

POST-ATOMIC PERSPECTIVES

John O'Loughlin



POST-ATOMIC PERSPECTIVES

Multigenre Philosophy by
JOHN O'LOUGHLIN
Of Centretruths Digital Media

CDM Philosophy

This edition of *Post-Atomic Perspectives* first published 2011 and
republished with revisions 2025 by Centretruths Digital Media

Copyright © 2011, 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: 978-1-4466-5307-4

CONTENTS

PREFACE

PART ONE – ESSAYS

Literary Developments
Transitional Kinds of Literature
A Second Coming
True and False Kinds of Messiah
Antithetical Equivalents
Withering of the State
Christian Pagans
Transvaluations

PART TWO – DIALOGUES

Knowledge of God
Relative and Absolute
Becoming and Become
Evolutionary Stages

PART THREE – APHORISMS

Concerning the Post-human

PART FOUR – MAXIMS

Concerning the Post-atomic

BIOGRAPHICAL FOOTNOTE

PREFACE

Combining essays and dialogues with aphorisms and maxims, this work goes beyond the scope of my previous philosophical projects in both its form and content, opening out towards a post-atomic future in what amounts to an entirely new civilization.

Subjects include the direction of literature in the civilization to come; the transitional nature of contemporary literature; speculations concerning future life forms and their relationship to what is called 'The Ultimate Creation'; the nature of divine love in relation to other types of love, and its bearing on messianic credibility; antithetical equivalents – such as birds and planes or horses and motorbikes – in the evolution of human life towards a post-human future; how the State 'withers', and why it does so; the paradoxical allegiance of Christian pagans, or so-called Christians whose loyalty is rather more to the Creator than to Christ; and transcendental transvaluations in a world that has largely turned its back on nature.

John O'Loughlin, London 1982 (Revised 2025)

PART ONE – ESSAYS

Literary Developments

The more spiritual one happens to be, that's to say, the more biased the constitution of one's psyche towards the superconscious, the less qualified one becomes to either create or enjoy reading fiction. By which I mean most traditional and a great deal of contemporary literature. For the creation and enjoyment of fiction requires a psyche constituted in such a manner as to be more or less balanced between the subconscious and the superconscious in egocentric dualism. Such a psyche will ordinarily be bourgeois and appertain, as a rule, to a suburban rather than to an urban lifestyle. Yet the proletariat can't entirely be exempted from equation with an egocentric integrity, and, even though a majority of them live in urban contexts, there are still those who prefer fiction to fact – the most plausible explanation probably being that, despite the artificial influence of the urban environment, such people aren't particularly intelligent.

To say that the production and assimilation of fiction corresponds to bourgeois dualistic and bourgeois/proletarian transitional levels of evolution, as opposed to a proletarian level, wouldn't be far off the mark. For the bourgeoisie are, as a rule, dualists and, consequently, they're sufficiently acquainted with subconscious influence to be capable of either creating or enjoying fiction. Likewise the petty bourgeoisie, although less egocentric and therefore more biased towards the superconscious than their class predecessors, are capable of creating and enjoying fiction; though they'll generally prefer novels with less fiction and more fact in them, and will write, if artists, more like Hermann Hesse or Arthur Koestler than, say, John Cowper Powys or Evelyn Waugh.

If, considered from a fictional point-of-view, literature should be limited in time to bourgeois and petty-bourgeois stages of evolution, when the psychic constitution of its practitioners and patrons is such as to preclude a wholly factual approach to it, what, you may wonder, will happen to literature when the proletarian stage of evolution eventually makes an official appearance on the level of post-dualistic civilization? The answer to this question must, I think, be fairly obvious: literature will cease to be written in the context of fiction. For by then the psychic constitution of the prevailing class of the day, namely the proletariat, will be so biased towards the superconscious ... as

to preclude either the creation or appreciation of a literature with any concessions to fiction. Thus even the most predominantly factual petty-bourgeois novels or short stories will be found wanting and be consigned, in consequence, to the proverbial rubbish bin of cultural history. Nothing pertaining to a subconscious allegiance would be relevant.

