

THE DIALECTICS OF SYNTHETIC ATTRACTION

John O'Loughlin



THE DIALECTICS OF SYNTHETIC ATTRACTION

By

JOHN O'LOUGHLIN

Of Centretruths Digital Media

CDM Philosophy

This edition of *The Dialectics of Synthetic Attraction*
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: 978-1-4466-8265-4

CONTENTS

PREFACE

001 – 025

026 – 050

051 – 075

076 – 100

101 – 123

BIOGRAPHICAL FOOTNOTE

PREFACE

As suggested by the title, this book of aphoristic philosophy advances my investigation of the dialectical process in terms of successive stages of civilization, from alpha to omega, and does so in considerably more detail than *The Classless Solution* (2004), not only correcting but expanding certain of the theories put forward at the tail-end of the above-mentioned work, with a consequence that what was virtually embryonic there has come to something approaching full maturity here, even down to the way in which the outcome of the historical process is envisaged. For this book leaves little or nothing, in that respect, to be desired, and I can confidently say that I have achieved, here, the summation of my life's work, bringing to a very confident conclusion matters that were first broached several years if not decades ago, but with nothing of the logical certainty and sophistication which has since ensued.

It is even good to be reminded that one's books are cyclical in character, spiralling up towards an ever-more comprehensively exacting summit which brings to a centro-complexifying head things that, in the very nature of such matters, it was only possible to introduce in more general terms earlier on or, rather, lower down the work's inner structure. In that respect, what I have achieved here with regard to the interaction and interrelativity of psychological and physiological factors

on either a female or a male basis, depending on the elemental context, surpasses, by far, whatever had been achieved before, and not only, I wager, by myself!

For this well-nigh definitive working-out, in some detail, of such psychological and physiological dualities puts everything into perspective, and it only remains for those who are capable of reading and appreciating my work – in all probability a tiny minority – to confirm me in the correctness of my vision and the accuracy of my truth, a truth which should endure for ever.

John O'Loughlin, London 2004 (Revised 2022)

001 – 025

001. Anyone who has followed the evolution of my thinking thus far would be aware that I have developed a concept of dialectical interaction in the explanation of the historical process, in relation to the development of civilization, which differs quite substantially from, say, Hegel or Marx, those, in many respects, forerunners of my own philosophical development in this regard. For it is not simply the case that thesis plus antithesis equals synthesis, or that a consequence of the interaction of thesis with antithesis is a sort of synthetic fusion which yet transcends the dialectical struggle whether in terms of idealism, as with Hegel, or materialism, as with Marx, but, rather, in contrast to any such simplistic deduction, that something corresponding to a thesis subsequently engenders an antithesis which becomes the starting point for or catalyst of a new thesis which exists in a synthetic relationship to the preceding antithesis.
002. I have described this process in terms of an action leading to a reaction which in turn becomes the subject of an attraction which, as the basis of a new action, subsequently engenders another reaction, and so on, in a dialectical process which involves both progression and regression, centro-complexification (de Chardin) and decentralization, evolution and devolution, in relation to either

positive or negative stages of civilized development.

003. We may, however, equate the action with a thesis, the reaction with an antithesis, and the attraction with a synthesis, and thus arrive at a process of dialectical interaction which explains, more fully and, I believe, credibly than either Hegelian or Marxian dialectics, the historical process, as bearing upon the development of civilization, as from an alpha point in the past to a hypothetical omega point in the future.
004. For I have contended that civilization begins positively, with birth, and concludes positively, with birth, albeit on diametrically antithetical terms, while in between come a series of alternations between death and birth which constitute intermediate manifestations of negative and positive development.
005. Furthermore the distinction between positivity and negativity isn't necessarily commensurate with progress on the one hand and regress on the other, nor is reaction to an action, the antithetical retort to a thesis, necessarily negative and/or regressive. For what determines whether something is progressive or regressive is not its affiliation with positivity or negativity, birth or death, but whether it conforms to centro-complexification in relation to decentralization, evolution in relation to devolution,

in which case it is progressive, or whether, on the contrary, it conforms to decentralization in relation to centralization, devolution in relation to evolution, in which case, quite obviously, it will be regressive.

006. Let us look into this matter in more detail. We began, you may recall, with the contention that civilization began liberally, in decentralized vein, and subsequently embraced a centralizing tendency commensurate with totalitarianism, as though in a distinction between Hinduism and Judaism, polytheism and monotheism. I would call this early civilization pagan in character, because it has more to do with free soma than with either bound psyche, bound soma, or free psyche; more to do, in other words, with the freedom of Devil the Mother conceived as that which most corresponds to free soma within civilized contexts, or societies, that are more cosmic than naturalistic or humanistic or cyborgistic, and which consequently tend to orientate their religious devotions, their worship, towards the most dominant and characteristic elements of the Cosmos, which happen to be stellar bodies.

