

STAIRWAY TO JUDGEMENT



JOHN O'LOUGHLIN

STAIRWAY TO JUDGEMENT

The Way to Eternity with Social Theocratic Truth

Philosophical Aphorisms by

JOHN O'LOUGHLIN

Of Centretruths Digital Media

CDM Philosophy

This 2003 title first published as an eBook 2012 and republished (with revisions) 2025 by Centretruths Digital Media

Copyright © 2012, 2025 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: 978-1-4709-9758-8

CONTENTS

PREFACE

001 – 025

026 – 050

051 – 075

076 – 100

101 – 111

BIOGRAPHICAL FOOTNOTE

PREFACE

Continuing from the previous title *Radical Progress* (2003), this project is not only more comprehensively exacting than that – and indeed than all of the earlier works in my not-inconsiderable *oeuvre* – in relation to the various ideological permutations of both state and church, politics and religion, but is more logically insightful as to the diametrically opposite ways in which what has been termed 'world overcoming' operates, whether from a secular or an ecclesiastic point of view, to the end of maintaining either the alpha ideal of somatic freedom from the standpoint of a female hegemony or the omega ideal of psychic freedom from the standpoint of a male hegemony, neither of which kinds of ideals are or ever can be compatible, and therefore necessitate and invariably result in contrary types of societies which, for obvious reasons, rarely if ever 'see eye to eye' with each other but remain at gender loggerheads for as long as 'the world' persists.

The 'world' as defined in the ensuing text, however, is no simple monolith where 'the people' are concerned, but is divisible, on the above-mentioned basis, between those who take the earth for granted in what I've described as a democratic/plutocratic type of worldly bias and those, on the contrary, who live in hope of salvation from 'the world' in what has been called a bureaucratic/meritocratic type of worldly bias which, scorning the earth, is avowedly antiearthly if not purgatorial in character and the precondition, through sin, of heavenly grace.

Therefore, split asunder between two types of 'worldly' society, the people, the electorate, the many, etc., can't be evaluated according to any one set of criteria, but, divided into ethnically incompatible camps, have to be differentiated on the basis of whether they appertain to the one manifestation of 'the world' or to the other, are just or meek, with contrary fates in both state and church, as described in this, my most ideologically conclusive and ethnically sensitive text to-date.

John O'Loughlin, London 2003 (Revised 2025)

001. We've established, in recent texts, a clear-cut distinction between the rising axis of a church hegemonic – coupled to a state subordinate – society, as in Ireland, and the falling axis of a state hegemonic – coupled to a church subordinate – society, as in Britain and, in particular, England, the land of autocracy and the plutocratic subversion of democracy *par excellence*.
002. This rising axis of sin to grace on the one hand, that of meritocracy–theocracy, and of pseudo-punishment to pseudo-crime on the other hand, that of bureaucracy–technocracy, has been characterized as signifying an overall male-hegemonic situation in which theocracy effectively conditions the acceptance of sin in the meritocratic 'below' in the interests of its own grace, and therefore effectively overcomes 'the world' of what would otherwise, in the more narrowly female-hegemonic nature of water over vegetation (earth) in the sensual realms of bureaucracy and meritocracy, be characterized, in due objective fashion, by relative crime.
003. Contrariwise, the falling axis of crime to punishment on the one hand, that of autocracy–plutocracy, and of pseudo-grace to pseudo-sin on the other hand, that of aristocracy–democracy, has been characterized as signifying an overall female-hegemonic situation in which autocracy effectively conditions the acceptance of punishment in the plutocratic 'below' in the interests of its own crime, and therefore effectively overcomes 'the world' of what would otherwise, in the more narrowly male-hegemonic nature of vegetation (earth) over water in the sensible realms of democracy over plutocracy, be characterized, in due subjective fashion, by relative grace.
004. Therefore we've found that there are two approaches to 'world overcoming' – the omega-aspiring theocratic approach which upends the terms of reference of the sensual 'below' ... of bureaucracy and meritocracy in its own graceful interests, and the alpha-stemming autocratic approach which upends the terms of reference of the sensible 'below' ... of democracy and plutocracy in the interests of

crime, albeit its interests are distinctly metachemical and fiery rather than metaphysical and airy, and therefore stand in an antithetical light to the interests of theocracy, and pretty much as the outer light to the inner light.