Does this therefore mean that the novel and the short story would cease to exist in a transcendental civilization? Yes, I believe it does. The masses would be provided, instead, with fusion literature, or the combination of various genres within the overall context of a single production. Thus no volume reminiscent of a petty-bourgeois novel or a collection of short stories or even a collection of poems would be published, though something approximating to a novel (long and/or medium prose?), a collection of short stories, etc., on a higher, more truthful basis within the context of fusion literature might still be read.

A proletarian civilization properly so-considered, with Transcendentalism as the official religion, would, however, be post-atomic – in contrast to the bourgeois and bourgeois/proletarian civilizations of the contemporary West. By 'post-atomic' I mean that the proton equivalents in literature, namely words, would be set free of electron equivalents, namely meanings, and enabled to exist in complete freedom on the post-atomic level. For meaning is the electron of a sentence, and when words are bound to meanings, as they tend to be in an atomic civilization, they become constrained by grammatical determinism, which serves to make meaning as clear or intelligible as possible. Grammatical determinism implies that words function as bound protons in the service of meaning. There can be no bound-proton equivalents in a post-atomic civilization!

Now what applies to literature applies no less to the other arts, which have already made considerable strides towards proton freedom within the context of transitional, or bourgeois/proletarian, civilization in recent decades. In art, representation is the electron of a subject and paint, the medium of art, functions as a bound proton when constrained by representational priorities. Bourgeois art is, as a rule, entirely representational, whereas petty-bourgeois art reflects a transitional status between naturalistic representation and artificial abstraction in some in-between realm of creative compromise. At its most radical, as in the finest works of Mondrian, Kandinsky, Nicholson, Pollock, *et al.*, it can be entirely abstract, though constrained from true proton freedom by the retention of naturalistic materials, such as oils and canvas,

which indirectly pertain to electron – or natural – determinism. Likewise in music, melody is the electron of a phrase or sentence, and notes correspond to bound protons when constrained by atomic convention to serve melody.

Bourgeois music is, as a rule, entirely melodic, and thus atomic, whereas petty-bourgeois music, like most of the music produced by Schoenberg, Berg, and Webern, signifies a degree of freedom on the part of notes which, at its most radical, is suggestive of a proletarian avant-garde, while yet being constrained to a petty-bourgeois context by dint of the composer's intermittent adherence to melody and/or continuous utilization of acoustic means. For what natural materials are to art, acoustic instruments are to music, and no truly transcendental, because exclusively artificial, music can be produced through such naturalistic means. Even the most atonal Webern or Schoenberg composition remains petty bourgeois on account of its reliance on acoustic instruments. Just so, the reliance of trad jazz on acoustic instruments precludes it from being wholly or completely proletarian.

Rather, it's a form of bourgeois/proletarian music.

Having outlined the direction I believe literature and the other arts will take in the coming post-atomic civilization, a few words should be said concerning other types of writings – as, for instance, those pertaining to science and philosophy. Clearly such writings can't be subject to exactly the same criteria as apply to the future development of literature, for intelligibility is of their essence in the dissemination of, for the most part, utilitarian, pragmatic and factual knowledge. If literature is destined to become totally abstract on the proletarian level, then those writings which aren't literary should retain allegiance to an atomic integrity, and thus to a degree of grammatical determinism, in fidelity to intelligibility for practical or evolutionary ends. A scientist dedicated to the discovery of means whereby, come the millennial stage of evolution, brains may be artificially supported and sustained in collectivized contexts, isn't going to derive much profit from a volume of abstract literature. As a member of that category of human beings whose principal responsibility is to lead humanity at large towards the 'promised land' of the millennial Beyond, it isn't for him to enter it himself, nor any interim 'promised land', such as might be signified by the assimilation of abstract literature. On the contrary, it's his duty to stand back from it at a kind of bourgeois remove, in loyalty to his vocational responsibility. For while the masses are perfectly entitled to avail themselves of every crumb of evolutionary progress in loyalty to their essentially passive, self-indulgent mentality, the leader, be he scientist, politician, philosopher or whatever, must refrain from participating in such crumbs to

anything like the same extent, in order that he may continue to struggle on behalf of mankind and so bring it closer, by degrees, to that ultimate 'promised land' which will only be attained with the culmination of evolution in the heavenly Beyond. Thus the leader, while not being entirely debarred from sampling the fruits of evolutionary progress himself, must remain committed to intelligible writings, in order that he may learn from them – and indeed contribute towards them – ways by means of which the quality of life on earth may be improved.

