

# VALUATIONS OF A SOCIAL TRANSCENDENTALIST

By

**John O'Loughlin**

Of Centretruths Digital Media

CDM Philosophy

This edition of *Valuations of a Social Transcendentalist* published 2012 by  
Centretruths Digital Media

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

## CONTENTS

### PREFACE

#### PART ONE: REVALUATIONS

1. Qualifying Freedom
2. Cursed Damnation vis-à-vis Blessed Salvation
3. Immutability of the Genders
4. More Exacting Terminologies
5. The Case for Social Transcendentalism
6. True Enlightenment

#### PART TWO: EVALUATIONS

1. Contrasting types of Sanity and Insanity
2. The Choice to be Made
3. The Nature of Democracy
4. Delving Beneath the Surface
5. Gender and Sexual Paradoxes
6. Reclaiming Truth from the Jaws of Fact

#### PART THREE: TRANSVALUATIONS

1. Elementally Conditioned Modes of Valuation
2. The Moral Undesirability of State Freedom
3. The Moral Desirability of Church Freedom
4. Gender Struggles in Sensuality and Sensibility
5. Getting Back on Track
6. The Meaning of Social Transcendentalism

### BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

Copyright © 2012 John O'Loughlin

## PREFACE

Carrying on from the multipart style of writing characterizing *Alpha and Omega – Diabolic Beginning and Divine End* (2002), this volume of aphoristic philosophy is divisible into three six-chapter parts entitled 'Revaluations', 'Evaluations', and 'Transvaluations', and therefore approaches the task outlined in the title from three different standpoints, albeit without undue inflexibility or too methodical a distinction between them. Nevertheless the result, overall, isn't logically displeasing, since each part has something new and different to offer, not least of all the third, which is closer to the 'transcendentalism' of the ideological title than to its 'social' aspect in the way the emphasis has been placed upon transvaluating, that is, upon shifting the concept of various notions or ideals or realities from alpha to omega, soma to psyche, not-self to self, in the interests of a transvaluation of society along lines likely, if not guaranteed, to lead to the sorts of positive outcomes which I have identified with virtue and, hence, morality, as befitting an alternative kind of society to that which generally prevails at present. And not only in countries or contexts where it is demonstrably official, like Britain and America, but also wherever it exists unofficially in consequence of the overwhelming influences and pressures which have been brought to bear on virtually *all* Western societies by their more powerful neighbours. That said, *Valuations of a Social Transcendentalist* is by no means defeatist but, on the contrary, cautiously optimistic as to the prospect of some kind of alternative dispensation, broadly identifiable with 'Kingdom Come', for the future. With certain revaluations of previous philosophical positions taken by me and a number of fresh evaluations also included along with these transvaluations, I feel that I can confidently claim to have finally reached the Social Transcendentalist omega-point of my philosophical oeuvre, and thus satisfied my claim to philosophic if not messianic credibility, whatever others may subsequently think.

John O'Loughlin, London 2002 (Revised 2012)

## PART ONE: REVALUATIONS

### *QUALIFYING FREEDOM*

1. Men and women or, rather, males and females (for we would not wish to exclude the upper-class categories of gods and devils) are, by definition, gender opposites - the former characterized by a bias, in physics and metaphysics, vegetation (earth) and air, for subjectivity in relation to a hegemonic psyche, the latter characterized by a bias, in metachemistry and chemistry, fire and water, for objectivity in relation to a hegemonic soma, and therefore we cannot, at risk of philosophic suicide, regard or treat them equally, as though they were the *same*. For the reality of their differences will remain even if, through philosophical ignorance, we apply identical criteria to both sexes, as to life in general, conveniently or unwittingly overlooking the fact that it is divisible between objective and subjective, female and male, factors, the former of which owe their origin to a vacuum, the latter to a plenum.
2. Males, whether phenomenal in mass/volume or noumenal in time/space, physical or metaphysical, are characterized not only by the predominance of psyche over soma, but by the precedence of soma by psyche, and therefore of particles by wavicles and, in an equivalent subjective sense, of illusion by truth.
3. Females, by contrast, whether noumenal in space/time or phenomenal in volume/mass, metachemical or chemical, are characterized not only by the predominance of soma over psyche, but by the precedence of psyche by soma, and therefore of wavicles by particles and, in an equivalent objective sense, of fiction by fact.
4. Therefore the *truth* of psychic precedence in more (relative to most) wavicles/less (relative to least) particles for physical males and most wavicles/least particles for metaphysical males, has to be contrasted with the *fact* of somatic precedence in most particles/least wavicles for metachemical females and more (relative to most) particles/less (relative to least) wavicles for chemical females, as one would contrast men and gods with devils and women, or, in elemental terms, the subjectivity of vegetation and air with the objectivity of fire and water.
5. That which is extrapolated from a particle hegemony in somatic fact