005. For if you ascend from sin to grace in primary, or church-hegemonic, terms and from pseudo-punishment to pseudo-crime in secondary, or state-subordinate, terms you effectively ascend from the outer darkness to the inner light, as though from the church sinful to the church graceful, with the pseudo-punishment and pseudo-crime of the subordinate states likewise reflecting this subjective orientation of male-hegemonic criteria.
006. But if you descend from crime to punishment in primary, or state-hegemonic, terms and from pseudo-grace to pseudo-sin in secondary, or church-subordinate, terms you effectively descend from the outer light to the inner darkness, as though from the state criminal to the state punishing, with the pseudo-grace and pseudo-sin of the subordinate churches likewise reflecting this objective orientation of female-hegemonic criteria.
007. Clearly, to ascend from sin to grace is to ascend from a genuine church in meritocracy to a genuine church in theocracy, with the corollary of a pseudo-state in bureaucracy and a pseudo-state in technocracy which are conditioned, contrary to genuine states, by subjective criteria appertaining to the hegemonic churches, or contrary aspects of the Church, so that they remain largely pseudo-punishing and pseudo-criminal in consequence.
008. Likewise, to descend from crime to punishment is to descend from a genuine state in autocracy to a genuine state in democracy or, rather, plutocracy, with the corollary of a pseudo-church in aristocracy and a pseudo-church in democracy which are conditioned, contrary to genuine churches, by objective criteria appertaining to the hegemonic states, or contrary aspects of the State, so that they remain largely pseudo-graceful and pseudo-sinful in consequence.
009. Fear of the dark won't be a characteristic of the rising axis of, in primary terms, sin to grace, but of the falling axis of, in primary terms,

crime to punishment, the outer light of metachemical sensuality to the inner darkness of chemical sensibility; for the outer light lives in fear of the inner darkness, whether in the primary terms of state-hegemonic autocracy–plutocracy or in the secondary terms of church-subordinate aristocracy–democracy, wherein the fear is of the devil of pseudo-sin rather than of the justice of punishment.

010. But if fear of the sensible darkness is characteristic of the sensual light, then hope of the sensible light, the inner light, is what most characterizes the outer darkness, the sensual darkness, of both sin and, in subordinate vein, pseudo-punishment, as physical sensuality longs for the peace of metaphysical sensibility, wherein the unholiness of sin is redeemed by the grace of God and the injustice of pseudo-punishment by the pseudo-crime of the Law.
011. Yes, no less surely than 'the unlawful' live in fear of Justice and 'the ungodly' in fear of the Devil, so, in contrary vein, do 'the unholy' live in hope of God and 'the unjust' in hope of the Law; for 'the criminal' can be sentenced down to punishment and 'the pseudo-graceful' damned down to pseudo-sin no less surely than 'the sinful' can be saved up to grace and 'the unjust' released up to pseudo-crime.
012. Therefore hope by those in the outer darkness for the inner light is no less characteristic of the diagonally rising axis which proceeds from sin and pseudo-punishment 'down below' to grace and pseudo-crime 'up above' than ... fear by those in the outer light for the inner darkness is characteristic of the diagonally falling axis which proceeds or, rather, recedes from crime and pseudo-grace 'up above' to punishment and pseudo-sin 'down below'.
013. Those who live in the outer light of a metachemical hegemony must ever fear the inner darkness of a sensibly chemical (antichemical) punishment which, paradoxically, has been engineered – at the expense of physics – by the metachemically criminal in the interests of power, not least their own.
014. Those, by contrast, who live in the outer darkness of a sensually physical (antiphysical) sin should ever remain in hope of the inner light of a metaphysical hegemony the theocratic proponents of which

have paradoxically engineered – at the expense of chemistry – such sin in the interests of grace, their own not excepted.

015. I brought in the terms 'antichemical' as shorthand for chemically sensible and 'antiphysical' for physically sensual in the above aphorisms and, to be sure, thinking in terms of a diagonal rise from antiphysics to metaphysics and of a diagonal fall from metachemistry to antichemistry is helpful in drawing attention to the kinds of paradoxes which obtain in the respective 'belows' by dint of contrary conditioning influences from 'above', not least in respect of the sidelining of chemistry in the one context and of physics in the other, so that the nominal hegemony of female over male in respect of chemistry and antiphysics, volumetric volume over massive mass, and of male over female in respect of physics and antichemistry, voluminous volume over massed mass, is overturned in 'world-overcoming' vein by the respective conditioning factors 'above', with metaphysics and antiphysics confirming the male-hegemonic prevalence of grace and sin at the expense of chemical crime in the one case, and metachemistry and antichemistry confirming the female-hegemonic prevalence of crime and punishment at the expense of physical grace in the other case.
016. Treating each axis separately, it can be maintained that the antiphysical-to-metaphysical diagonally rising axis of sin and grace – to take its primary aspects alone – is equivalent to antihumanism vis-à-vis transcendentalism or, in slang parlance, to 'fuck*** antipricks' vis-à-vis 'snogg*** bums', since we're dealing with the preconditions of an approach to, or hope of, God which presupposes an antinonconformist willingness to undergo self-overcoming in the interests of that enhancement of the Self which is commensurate with grace and is avowedly universal rather than personal or, in this instance, what could, in antiphysical vein, be called antipersonal.
017. Conversely, it should be maintained that, in like primary terms, the metachemical-to-antichemical diagonally falling axis of crime and punishment is equivalent to materialism vis-à-vis antinaturalism or, in slang parlance, to 'frigg*** jerks' vis-à-vis 'suck*** anticunts', since we're dealing with the preconditions of an approach to, or fear of, Justice which presupposes a materialist unwillingness to undergo the

