, since those who are viciously and virtuously moral, or psychic, stand to those who are viciously and virtuously immoral, or somatic, as the conservative/radical Left to the radical/conservative Right.

010. One cannot, however, leave this axial disparity in representative terms, as between the hegemonic factors already described; for there are also subordinate factors to be considered, whether state subordinate in relation to the axis diagonally ascending from phenomenal sensuality to noumenal sensibility or church subordinate in relation to the axis diagonally descending from noumenal sensuality to phenomenal sensibility, both of which complicate the overall picture.

011. In the case of the diagonally ascending axis, it

should be maintained that, correlative with the salvation of the moral from bound to free psyche, comes the counter-damnation of the pseudo-immoral from free to bound soma, and that this is commensurate with a counter-regression from the pseudo-radical right to the pseudo-conservative right, as from the 'pseudo' modes of pro-not self to anti-not self, pro-war to anti-war, whereas in the case of the diagonally descending axis it follows that, correlative with the damnation of the immoral from free to bound soma, comes the counter-salvation of the pseudo-moral from bound to free psyche, which is commensurate with a counter-progression from the pseudo-conservative left to the pseudo-radical left, as from the 'pseudo' modes of anti-self to pro-self, anti-peace to pro-peace.

012. Therefore in what could be called unrepresentatively subordinate terms each axis is either of the pseudo-Right or of the pseudo-Left, somatically right in state-subordinate terms or psychically left in church-subordinate terms, but each of these subordinate positions is divisible between 'pro' and 'anti' manifestations of soma or psyche which distinguish the many from the few, the conservative from the radical, since those who are viciously and virtuously pseudo-immoral, or somatic, stand to those who are viciously and virtuously pseudo-moral, or psychic, as the radical/conservative pseudo-Right to the conservative/radical pseudo-Left.

013. There is as considerable a difference, however, between the hegemonic and subordinate modes of church morality as between the hegemonic and subordinate modes of state immorality, and therefore one cannot suppose that the pseudo-Left, whether viciously or virtuously of psyche, are anything like as unfreely or freely psychic as their hegemonic counterparts on the axis that diagonally ascends from phenomenal sensuality to noumenal sensibility, or that the pseudo-Right, whether viciously or virtuously of soma, are anything like as freely or unfreely somatic as their hegemonic counterparts on the axis that diagonally descends from noumenal sensuality to phenomenal sensibility.
014. Moreover the pseudo-Left are as fated to remain in the shadow of the genuine Right in state-hegemonic society as the pseudo-Right in the shadow of the genuine Left in church-hegemonic society. And this applies equally to both genders, whether in relation to the primary and secondary manifestations of church subordination vis-à-vis their state-hegemonic counterparts on the diagonally descending axis or in relation to the primary and secondary manifestations of state subordination vis-à-vis their church-hegemonic counterparts on the axis that diagonally ascends.
015. Therefore there is no sense in trying to hype or

exaggerate the significance of either the pseudo-Left or the pseudo-Right vis-à-vis the more representatively Right or Left of each type of society, any more than there would be much sense in trying to exaggerate the significance of the pseudo-Left at the expense of the Left or of the pseudo-Right at the expense of the Right across the axial divide which distinguishes those led by morality in church-hegemonic fashion from those ruled by immorality in state-hegemonic fashion.

016. What really matters is not the standing of Left to pseudo-Left or of Right to pseudo-Right, or *vice versa*, but the deference of pseudo-Right to the Left, whether in sensuality or sensibility, and of pseudo-Left to the Right, likewise whether in vice or virtue, in the interests of axial stability and overall accountability; for there is no more a situation in which the Left can exist independently of the pseudo-Right than one in which the Right can exist independently of the pseudo-Left, radicalism and conservatism hanging together almost as two sides of the same phenomenal or noumenal coin even as one either progresses/counter-regresses or regresses/counter-progresses, according to axis, from the one to the other on both genuine and 'pseudo', hegemonic and subordinate, terms in both primary and secondary gender contexts.

017. Therefore along with the progressive axial ascent in

male salvation from sin to grace of the anti-humanistically anti-physical to the, as it were, transcendentalistically metaphysical and in female salvation from pseudo-evil to pseudo-goodness of the nonconformistically chemical to the anti-fundamentalistically anti-metachemical, as from conservative Left to radical Left on both primary and secondary psychic terms, must go the counter-regressive axial ascent in male counter-damnation from folly to wisdom of the anti-naturalistically anti-physical to the idealistically metaphysical and in female counter-damnation from pseudo-crime to pseudo-punishment of the realistically chemical to the anti-materialistically anti-metachemical, as from pseudo-radical Right to pseudo-conservative Right on both primary and secondary somatic terms.

018. Conversely, along with the regressive axial descent in female damnation from crime to punishment of the materialistically metachemical to the anti-realistically anti-chemical and in male damnation from pseudo-folly to pseudo-wisdom of the anti-idealistically anti-metaphysical to the naturalistically physical, as from radical Right to conservative Right on both primary and