will partake of a psychically fictional status in subordinate wavicles, whereas that which is extrapolated from a wavicle hegemony in psychic truth will partake of a somatically illusory status in subordinate particles. The former, being female, will entail a fundamentalist subordination to materialism in metachemistry and a nonconformist subordination to realism in chemistry. The latter, being male, will entail a naturalist subordination to humanism in physics and an idealist subordination to transcendentalism in metaphysics.

6. Therefore far from being equal in significance, materialism and realism, corresponding to somatic metachemistry and chemistry, will be *primary* modes of soma, and naturalism and idealism, their physical and metaphysical counterparts, *secondary* modes of soma, while, in psychic metachemical and chemical contrast, fundamentalism and nonconformism will be *secondary* modes of psyche, and humanism and transcendentalism their *primary* counterparts in physics and metaphysics.
7. For somatic fact takes precedence, whether on absolute or relative terms, over psychic fiction on the objective, or female, side of life, while psychic truth takes precedence, whether on relative or absolute terms, over somatic illusion on the subjective, or male, side of life - at least in theory and according to the extent to which each gender is being loyal to itself and has not been subordinated to the interests of the opposite gender.
8. The subordination of the one gender to the other, however, tends to be the societal norm, since society cannot properly function if fact and truth have equal weight or importance when, in reality, such somatic and psychic contrasts tend to be in moral opposition, with contrary concepts of freedom attending each. With somatic freedom, the State tends to take precedence over the Church, and scientific and political interests take control of society in the name of the secular objectivities of a female disposition. With psychic freedom, by contrast, the Church tends to take precedence over the State, and economic and religious interests take control of society in the name of the ecclesiastic subjectivities of a male disposition.
9. Some kind of amoral or androgynous cross-breeding is, of course, possible and does occasionally occur, with overly liberal implications. But, by and large, stable societies require either the rule of somatic freedom in secular objectivity or the rule of psychic freedom in ecclesiastic subjectivity, since vacillation between the one and the other is not only socially undesirable but morally and practically undesirable to boot, bearing in mind the need for a specific

commitment, one way or the other, if chaos or anarchy is not to prevail.

10. So one cannot simply proclaim a commitment to freedom without begging the question: to what kind of freedom are you committed? at least from anyone who has sufficient philosophical and moral insight to realize that freedom needs to be qualified according to gender, and that there are accordingly two kinds of female, or somatic, freedom on the objective side of life and two kinds of male, or psychic, freedom on its subjective side, neither of which is much given to the idea of sharing freedom with the other or even of admitting that alternatives exist, whether in relation to themselves or, more critically, across the gender divide, where they of course transcend class and become more susceptible to distinctions of fact and truth.
11. Granted that freedom is a meaningless word without due qualification according to gender, we have to allow that societies given to somatic freedom in objective fact will be the natural enemies of those for whom psychic freedom in subjective truth is the ideal, since one cannot have it both ways when the security of each depends upon the exclusion, to all intents and purposes, of the other, be it factual or truthful, female or male, evil or wise, criminal or graceful, of the free state or of the free church.
12. When people speak of freedom without qualification it is either because they are ignorant of the fact that freedom is or can be other than how they conceive of it or, conditioned by one type of freedom within stable societies, are so much a product of their particular type of society that they take its concept of freedom for granted, since such freedom is so much the rule that the exception, if recognizable, hardly warrants consideration. Therefore they talk and act as though only *one* concept or kind of freedom existed, and would incline to the view that alternative freedoms or, rather, societies, if contrary to their own, might well be the enemies of freedom and likely, in consequence, to enslave them.
13. But to what? That, of course, is another thing, and returning from the hypothetical plane of people in general to the specific plane of this writer's particular theory, we should allow that the rule of one gender over another means that either a lot of males will be corrupted in the case of a female hegemony or, conversely, a lot of females corrupted in the case of a male hegemony, since the one gender's meat is effectively the poison of the opposite gender, whatever they may think or say.