Not Self's overcoming in the interests of that reduction of the Not Self which is commensurate with punishment and is avowedly antiimpersonal rather than impersonal or, in this instance, polyversal.

018. One can see from the above aphorism how important it is that the reader should have familiarized himself with preceding texts in order to understand the distinction between terms like 'polyversal' and 'universal' on the one hand, and 'impersonal' and 'personal' on the other, quite apart from their 'anti' versions which slot in subordinately to the prevailing reality and/or ideality, as the case may be; for I can't repeat myself from text to text except in a sketchy and passing manner in order to be able to push ahead with new material or further develop such material as already exists, even to the extent of revising previous contentions.
019. Therefore the reader should be aware that the polyversal and the metachemical (not to mention the antipolyversal and the antimetachemical) are as intertwined as the universal and the metaphysical (not to mention the antiuniversal and the antimetaphysical), while, 'down below', the impersonal and the chemical are as deeply intertwined as the personal and the physical or, for that matter, the antipersonal and the anti-, not to mention the antiimpersonal and the antichemical.
020. And he will know too, if he has read as advised, that being anti-Self is as contrary to being pro-Self in relation to sin and grace ... as being pro-Not Self is contrary to being anti-Not Self in relation to crime and punishment, where the overall dichotomy between the theocratic struggle against chemical soma in the interests of psychic freedom and the autocratic struggle against physical psyche in the interests of somatic freedom is what chiefly differentiates the two axial contexts – that of the male-hegemonic diagonally rising axis on the one hand, in which bureaucracy is subverted by meritocracy at theocracy's graceful behest, and that of the female-hegemonic diagonally falling axis on the other hand, in which democracy is subverted by plutocracy at autocracy's criminal behest.
021. Therefore just as being sinfully anti-Self follows from the subversion of the chemical Not Self by the antiphysical Self acting under the lead

of an omega-oriented inner light of the metaphysical Self, so being punishingly anti-Not Self follows from the subversion of the physical Self by the antichemical Not Self acting under the rule of an alpha-stemming outer light of the metachemical Not Self, so that in the one case the antiphysical Self is twisted against itself by dint of its relationship to the chemical Not Self, whilst in the other case the antichemical Not Self is twisted against itself by dint of its relationship to the physical Self, neither of which are free to be 'true' to themselves in respect of either relatively pro-Self or pro-Not Self behaviour but, in binding their relatively criminal and graceful antagonists of the chemical and physical planes above, function at cross-purposes with themselves in the paradoxical manners described.

022. But such is the price of theocratically maintaining sin at the expense of crime in the one context, that of meritocracy and bureaucracy, and of autocratically maintaining punishment at the expense of grace in the other context, that of plutocracy and democracy, so that each manifestation of 'the world' is overcome in diametrically opposite fashions, whether with regard to the autocratic ideal of criminal freedom (to which is bound the pseudo-grace of the aristocratic church) on the one hand, or with regard to the theocratic ideal of graceful freedom (to which is bound the pseudo-crime of the technocratic state) on the other hand.
023. One could characterize the descending axis of state-hegemonic criteria in respect of crime and punishment as being equivalent to the female chromosomal reality of 'XX', in which a double negativity, analogous to fire and water (photons and electrons?), exists by dint of the vacuously-conditioned objective orientation of both the autocratic plutocratic forms of the state, whereas the ascending axis of church-hegemonic criteria in respect of sin and grace could be characterized as being equivalent to the male chromosomal reality of 'XY', in which something approximating to a double positivity or, at any rate, to an anti-negative and effectively pro-positive neutrality coupled to a positivity, analogous to vegetation and air (neutrons and protons?), exists by dint of the, as it were, plenumously-conditioned subjective orientation of both the meritocratic and theocratic forms of the church which, contrary to their axial antitheses, tend to operate in the indirect terms of a curvilinear divergence (sensuality) or convergence

(sensibility) rather than in the direct terms, vacuously conditioned, of a rectilinear divergence (sensuality) or convergence (sensibility).