On the materialist side, one has science and politics; on the spiritual side – art and religion. Philosophy, which functions as a kind of bridge between materialism and spirituality, must also retain allegiance to intelligibility in the interests of its synthesizing vocation. And the same will, of course, apply to philosophical literature, which is but a more philosophically-biased mode of literature – too literary to be literally philosophy, but, at the same time, too philosophical to be subject to such evolutionary criteria as pertain to literature proper. The philosopher, that hybrid writer somewhere in-between the scientist and the artist, may lean towards the spiritual more than the material or, conversely, towards the sciences more than the arts, but, whatever the case, he can never become wholly committed to either discipline, since that would spell his end as a philosopher. His primary task is to attempt a reconciliation of science and art, or politics and religion, on a new, higher level, and thus act as a 'bridge builder', in Aldous Huxley's apt phrase, between the various disciplines, integrating them to an end that will transcend the pitfalls of exclusivity which make, on the materialist side, for scientism, and, on the spiritual side, for aestheticism. Scientism and aestheticism are alike in that they pursue their respective bents without recourse to a wider, more comprehensive perspective which, if comprehended, would preclude the emergence of those dangerously anarchic and nihilistic tendencies accruing to them. The scientist who pursues experimentation for its own sake, without reference to a higher moral purpose, is no less destructive and misguided than the artist who excludes scientific progress from his worldview in fidelity to a narrowly aesthetic bias.

But if scientism and aestheticism are two sides of the one exclusive coin, then what may be called politicism and spiritism are two sides of another, and they must also be criticized or countered by the philosopher, since politics divorced from a moral perspective is no less dangerous than scientism, while religion divorced, through spiritism, from political reality is no less fatuous than aestheticism. The one results in the emergence of a Stalin, the other in

the emergence of a Gandhi or, translated into Huxley-derived literary terms, a Propter – watching his own navel. The fact, however, that politicism and scientism will prevail in a barbarous post-dualistic state is only to be expected, in light of the materialist lopsidedness of such a state, which conforms to an opposition to existing levels of (decadent) civilization. Naturally, it's impossible for a philosopher to exist in such a society. For his vocation conforms to civilization, in which the various disciplines exist in a kind of symbiosis or equilibrium of warring tensions, and the spiritual side has not capitulated to the materialist side nor, as in the case of religion in Marxist-Leninist states, been officially banned. When art is made to serve politics no such symbiosis exists, and consequently there's no place for the philosopher, since politicism and scientism are taken for granted.

A post-dualistic civilization, however, would once again free art and religion from materialist constraint, only this time they'd be even freer from such constraint than had been the case at lower stages of civilization. Yet not so free that there was no place for science or politics in society, and therefore no place for the philosopher! His task would probably be easier than at any previous stage of civilization but, even if the danger of scientism and politicism wasn't so great, he'd still have to warn people against the danger of aestheticism and spiritism, which, in a post-atomic civilization, could only be greater!

Transitional Kinds of Literature

At its best literature is a superior kind of human endeavour to science, being concerned not with the apparent, i.e. the external world and the way it works or may be changed, but with the essential, i.e. the internal world of the psyche in connection with spiritual experience. Literature can and does evolve from a lower, instinctually emotional level to a higher, spiritually intellectual level, just as science evolves from a lower materialist to a higher quasi-spiritual level, with the development from Newtonian objectivity to Einsteinian subjectivity, as relative to the evolution of the psyche from the internal objectivity of the subconscious to the internal subjectivity of the superconscious. Yet science, for all its transmutations, can't deal in direct spiritual experience, for which the discipline of literature is required, in fidelity to man's highest and most sublime aspirations – aspirations which

transcend the pragmatic prerogative of proof through verifiable experimentation, and therefore can't be subjected to scientific endorsement.