007. Be that as it may, any distinction between liberalism and totalitarianism, polytheism and monotheism, in relation to somatic freedom of a broadly metachemical order, the order most affiliated to stellar bodies in the Cosmos, will have

reference not only to positivity, the positivity of a stage of civilization corresponding to the birth of Devil the Mother, to worship of Devil the Mother hyped as God, but once that distinction is understood to embrace both thesis and antithesis, action and reaction, in relation to somatic freedom of a metachemical order, also to a progression from the liberal version of paganism to its totalitarian version, as indeed from Hinduism to Judaism, commensurate with a shift, where applicable, from cosmic polytheism to cosmic monotheism, such that enables us to infer a progression, correlatively, from decentralization to centralization and, indeed, to interpret such a progression in terms of centro-complexification in respect of Devil the Mother.

008. Thus pagan civilization presents us with a positive stage of civilization divisible into two phases, the active phase which is liberal in its cosmic polytheism, and the reactive phase which is totalitarian in its cosmic monotheism, the latter of which signifies a progression over the former as somatic freedom proceeds from stellar bodies in general to one stellar body in particular, the focus of Creator for Judaic and, subsequently, Christian civilizations or, more correctly, stages of civilization.

009. Polytheistic thesis plus monotheistic antithesis does not, however, equal a pantheistic synthesis, at least not in relation to what already exists, but only in

terms of a negative attraction to the progressive reaction to a positive action, the negativity of which takes the totalitarian form of the death of Devil the Mother or, more correctly, the death of the (paganistic) worship via sacrifice to Devil the Mother as the coming of Christianity, specifically in terms of its inceptive manifestation in Catholicism, establishes what can be regarded as a synthetic context whereby like backs away from like, in this case the totalitarianism of monotheism, albeit on the negative terms alluded to above, so that one may speak of the overlap between Judaism and Roman Catholic Christianity as constituting a synthetic attraction involving both the preceding antithetic reaction and the ensuing thetic action, the former both progressive and positive, the latter negative, since the death of Devil the Mother must ever contrast negatively with the actual worshipful birth and, in some sense, life of Devil the Mother conceived as characteristically pagan.

010. Christianity, on the other hand, is precisely that which is contrary to or against anything pagan, and therefore the death of the Son of Devil the Mother or, more correctly, of the earthly and effectively pantheistic embodiment of Devil the Mother constitutes an altogether new stage of civilization in which the Crucifixion comes to symbolize the death of pagan sacrifice to Devil the Mother (hyped as God) as Devil the Mother gave Her Son to be sacrificed in such fashion that mankind, albeit not

yet fully human, could partake of the Eucharistic paradox of Her Son's self-sacrifice instead, thereby ceasing to be pagan and becoming what we would regard as Christian. Even the 'Virgin Birth' makes a certain amount of theological sense in relation to Devil the Mother, to the fact that there is nothing anterior to Devil the Mother, least of all in the Cosmos, that could be held responsible for impregnating Her, since not only is space anterior to time, as, lower down the hierarchy of planes, volume would be anterior to mass, but the stellar plane is anterior to the solar one, as the lunar plane to the terrestrial one, and therefore even the earthly embodiment of Devil the Mother, the so-called 'Mother of God', can be regarded as being extrapolated out from a primal status in such manner that the concept of a virgin birth remains theologically credible.

011. But if the earthly embodiment of Devil the Mother is no 'Mother of God', then neither is the Son of Devil the Mother commensurate with 'God the Son' or 'the Son of God', but simply that which, issuing from Devil the Mother, made it possible for people, who became known as Christians, to partake of His own 'body and blood' in Eucharistic rejection of pagan sacrifice, or sacrifice of animal or other somatic matter to Devil the Mother, since His sacrifice on the Cross had the effect of allowing civilization to advance a stage further than paganism as it effectively turned its back on Devil

the Mother through worship of Her Son, albeit Devil the Mother was still hyped as 'God' and the Son of Devil the Mother still regarded, somewhat illogically and paradoxically, as the 'Son of God'.

012. The above fact continued to be the case even when this totalitarian thesis of Christian negativity came up against a regressive reaction in the guise of the Reformation, and the ensuing schism within Christianity that led to a distinction between the totalitarian version of the death of (pagan worship of) Devil the Mother and its liberal version, this latter, broadly identified as Protestant, itself subject to subsequent denominational splinterings and divisions, whether in terms of Puritanism against Anglicanism, for example, or indeed of subsequent rifts and splinterings within Puritanism itself.