024. Be that as it may, there can be no question that whereas the descending axis is characterized by female-hegemonic criteria in which anything 'XY' is dominated by 'XX', even to the extent of the 'Y' of church-subordinate pseudo-grace and the 'X' of church-subordinate pseudo-sin being consigned to an inferior status vis-à-vis the prevailing autocratic and plutocratic factors which proclaim the primacy of crime and punishment, the ascending axis, by contrast, is characterized by male-hegemonic criteria in which anything 'XX' is sidelined, if not exactly dominated, by 'XY', even to the extent of the 'X' of state-subordinate pseudo-punishment and the 'X' of state-subordinate pseudo-crime being consigned to an inferior status vis-à-vis the prevailing meritocratic and theocratic factors which proclaim the primacy of sin and grace.
025. But no less than sin and grace can't exist without pseudo-punishment and pseudo-crime in the shadow 'XX' to the prevailing 'XY' of male-oriented criteria in respect of a hegemonic church, so crime and punishment can't exist without pseudo-grace and pseudo-sin in the shadow 'XY' to the prevailing 'XX' of female-oriented criteria in respect of a hegemonic state.

026 – 050

026. You don't just have sin and grace on the one hand and crime and punishment on the other; for no society that calls itself civilized, however superficially or profoundly it interprets this, can exist either solely on the basis of the Church or solely on the basis of the State, but if church hegemonic will require a subordinate state characterized by pseudo-punishment and pseudo-crime, and if state hegemonic will require a subordinate church characterized by pseudo-grace and pseudo-sin, the subordinate state of the ascending axis no less 'pseudo' vis-à-vis the hegemonic state of the descending axis than the subordinate church of the descending axis ... vis-à-vis the hegemonic church of the ascending axis.

027. For no society can properly and consistently function on the basis of a genuine church and a genuine state or *vice versa*, as though in diagonal equilibrium, but will tend to favour either the ascending axis of church-hegemonic criteria or the descending axis of state-hegemonic criteria, depending on its overall gender orientation, an orientation in which either female crime will autocratically rule society in the interests of metachemically free soma or, contrary to this, male grace will theocratically lead society in the interests of metaphysically free psyche, the alpha and omega of things upper class or, as I've also described it in the past, noumenal, whereby time and space take precedence over volume and mass conceived, in phenomenal contrast, as lower-class actualities which require simply to be managed from 'On High', whether in terms of autocratic unlawfulness and aristocratic ungodliness, crime and pseudo-grace, or in terms of theocratic godliness and technocratic lawfulness, grace and pseudo-crime.
028. Those who rule 'the overcome world' of plutocratically-subverted democracy from autocratically/aristocratically 'On High' necessarily fear the justice of punishment and the devil of pseudo-sin, to which one can be sentenced down in state-hegemonic vein or damned down in church-subordinate vein, falling diagonally from the outer light to the inner darkness, as from metachemistry and antimetaphysics to antichemistry and physics, wherein plutocracy and democracy have their lowly places.
029. Those who lead 'the overcome world' of meritocratically-subverted bureaucracy from theocratically/technocratically 'On High' necessarily trust that those 'down below' will live in hope of the godliness of grace and the lawfulness of pseudo-crime, to which they can be saved up in church-hegemonic vein or released up in state-subordinate vein, rising diagonally from the outer darkness to the inner light, as from antiphysics and chemistry to metaphysics and antimetachemistry, wherein theocracy and technocracy have their exalted places.
030. Thus there's all the difference both in the world and above it between these two axial orientations, each of which has a shadow which isn't at cross-purposes with it in antithetically diagonal vein but, contrary to

any such equilibrium, effectively runs parallel to it in either pseudo-state or pseudo-church terms, depending on the axis, so that one can never infer anything genuinely antiphysical, much less metaphysical, about the pseudo-churches of the descending axis, or indeed anything genuinely metachemical, much less antichemical, about the pseudo-states of the ascending axis.