Science may dismiss these aspirations from its own, narrowly empirical point-of-view, but they can't be dismissed on their own terms, which, being internal, transcend the boundaries of scientific inquiry. Neither can they be proved in terms of the quasi-proton science of post-Einsteinian subjectivity, despite the various attempts which this 'spiritual' science may make to prove them. For, once again, experience transcends investigation, making the findings of this pseudo-science conform to hidden impulses which derive, in all probability, from the superconscious.

If modern science is an ally of the spiritual life rather than a sceptical enemy, it's nonetheless constrained by the fundamentally external, superficial nature of science from a truly spiritual identification with matters experiential, as opposed to experimental. Only literature is capable of speaking on behalf of the spirit from a direct point-of-view, and the greater the literature ... the more direct will be its speech. To paraphrase, one may say that whereas science deals with phenomena, literature deals with noumena – a distinction, in short, between the apparent and the essential. When science strives to deal with tiny phenomena, as it must do at its highest level, it interprets what is being investigated as though they were noumena. For it, too, is subject to superconscious influence, and must accordingly accommodate its findings or provisional hypotheses to the internal subjectivity of contemporary reality. No scientist is an impartial instrument looking at the world from a completely neutral point-of-view. His psyche is conditioned by the age in which he lives and by the influences, intellectual or otherwise, with which he's brought into regular contact. The man who appertains to a transcendental civilization must necessarily interpret matter according to transcendent criteria.

As yet, however, no transcendental civilization has officially arisen in the world; for it can only do so once society becomes wholly post-atomic in constitution, which, needless to say, won't be before the existing bourgeois and bourgeois/proletarian civilizations have been superseded by proletarian civilization at some future point in time. The contemporary transitional level of civilization, which for the most part prevails in America and Germany, may have extended traditional dualistic alignments in the arts and sciences towards the coming post-dualistic ones, but it hasn't entirely broken with the past, nor can we reasonably expect it to do so! The particle/wavicle theory of matter, as relative to transitional science, may prevail over the traditional particle theory of bourgeois science, but we can't expect it to be transmuted

into an exclusively wavicle theory before the onset of post-atomic civilization. So long as transitional civilization prevails, a particle/wavicle theory of matter will be the academic norm, against which the scientifically precocious would be powerless to rebel. Only an ignoramus could expect bourgeois/proletarian science to accommodate itself to wholly proletarian criteria.

And something similar could be said with regard to literature, which will continue to toe-the-line of transition between bourgeois determinism and proletarian freedom so long as bourgeois/proletarian civilization remains relatively intact. Even if, here and there, some form of proletarian literature were to be created, it couldn't be popularly endorsed, but would exist beyond the pale of transitional civilization, awaiting its proper appreciation in the post-atomic civilization still to arise. My guess, however, is that no such literature would be created, anyway – the nearest thing to it being some radical manifestation of petty-bourgeois decadence, such as exists, in comparatively short supply at present, in the contemporary West.

The progression away from traditional fictional standards is manifested on two levels of petty-bourgeois literature and, broadly, one might define them as the objective and the subjective, or the lower and the higher. The first level mainly pertains to what has become known as philosophical literature, and is characterized by a partial rejection of fictitious illusions in favour of factual truths, in order that the resulting literature may serve as a vehicle for philosophical speculation. Among the major authors to have worked on this level are André Gide, Aldous Huxley, Hermann Hesse, Arthur Koestler, and Jean-Paul Sartre. The second level mainly pertains to either the substitution of autobiographical information, i.e. subjective fact, for conventional fictional inventions, or the extension of literature, whether fictitious or otherwise, into experimental channels. Leading exponents on this level include James Joyce, D.H. Lawrence, Henry Miller, Lawrence Durrell, Anthony Burgess, and William Burroughs. Both levels of literature tend away from fictions, but they do so in different directions – the first down towards philosophy, the second up towards the proletarian literature of the future post-atomic civilization. Admittedly, no writer is ever entirely any one thing, since no man is an absolute. But a preponderating tendency will exist in each author for either the first or the second level, thereby enabling us to define him in terms of one of the two traditions. If, on the one hand, the philosophical is the tradition to which he pertains, then his art will be constrained to an atomic integrity by dint of its adherence to philosophical

speculation and factual information, and will accordingly exist on a comparatively materialist level of dogmatic thought. If, on the other hand, the autobiographical and/or experimental is the tradition to which he pertains, then his art will be capable of extension towards the post-atomic, though only on experimental terms. For a wholly abstract post-atomic literature can only arise out of a subjective tradition which, in abandoning or spurning autobiographical fact, may gravitate towards the higher subjectivity of the abstract.