14. Consequently if somatic freedom is objectively paramount in factual darkness, the darkness of criminal evil for females, then males will be corrupted in terms of illusory darkness, the darkness of sinful folly, and accordingly be no better than antigods to devils or antimen to women, bearing in mind the class distinction that exists between the sensuality of time and space in relation to somatic noumenality and the sensuality of mass and volume in relation to somatic phenomenality.
15. However, if psychic freedom is subjectively paramount in truthful light, the light of graceful wisdom for males, then females will be corrupted in terms of fictional light, the light of punishing goodness, and accordingly be no better than antiwomen to men or antidevils to gods, bearing in mind the class distinction that exists between the sensibility of mass and volume in relation to psychic phenomenality and the sensibility of time and space in relation to psychic noumenality.
16. In the one case, that of a somatically free society, the vices of crime and sin, with evil and foolish consequences. In the other case, that of a psychically free society, the virtues of grace and punishment, with wise and good consequences. The antigods and/or antimen of the former types of society will not be devils or women but simply that which, not being properly godly or manly, divine or masculine, exists under the hegemonic rule of devils and/or women, diabolic and/or feminine types of female. Conversely, the antiwomen and/or antidevils of the latter types of society will not be men or gods but simply that which, not being properly womanly or devilish, feminine or diabolic, exists under the hegemonic rule of men and/or gods, masculine and/or divine types of male.
17. This logic should prove that one cannot have it both ways, for life is really a gender tug-of-war between darkness and light, somatic and psychic orders of freedom, and the rule of the one gender by the other is only possible on the basis of the corruption of the opposite gender in terms that remove it from its ideal to a subordinate position at cross-purposes with itself whereby, far from being holy or clear, it is either unholy or unclear, depending on gender. For that which is sensually hegemonic is characterized by the clearness of criminal evil, which rules over the unholiness of sinful folly, whereas that which is sensibly hegemonic is characterized by the holiness of graceful wisdom, which rules over the unclearness of punishing goodness.

## ***CURSED DAMNATION VIS-À-VIS BLESSED SALVATION***

1. In the past I have tended to draw a Heathen/Christian distinction, with the Heathen blessedness of somatic freedom of females and the Heathen cursedness of somatic or, rather, psychic enslavement of males contrasting with the Christian salvation of psychic freedom of males and the Christian damnation of psychic or, rather, somatic enslavement of females. For salvation, I have argued, tends to be from the curse of psychic subjection of males and damnation, by contrast, from the blessing of somatic freedom of females, so that as the former rise diagonally through two contiguous class planes from sensuality to sensibility, the latter are obliged to fall diagonally through the equivalent planes from sensuality to sensibility, becoming enslaved to the opposite gender's freedom.
2. Consequently salvation for males has been construed as being either from mass to volume in mass-volume subjectivity, as from phallus to brain, or from time to space in time-space subjectivity, as from ears to lungs, the former physical and the latter metaphysical, whereas damnation for females was construed to be either from space to time in space-time objectivity, as from eyes to heart, or from volume to mass in volume-mass objectivity, as from tongue to womb, the former metachemical and the latter chemical.
3. The contrary fates of the genders as they rise or fall through two contiguous class planes seems to be incontrovertibly valid. But the connection of being cursed with unholiness in physical and/or metaphysical sensuality for males and of being blessed with clearness in metachemical and/or chemical sensuality for females now seems to me partly specious, as does the contrary, or sensible, connection of being saved or damned according to gender, when one could - and probably should - argue that the sensual are invariably damned and the sensible saved, if for no other reason than that somatic negativity rules in the former case and psychic positivity in the latter.
4. Let me attempt to clarify. If we attach the concept of being cursed to somatic negativity and of being blessed to psychic positivity, given that soma, when free, is more usually negative and psyche positive in freedom, then the metachemical ratio of most particles/least wavicles will equate with a context of most negativity/least positivity, and therefore of most cursedness/least blessedness, whereas the chemical ratio of more (relative to most) particles/less (relative to least) wavicles will equate with a context of more (relative to most) negativity/less (relative to least) positivity, and therefore of more

(relative to most) cursedness/less (relative to least) blessedness, in contrast to the physical ratio, across the gender divide, of more (relative to most) wavicles/less (relative to least) particles equating with a context of more (relative to most) positivity/less (relative to least) negativity, and therefore of more (relative to most) blessedness/less (relative to least) cursedness, and also in contrast to the metaphysical ratio of most wavicles/least particles equating with a context of most positivity/least negativity, and therefore of most blessedness/least cursedness.