031. On the contrary, the bureaucratic and technocratic pseudo-states will be no-less far removed from anything genuinely antichemical or metachemical in their antiphysically-subverted chemical or metaphysically-subverted antimetachemical dispositions for pseudo-punishment and pseudo-crime than the aristocratic and democratic pseudo-churches ... from anything genuinely metaphysical or antiphysical in their metachemically-subverted antimetaphysical or antichemically-subverted physical dispositions for pseudo-grace and pseudo-sin.
032. I believe I've already described, in a previous text, the state-hegemonic aspect of things on the descending axis in terms of antiidealism vis-à-vis antinaturalism, though this was in order to emphasize the highness of the former at the expense of the lowness of the latter, descending from autocracy to plutocracy, while reserving for the state-subordinate aspect of things on the ascending axis of bureaucracy to technocracy the terms naturalism vis-à-vis idealism, so that antiidealism stood autocratically antithetical to technocratic idealism and, in reverse order, antinaturalism plutocratically antithetical to bureaucratic naturalism.
033. In reality, however, antiidealism and antinaturalism could be more conventionally described as materialism and realism, so that the descent from antiidealism to antinaturalism is equivalent to a descent from materialism to realism, and is in that respect antithetical to the ascent from naturalism to idealism which we've characterized as typifying the diagonally rising axis of bureaucracy–technocracy.
034. Yet there's also, I maintain, a distinction between materialism and antiidealism on the one hand, and between antinaturalism and realism on the other; for materialism is, it seems to me, the female aspect of autocracy and antiidealism its male aspect, the aspect that stands

closer, in a manner of speaking, to aristocracy without, however, being properly aristocratic (and church subordinate), whereas antinaturalism is the female aspect of plutocracy and realism its male aspect, the aspect that stands closer, in a manner of speaking, to democracy without, however, being properly democratic (and church subordinate).

035. Contrariwise, I believe I've elsewhere described the church-subordinate aspect of things on the descending axis in terms of antitranscendentalism vis-à-vis nonconformism, in order once again to emphasize the highness of the former at the expense of the lowness of the latter, descending from aristocracy to democracy, while reserving for the church-hegemonic aspect of things on the ascending axis of meritocracy to theocracy the terms antinonconformism vis-à-vis transcendentalism, so that antitranscendentalism stood aristocratically antithetical to theocratic transcendentalism and, in reverse order, nonconformism democratically antithetical to meritocratic antinonconformism.
036. In reality, however, antitranscendentalism and nonconformism could be more conventionally described as fundamentalism and antihumanism, so that the descent from antitranscendentalism to nonconformism is equivalent to a descent from fundamentalism to antihumanism, and is in that respect antithetical to the ascent from antinonconformism to transcendentalism coupled, on the female side of the fence, to one from humanism to antifundamentalism, which we've characterized as typifying the diagonally rising axis of meritocracy—theocracy and bureaucracy—technocracy.
037. Yet there's also, in a sense, a gender distinction between antitranscendentalism and fundamentalism on the one hand, and between antinonconformism and humanism on the other hand; for it seems to me that antitranscendentalism is the male aspect of aristocracy and fundamentalism its female aspect, the aspect that stands closer, in a manner of speaking, to autocracy without, however, being properly autocratic (and state hegemonic), whereas antinonconformism is the male aspect of democracy and humanism its female aspect, the aspect that stands closer, in a manner of speaking, to plutocracy without, however, being properly plutocratic (and state

hegemonic).

038. However that may be, what antiidealism is to materialism and realism to antinaturalism, namely the male side of a diagonally-descending autocratic–plutocratic state-hegemonic integrity, so, in gender reverse, antinaturalism to realism and antimaterialism to idealism, namely the female side of a diagonally-ascending bureaucratic–technocratic state-subordinate integrity; for naturalism is the female aspect of bureaucracy and antirealism its male aspect, the aspect that stands closer, in a manner of speaking, to meritocracy without, however, being properly meritocratic (and church hegemonic), whereas antimaterialism is the female aspect of technocracy and idealism its male aspect, the aspect that stands closer, in a manner of speaking, to theocracy without, however, being properly theocratic (and church hegemonic).
039. Conversely, what fundamentalism is to antitranscendentalism and humanism to antinonconformism, namely the female side of a diagonally-descending aristocratic–democratic church-subordinate integrity, so, in gender reverse, nonconformism is to antihumanism and transcendentalism to antifundamentalism, namely the male side of a diagonally-ascending meritocratic–theocratic church-hegemonic integrity; for antinonconformism is the male aspect of meritocracy and humanism its female aspect, the aspect that stands closer, in a manner of speaking, to bureaucracy without, however, being properly bureaucratic (and state subordinate), whereas transcendentalism is the male aspect of theocracy and antifundamentalism its female aspect, the aspect that stands closer, in a manner of speaking, to technocracy without, however, being properly technocratic (and state subordinate).
040. In general theoretical terms, one can distinguish the humanism and transcendentalism of the church-hegemonic axis from the fundamentalism and nonconformism of the church-subordinate axis, but in overall practical terms what transpires in the one case is an antinonconformist subversion of humanism at the behest of ...

END OF PREVIEW