But I use the term 'subjectivity' only in contrast to the objectivity of philosophical literature, which largely focuses on facts outside the self, i.e. in the external world. I don't wish to give the impression that such subjectivity is in any way illusory or necessarily entails a concession to fiction. On the contrary, it's really the highest form of objectivity, insofar as it pertains to the superconscious looking back and down at the subconscious. Perhaps one should therefore define it as the higher objectivity, in contrast to the lower objectivity of philosophical literature, which focuses on external reality and the world in general? This higher objectivity of autobiographical and/or experimental literature transcends the self for an impersonal realm of post-atomic freedom. Or, at any rate, it will do so in the future. For, in the contemporary West, it exists on a petty-bourgeois level, and that level is by no means post-atomic.

Probably the greatest petty-bourgeois novelist of the twentieth century was James Joyce, whose *Finnegans Wake* extended language beyond the merely national to the international, in its adoption of multilingual puns and phrases. *Finnegans Wake* is almost abstract, but not quite! Most of it's intelligible and therefore subject to a degree of electron constraint in the interests of meaning. The words – often oddly juxtaposed or formed into teasing puns – are perhaps freer than words have ever been at any previous time in the history of literature, but they aren't completely free; they don't correspond to free-proton equivalents. They exist on the level of some radically Expressionist painting, say a Kokoschka, or some predominantly atonal acoustic composition by a composer like Webern. And, of course, they exist in a novel, not in a volume of fusion literature, which may or may not embrace narrative writings. Together with their syntactical predecessors in *Ulysses*, they constitute a petty-bourgeois contribution to the decadence of French dualistic civilization. For although Joyce was born in Ireland, his native country couldn't, at that time, have championed or encouraged his work. He was simply one of a number of brilliant exiles forced to seek

approval from decadent bourgeois civilization. And he found it not through the generosity of the French but, none too surprisingly, through the courage and open-mindedness of Sylvia Beach – an émigré American publisher.

None too surprisingly, to repeat myself, because Americans were asserting themselves in a like-manner to Joyce and were already set on course for the coming time of American ascendancy in the arts, when the tide of exile would be reversed and Europeans flock to America instead of Americans flocking to Europe and, in particular, to France. Prior to the Second World War, however, it was generally the other way around, since the transitional civilization of America had yet to come into its own, being, until that time, in the process of formation. Paris was still the most important cultural centre in the West, and so it was to France that such up-and-coming American talents as Ezra Pound, Ernest Hemingway, and, later, Henry Miller gravitated.

Pound, especially, did much fine work in Europe, including England and Italy, but it was with his enforced return to the States, following capture by the Americans for allegedly treasonous activities on behalf of Mussolini's Italy, that his best poetry was written, and then in the lunatic asylum where he was destined to spend the next twelve years. This poetry, which came to be known as the *Cantos*, surpassed all previous levels of poetic creation in terms of its technical freedom and lingual internationalism. Dispensing with the traditional constraints of rhyme, regular metre, and stanza division, with their concessions to appearances, as to what is most superficial in literature, Pound pursued a relatively free-verse style commensurate with the aspirations of a transitional civilization, and utilized, in the process, a variety of foreign languages, including French, German, Italian, Arabic, and Chinese. What Joyce had achieved for literature with *Finnegans Wake*, Pound was to achieve for poetry with the *Cantos*. If Joyce was the greatest petty-bourgeois novelist of his time, then Pound arguably qualifies for the equivalent honour with regard to poetry, which became, in his most outstanding work, an intimation of what poetry will be like in the future, when it's finally released from electron determinism by the free-proton works of a post-atomic civilization. An intimation, yes! But no more! For Pound remains a petty-bourgeois poet for whom the separate genre of poetry, created in a moderately free fashion, though constrained by a transitional loyalty to some grammatical determinism in the service of meaning, continues to be the norm.