5. Therefore as we range across the elements from metachemistry and chemistry on the objective, or female, side of life to physics and metaphysics on its subjective, or male, side, as from fire and water to vegetation (earth) and air, we find a situation in which somatic negativity devolves through the particle and psychic positivity evolves through the wavicle, making for a devolution of cursedness proportionate to an evolution of blessedness.
6. The most cursed elemental context of fiery metachemistry is also the most clear in its somatic absolutism of most particles/least wavicles, whereas the most blessed elemental context of airy metaphysics is also the most holy in its psychic absolutism of most wavicles/least particles, while, in between these space/time noumenal planes, and therefore lower down on the phenomenal planes of mass/volume, the relatively cursed and blessed elemental contexts of watery chemistry and vegetative physics are respectively more (relative to most) clear in the somatic relativity of more (relative to most) particles/less (relative to least) wavicles and more (relative to most) holy in the psychic relativity of more (relative to most) wavicles/less (relative to least) particles - at least when each is free to be either somatically or psychically hegemonic, as the case may be.
7. Consequently life can be said to devolve from the clear absolutism of metachemical objectivity to the clear relativity of chemical objectivity, and to evolve, on the opposite side of the gender fence, from the holy relativity of physical subjectivity to the holy absolutism of metaphysical subjectivity, as from fire to water on the one hand, and from vegetation to air on the other. But while clearness is hegemonic in sensuality, then unholiness will be its male counterpart there, and such sensual metaphysics and/or physics will constitute a secondary order of cursedness which cannot but defer, in under-plane subservience, to the primary order of cursedness which is less sinful than criminal and accordingly less foolish than evil.
8. Conversely, while holiness is hegemonic in sensibility, then

unclearness will be its female counterpart there, and such sensible chemistry and/or metachemistry will constitute a secondary order of blessedness which cannot but defer, in under-plane subservience, to the primary order of blessedness which is less punishing than graceful and accordingly less good than wise.

9. For males, remember, are characterized by a psychic predominance in either relative (physically masculine) or absolute (metaphysically divine) terms and cannot but be at cross-purposes with their gender in contexts where, under female hegemonic pressures, they are obliged to grant greater prominence to soma than to psyche and to behave in a foolishly sinful manner which is both unholy and damned, whereas females, by contrast, are characterized by somatic predominance in either absolute (metachemically diabolic) or relative (chemically feminine) terms and cannot but be at cross-purposes with their gender in contexts where, under male hegemonic pressures, they are obliged to grant greater prominence to psyche than to soma and to behave in a goodly punishing manner which is both unclear and saved.
10. For the primary blessings of holiness for males only follow from a free psyche, and such freedom is only possible in sensibility, whether on relative or absolute terms, since then they are in harmony with their gender constitution as creatures for whom psyche predominates over soma in response to the fact or, rather, truth that, with them, psyche precedes soma, as in the more (relative to most) wavicle/less (relative to least) particle context of physics and in the most wavicle/least particle context of metaphysics, and a blessed control of soma by free psyche ensures that the former is less cursed than quasi-blessed in concentric deference to the prevailing freedom, be it egocentric in physics or psychocentric (soulful) in metaphysics.
11. In partnership with this, the secondary blessings of goodness for females only follow from a bound soma, and such binding is only possible in sensibility, whether on relative or absolute terms, since then they are at cross-purposes with their gender constitution as creatures for whom soma predominates over psyche in response to the truth or, rather, fact that, with them, soma precedes psyche, as in the most particle/least wavicle context of metachemistry and in the more (relative to most) particle/less (relative to least) wavicle context of chemistry, and a blessed control of soma by free or, more correctly, pseudo-free psyche ensures that the former is less cursed than pseudo-blessed in concentric deference to the prevailing freedom.
12. Yet the primary cursings of clearness for females only follow from a free soma, and such freedom is only possible in sensuality, whether on

absolute or relative terms, since then they are in harmony with their gender constitution as creatures for whom soma predominates over psyche in response to the fact that, with them, soma precedes psyche, as in the most particle/least wavicle context of metachemistry and in the more (relative to most) particle/less (relative to least) wavicle context of chemistry, and a cursed control of psyche by free soma ensures that the former is less pseudo-blessed than quasi-cursed in eccentric deference to the prevailing freedom.