013. However that may be, Christianity remains broadly negative in its worship of the Crucified, Whose sacrifice put an end to pagan positivity and thus to the taking for granted of somatic freedom, His body nailed to the Cross in a graphic paradigm of somatic binding, a binding that, in rejecting pagan freedom, inevitably paves the way for greater emphasis, albeit within a limited context prescribed by both Catholic and Protestant structures of Christian worship, on free psyche, regarded as salvation. But the development from Roman Catholicism to Protestantism, however one conceives of the latter, was certainly symptomatic

of a regressive reaction to a negative thesis, one leading, as noted, from totalitarian centralization in respect of a pantheistic order of monotheism to a sort of liberal or pluralistic decentralization in respect of a pantheistic order of polytheism or, rather, polytheistic order of pantheism in which Christ Himself became fragmented along multid denominational lines broadly corresponding not only to the Protestant schism between Anglicanism and Puritanism but, more generally, to the ensuing denominational subdivisions within Puritanism itself, of which Quakers, Baptists, Methodists, Unitarians, Presbyterians, Calvinists, and Seventh Day Adventists are only a selection.

014. But if the second stage of civilization is broadly negative, then what ensues with the coming of humanism in synthetic attraction with the liberal phase of the death of (pagan worship of) Devil the Mother, is altogether more positive in character, a birth and not a death, the birth, more particularly, of man, and thus of a new emphasis on mankind and mankind's ability to take care of itself and sort out its own problems, whether with or without 'God's' help. Thus a new synthesis is established and remains discernible in which the liberal version of the birth of man backs off the liberal version of the death of Devil the Mother, a positive action backing off a regressive reaction which paves the way, in due humanistic course, for a progressive reaction to this action, which of course takes the form of the

totalitarian version of the birth of man, call it social democracy after liberal democracy or communism after parliamentary liberalism or even proletarian humanism after bourgeois humanism, as the greatest happiness of the greater number is developed to its logical conclusion along broadly Marxist lines.

015. Were social democracy the end of the evolutionary line of civilization's advance, history would already have reached its culmination, and we would now live in a communist world. Such, of course, was not to be the case, for even the totalitarian version of the birth of man, being a phase of the third stage of civilization, became subject, in due historical course, to a negative synthetic attraction in the guise of the totalitarian version of the death of man, which, having more to do with worship of the machine and of machine culture than of mankind's self-worship along broadly political lines, can be equated with fascism, that arch-rival to communism which owes not a little to Hegelian dialectics and to state-worship of a markedly different kind, a kind effectively more economic than political, and dedicated to the furtherance of national self-interest at the expense of internationalism, including the so-called internationalism of Marxism-Leninism which, for a totalitarian version of the birth of man, must rank somewhat below bourgeois liberalism in terms of international endeavour and appeal, not least in respect of empire-building.

016. Be that as it may, the more avowedly nationalistic form of totalitarianism that emerged with fascism, while it might oppose social democratic totalitarianism, soon found itself up against a regressive reaction in terms of the liberal version of the death of man that, hailing principally from America, duly made a major contribution to the demise of economic totalitarianism in the so-called corporate state as it sought not only to supplant fascism but, in conjunction with what had survived of the liberal version of the birth of man, principally in respect of Great Britain, to squeeze out totalitarian competition wherever it raised its anachronistic head, whether on positive or negative terms, and to further, in conjunction with countries like Britain, a world safe for liberalism, for secular pluralism, for economic internationalism, which is not only distinct from economic nationalism, but from political nationalism, including the Bolshevik variety, as well!

017. Not altogether surprisingly, political internationalism and economic internationalism, the two ends of the humanistic spectrum, have been able to work together to defeat humanistic totalitarianism, whether that totalitarianism took a positive reactionary turn, as in the case of communism, or a negative reactionary turn, so to speak, as in the case of fascism, discarding for a moment fascism's own synthetic status in the

negative attraction with communism which spanned the humanistic divide between the birth of man and the death of man, politics and economics, as civilization, besotted by the machine, entered its fourth stage of development, and did so via arguably the worst war in the history of mankind.

018. But now that both communism and fascism are no more, or at least no more than peripheral to the mainstream thrust of civilization, and liberalism stands triumphant over the world like a pluralistic colossus bestriding both the political and economic forms of mankind's internationalism, the time is fast approaching when a new synthesis will emerge, when civilization will enter its fifth and final stage, as a positive attraction to economic liberalism's regressive reaction to totalitarian economics signals the dawn of the liberal birth of God the Father, of the coming of 'the Kingdom' under the auspices of Messianic leadership, broadly identifiable with the Second Coming, in which a pluralistic manifestation of what has been termed Social Theocracy, aiming at a Triadic Beyond and administrative aside to the said Beyond, utilizes liberal democracy for purposes of encouraging the electorates of certain already-specified countries to vote for religious sovereignty and thus move beyond humanism, whether in respect of its birth or its death, but especially in relation to its more contemporary manifestation, towards that transcendentalism which will be properly

commensurate with God the Father, and thus with a divine leadership of society to a self-transcending end.

019. Therefore just as totalitarian corporatism, or fascism, opposed totalitarian socialism, or communism, from a contrary humanistic standpoint, so must liberal centralism, or social theocracy, offer mankind an alternative to liberal corporatism, the non-fascist corporatism of the present age, in order that man may be overcome