At the time of writing, transitional civilization – which, of course, is more than petty bourgeois – is still in existence, and America is its chief exponent. Not surprisingly, the most notable developments in literature and poetry since

Joyce and Pound have come from America, and thus from Americans. Probably the two most outstanding artists to have emerged, in the wake of the above-mentioned geniuses, are William Burroughs in literature and Allen Ginsberg in poetry, both of whom have experimented along paths similar to those first explored by their creative predecessors. Burroughs developed a quasi-abstract serial style of writing which, in his most controversial novels *The Naked Lunch* and *The Soft Machine*, borders here and there on unintelligibility, and thus on a free-proton literature, without, however, completely sacrificing meaning or indeed the petty-bourgeois right to work in separate genres, such as the novel. To say that Burroughs had gone beyond Joyce would be to overstate the case; for while his 'cut-up', or serial, technique signifies progress in one direction, namely towards greater abstraction, his lingual confinement to English, with only an occasional use of foreign words, doesn't so much represent progress towards that multilingual literature which should emerge with post-atomic civilization ... as signify a bourgeois shortcoming commensurate with a more nationalist type of petty-bourgeois writing. Likewise, Allen Ginsberg, for all his relative technical freedom in the construction of poetry, hasn't sought to emulate Pound in the manipulation of foreign languages, and therefore can't be said to have progressed beyond Pound in that respect.

Petty-bourgeois literature and poetry have generally failed to live-up to the challenges set by Joyce in *Finnegans Wake* and by Pound in the *Cantos*. The finest artists since they may have extended creative progress in one or two directions, but, overall, they've failed to extend it more comprehensively ... right across the transitional board, as it were, of the higher literature. Even Henry Miller, who succeeded like no-one else in making autobiographical literature respectable, couldn't attain to the same experimental level as Joyce, and came no closer than Surrealism to the abstract. Of British writers, both Lawrence Durrell and Anthony Burgess have surpassed Miller in certain technical matters, though they haven't produced anything analogous to *Finnegans Wake*, despite their commitment to the experimental. Could it be, I wonder, that petty-bourgeois genius attained to its zenith with Joyce and Pound, or has someone greater still to arise?

One will have to wait until transitional civilization has run its course before a definite answer to that question becomes possible! Although it does seem that the petty-bourgeois literature of the above-mentioned masters has been eclipsed by bourgeois/proletarian literature which, ever more popular, seeks an accommodation with film, and thus with proletarian civilization in its

comparatively naturalistic phase.

A Second Coming

'No man will enter the Kingdom of Heaven unless he first comes unto me,' said Christ, and I, who am disposed to regard myself in a kind of messianic light, also say it, albeit on higher terms. For I don't believe that any man will enter the 'Kingdom of Heaven', and I don't much like the word 'Kingdom', which has an old-fashioned, not to say monarchical, connotation more applicable to the alpha than to the omega of things. Nevertheless, unless men 'come unto me', unless they read and adopt my teachings, particularly those appertaining to religion, they won't attain to Heaven. That, I believe, is a fact. For I've outlined, in various works, the direction of evolution, with the life forms which correspond to each distinct, successive stage of its unfolding – life forms that extend above man in the guise, firstly, of the Supermen, i.e. human brains (with both the old and new brains) artificially supported and sustained in collectivized contexts, and, secondly, of the Superbeings, i.e. new brains artificially supported and sustained in more intensively collectivized contexts. These two life forms are destined, I maintain, to emerge out of man with the establishment of a Posthuman Millennium at the termination of, or climax to, the next and final civilization – the global civilization of transcendental man. The Superbeings would constitute, in each of their separate collectivized contexts, a life form antithetical to trees, which are completely subconscious. The Superbeings will be completely superconscious, since collectivized new brains will know nothing of old-brain/subconscious allegiance, as relative to the preceding superhuman stage of evolution in the first phase of the Posthuman Millennium...

I've dwelt on these and similar speculative themes throughout my writings, and by now I know, more or less building on Teilhard de Chardin, what I'm talking about! Only from the Superbeings would transcendent spirit eventually emerge, and its emergence would signify the attainment ...

END OF PREVIEW