13. In partnership with this, the secondary cursings of folly for males only follow from a bound psyche, and such binding is only possible in sensuality, whether on relative or absolute terms, since then they are at cross-purposes with their gender constitution as creatures for whom psyche predominates over soma in response to the truth that, with them, psyche precedes soma, as in the more (relative to most) wavicle/less (relative to least) particle context of physics and in the most wavicle/least particle context of metaphysics, and a cursed control of psyche by free or, more correctly, pseudo-free soma ensures that the former is less blessed than pseudo-cursed in eccentric deference to the prevailing freedom.
14. The clearness of the female in harmony with her gender disposition of somatic predominance in hegemonic sensuality has to be contrasted with the unclearness of the female at loggerheads, due to psychically free male hegemonic pressures, with her gender disposition of somatic predominance in subordinate sensibility, while, conversely, the holiness of the male in harmony with his gender disposition of psychic predominance in hegemonic sensibility has to be contrasted with the unholiness of the male at loggerheads, due to somatically free female hegemonic pressures, with his gender disposition of psychic predominance in subordinate sensuality.
15. Therefore we must distinguish the primary damned females of metachemical and/or chemical sensuality from the secondary saved females of chemical and/or metachemical sensibility, the former cursed, in the evil and clearness of their somatic freedom, with the primary vice of crime and the latter blessed, in the goodness (unevil) and unclearness of their somatic binding, with the secondary virtue of punishment, while likewise distinguishing the primary saved males of physical and/or metaphysical sensibility from the secondary damned males of metaphysical and/or physical sensuality, the former blessed, in the wisdom and holiness of their psychic freedom, with the primary virtue of grace and the latter cursed, in the folly (unwisdom) and unholiness of their psychic binding, with the secondary vice of sin.

## ***IMMUTABILITY OF THE GENDERS***

1. It would seem that females are, by nature, the cursed sex and males the blessed sex - at least when each sex is freely hegemonic in either somatic sensuality for the one or psychic sensibility for the other. For even when males are damned to sensuality in the sinfulness of folly and unholiness they are only cursed on secondary terms, being, as it were, pseudo-cursed in the undermining of psychic freedom, whereas even females who have been saved to sensibility in the punishingness of goodness and unclarity are only blessed on secondary terms, being, as it were, pseudo-blessed in the undermining of somatic freedom.
2. For as creatures for whom psyche precedes soma, males remain psyche-over-soma even in sensuality, despite the greater emphasis upon soma that accrues to their subordinate position under a female hegemony, while, as creatures for whom soma precedes psyche, females remain soma-over-psyche even in sensibility, despite the greater emphasis upon psyche that accrues to their subordinate position under a male hegemony, and therefore we have to regard the primary manifestation of cursedness as pertaining in females to free soma and its secondary manifestation as pertaining in males to bound psyche, in contrast to the primary manifestation of blessedness as pertaining in males to free psyche and the secondary manifestation of it as pertaining to females in bound soma.
3. For males should be conceived of primarily in terms of psychic predominance in relation to the precedence of soma by psyche and females, by contrast, in terms of somatic predominance in relation to the precedence of psyche by soma. The gender for whom freedom is primarily in terms of soma can only be bound, or enslaved, on those terms, as is the case for females in sensibility, whereas the gender for whom freedom is primarily in terms of psyche can only be bound, or enslaved, in terms of psyche - something that applies to males in sensuality.
4. Therefore the free female, whose cursedness will be evil in will and clear in spirit, always presupposes, in subordinate sensual positions, the bound, or enslaved, male, whose cursedness will be foolish in id-undermined soul and unholy in spirit-undermined ego, that is, whose cursedness will be primarily ...