

THE WAY OF EVOLUTION

JOHN O'LOUGHLIN



THE WAY OF EVOLUTION

By

JOHN O'LOUGHLIN

Of Centretruths Digital Media

CDM Philosophy

This edition of *The Way of Evolution* first published 2011 and republished with revisions 2022 by Centretruths Digital Media

Copyright © 2011, 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: 978-1-4466-4835-3

CONTENTS

Preface

The Essential Goal

Means before Ends

Post-egocentric Art

Natural and Artificial kinds of Sex

Confessions of an Atheist

The Literary Revolution

Music in an Age of Transition

Historical Analogies

The Way of Evolution

Aphoristic Appendix

Biographical Footnote

PREFACE

Originally dating from 1981, this collection of essays is thematically more homogeneous than those included in *The Fall of Love* (1979), and reflects a more optimistic outlook on progress as something that, being evolutionary, should culminate in a future paradise having nothing whatsoever to do with the cosmic inception of life.

Art, literature, music, sex, gender, history, technology, and religion are the principal themes under consideration here, and they are generally treated in relation to my philosophy of evolution, which owes not a little, in its origins, to the estimable likes of Nietzsche, Spengler, and Teilhard de Chardin.

As usual for my work of this period, *The Way of Evolution* ends with a series of aphorisms, which both summarize and encapsulate its overall philosophy.

John O'Loughlin, London 1981 (Revised 2022)

THE ESSENTIAL GOAL

It has long been acknowledged by a number of the world's greatest thinkers, including both Schopenhauer and Nietzsche, that men and women are not equal but, rather, that women are decidedly inferior to men – indeed, judged from a sensible standpoint, a second sex. It has also been acknowledged that the chief reasons for this inequality are that women are physically weaker and more timid than men, with a greater dependence upon nature in consequence of their greater physical proximity to it, not only in terms of bodily structure and composition, but also in contexts like lactation and menstruation. They are less free than men in their behaviour and are inclined to resist radical change from a standpoint rooted in natural determinism. They are apt to be more emotional and therefore less stable, more sensual and therefore less spiritual, more intuitive and therefore less rational, more realistic and therefore less idealistic, more worldly and therefore less otherworldly, and so on.

In general, it is fair to say that much of this is largely true. For men and women *are* fundamentally different creatures, with separate functions in life, and cannot, by the very nature of their differences, both physiological and psychological, be equal, i.e. exactly the same. Men are, on the whole, physically stronger than women, more intellectually-biased, more spiritually progressive, etc., and therefore not susceptible to being regarded as the exact equals of women, nor, on those counts, as their inferiors. On the contrary, they are essentially and morally superior to women and, if the greatest philosophers are believable, have long been so, though not perhaps with any distinct consciousness of the fact. But the modern world has tended to treat men and women as though they were equal and is increasingly doing so, offering women more job opportunities and social freedoms than ever before. Literally for the first time in the world's history, woman is being regarded as man's equal. Why is this?

The answer to such a question is not, I think, to be found in the assumption that, previously, men had been grossly mistaken in their assessment of women but, rather, that the world has recently become so male-biased that women are being treated as though they were men. Not in every context of course, but certainly in contexts which relate to professional, commercial,

and industrial occupational affairs. Now the reason the world has recently become so male-biased is that urbanization and technology have developed to such an extent that we are neither as close to nor, on the whole, as much influenced by nature as were our pre-industrial and pre-urban ancestors.

For nature, being subconsciously dominated, is essentially a feminine phenomenon, and the further away from it one evolves the less influence does the feminine exert on life and the more, by a corresponding degree, does the masculine come to predominate.

The big city, then, reflects an anti-natural environment, one might almost say to the point of constituting a lunarization of the world, and what is anti-natural and/or artificial is also, *ipso facto*, anti-feminine and anti-sensual.

The consequences of this for women are a weakening of the traditional feminine roles of sexual and maternal commitment and the imposition, in their place, of a masculine role of professional responsibility. Woman is, to a certain extent, masculinized under the mounting influence of urban expansion and, consequently, she ceases to regard herself simply as a female, with traditional domestic responsibilities. Of course, these responsibilities are still there, but now they are obliged to make way for such responsibilities as modern life in the big city have thrust upon her and no longer, except in exceptional cases, completely dominate her life to the exclusion of other things. She won't, however, look upon this as a misfortune but, rather, as a consequence of liberation, the progress of women in the modern world.... To be confined, on the other hand, to traditional marital and maternal duties too exclusively *would* be regarded as a misfortune, comparatively speaking, and thus as a mode of oppression which one is much better off without. Progress demands that women take a more active role in the world.

Yes, but it does so at the expense of the feminine ideal and at a high cost to women personally! For with the possible exception of the witch hunts of the 16-17th centuries, there has never been an age when women were so greatly oppressed – certainly not within the annals of recorded time. By dint of its masculine bias the modern world directly makes war on the feminine element in life, and makes war on it so ruthlessly and successfully that the female does not lament the passing of her femininity, her sensuous appearance, but willingly joins in the war against it for the sake of progress or, more specifically, with a view to acquiring liberation from womanhood, which is to say, liberation from nature. So great is the influence of the

modern world over her that she is obliged to regard the gradual eradication of the feminine element in life as a good thing, a positive blessing which will pave the way for greater social and professional opportunities in the future. Put bluntly, woman is obliged to turn against her own fundamental interests in the interests of men, and to do so, moreover, under the false though necessary assumption that she is thereby serving her own deepest interests, which are not now, however, feminine and domestic, as traditionally, but masculine and industrial, as required by the modern world. A sort of 'transvaluation of all values' is imposed upon her *from without*, which leads to a liberation from traditional values *from within*, and a reappraisal of the self in terms of essentially masculine criteria of progress. No longer is she content to remain 'just a woman', with all the maternal, sexual, and sensual obligations such a status implies, but is effectively determined to become a man, determined to commercialize and intellectualize and professionalize and monetize herself to the extent that she can. To be the passive, helpless victim of industrial and urban progress would be simply too humiliating! Better to ignore or, at any rate, undervalue the coercive element in modern life and act as though one were directly responsible for one's own transformation – in short, as though one had personally willed it! Such, at present, is the general attitude of women, consciously or unconsciously, towards the transformations imposed upon them by technological progress. Rebellion is simply out-of-the-question.

So, obviously, the more urban civilization masculinizes women, the more reasonable it becomes that they should be treated like men and granted equal opportunities, not be discriminated against *as women*. And equal opportunities should lead to equal rewards, both financial and social. If at present this isn't always the case, it must be because there is a discrepancy in the system or, alternatively, because women, or certain women, haven't yet emancipated themselves from traditional responsibilities to any appreciable extent and thereby proved their worth in masculine terms. With the further development of liberation and, needless to say, urban civilization, it is to be hoped that a more consistent and widespread equality of opportunity will emerge, as evolutionary progress would seem to require. But, at present, the tendency of women to draw away from traditional responsibilities is still a comparatively new one, its origin largely confined to the twentieth century and, in particular, to the early decades thereof, which, in historical terms, is an extremely short period of time. Prior to then, the Industrial Revolution hadn't unduly affected them.

For they were still, to a large ...