

# THE RADICAL PROGRESS QUARTET

John O'Loughlin



# THE RADICAL PROGRESS QUARTET

By

JOHN O'LOUGHLIN

Of Centretruths Digital Media

CDM Philosophy

This edition of *The Radical Progress Quartet* 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: 978-1-4466-9987-4

# CONTENTS

Preface

Radical Progress

Stairway to Judgement

A Perfect Resolution

The Last Judgement

Biographical Footnote

## PREFACE

Following on from *The Apocalypso Quartet* (2003), this 'quartet' of philosophical writings brings into one chronologically convenient volume the titles 'Radical Progress', 'Stairway to Judgement', 'A Perfect Resolution', and 'The Last Judgement', all of which are also independently available as free-standing titles in both eBook and paperback formats.

Brought together, however, the continuity in John O'Loughlin's philosophical development at around this time becomes once again both more accessible and intelligible, enabling one to follow the evolution of his thought processes from book to book in what is one of a number of such literary 'quartets', in which a loosely aphoristic structure serves as the appropriate methodology underlining his mainly metaphysical approach to philosophy which is not, however, without discursive interest of a political or social or even ideological nature.

John O'Loughlin, 2012 (Revised 2022)

# RADICAL PROGRESS

## (The Only Way Forward)

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-not self crime and anti-not self 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 not self-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 not self than to 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 reaffirm 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 self is quite distinct from that of the not self, 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 fascistic 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 of grace 'down below' is only sustainable on the basis of the free influence of crime autocratically obtaining 'up above', which effectively upends, in paradoxical vein, the terms of reference at the expense of the nominal male hegemony which would otherwise favour relative grace and ensure that such grace was the characteristic aspect of democratic freedom.

019. Instead of which, thanks to the upper class influence of a criminally free autocracy, punishment becomes no less the chief characteristic of plutocratic freedom to which relative grace is

bound than sin the chief characteristic of meritocratic freedom to which relative crime is bound vis-à-vis the upper class influence of a gracefully free theocracy.

020. Of course the plutocratic freedom of the anti-chemical is more usually called democratic, just as the meritocratic freedom of the anti-physical is usually called bureaucratic. But, in actuality, state-hegemonic criteria characterize the former context no less than church-hegemonic criteria the latter, and the existence of punishment at the expense of grace in the one context and of sin at the expense of crime in the other owes much, if not everything, to the contrary noumenal influences of autocratic crime and theocratic grace, without which neither phenomenal context would paradoxically continue in effectively plutocratic or meritocratic fashion but in outright democratic or bureaucratic fashion, as befitting church and state hegemonies of a lower class order.

021. However, a graceful democracy is no more desirable from the standpoint of autocratic crime, which subverts democracy plutocratically, than is a criminal bureaucracy from the standpoint of theocratic grace, which subverts bureaucracy meritocratically, and therefore neither lower class actuality will obtain in countries or societies conditioned by upper class criteria, whether for theocratically better or autocratically worse, the

former of course subverting females sinfully, the latter subverting males punishingly. For theocracy is no less male in its upper class grace than autocracy female in upper class crime – the former metaphysical and airy, the latter metachemical and fiery.

022. But, down below, it is not quite so clear-cut, so absolutist, but subject, as the phenomenal always is, to the relativity of both chemistry and physics, water and vegetation (earth), whether in respect of a nominal chemical hegemony in the case of theocratically-subverted bureaucracies, which pander to anti-physical meritocracy, or of a nominal physical hegemony in the case of autocratically-subverted democracies, which pander to anti-chemical plutocracy.
023. Let's have, at this point, some slangful fun – shall we? – and revert to terms like 'prick' and 'cunt' and 'fucking' and 'sucking' (equivalent to 'sodding' in the sense of a female bias to squeeze, but more