

SPIRITUAL INTIMATIONS



John O'Loughlin

SPIRITUAL INTIMATIONS

Free Verse Poems by
John O'Loughlin
Of Centretruths Digital Media

CDM Poetry

This edition of *Spiritual Intimations* first published 2011 and republished with revisions 2024 by Centretruths Digital Media

Copyright © 2011, 2024 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: 978-1-4466-5428-6

CONTENTS

PREFACE

Illusion and Truth

A True Fight

The Divine Right

An Absolute Sovereignty

Centro-complexification

Independent Mind

Questions

Blessed Cold

Meritocratic Affairs

Self-Destructive

Moral Judgement

The Real Obstacle

Supersex

Alternative Supersex

Indirect Approach

Last-Ditch Conservatism

Supernatural Synthesizer

Anti-natural Art

Supernatural Art

Supra-natural Art

Realist Art

Anti-natural Literature

Supernatural Literature

Atomic Dichotomy

Relative Atoms

A Relativistic Absolutism

Barter

Vouchers

Money

Above Money

Supernatural Pitch

Spiritual Intimations

Beyond Christianity

Last Judgement

BIOGRAPHICAL FOOTNOTE

PREFACE

Comprised of 34 free-verse poems, this further collection is slightly freer, overall, than the previous one, *Stressing the Essential* (1982), and ranges across a wide variety of topics ... from politics and sex to literature and money ... in what I prefer to regard, being something of a philosopher, as a loosely poetic way; though not one devoid, I flatter myself to add, of stylistic methodology or thematic consistency!

John O'Loughlin, London 1983 (Revised 2024)

Illusion and Truth

There are two ways of looking at
The origins of the Universe according to
The Big Bang theory: either as
An extrapolation from Judaic monotheism or as
An extrapolation from the Superconscious in deference
To contemporary transcendental requirement,
So that its origins are conceived
As being of nobler provenance
Than perhaps they actually were.
In the first instance we have
A Judaic abstraction; in the second ...
An example of pseudo-scientific subjectivity.
A Big Bang, just imagine it!
A divine Oneness to begin with!
But we ought to know by now
That evil is never solitary,
Always acts in competition with others,
Against others, whether on the stellar level
Of absolute evil, or on the organic level
Of relative evil – an evil, in other words,
Between disparate life forms,
Or between two or more racial variations on
The same life form, as in the case of man.
Absolute evil reacts in the guise of stars,
Which diverge from one another.
Why should they have begun in unity
And duly become many?
If the emergence in the void
Of inflammable gases was possible,
Why should it only have been so
In one part of the void?
What was there to prevent simultaneous or successive
Emergences of star embryos?
And if they subsequently grew into flaming stars,
What was there to prevent the birth of smaller stars

From the reactive frictions and clashes of
The larger primal ones – some of which
Would eventually cool and harden into planets,
To bring about the rudiments of
A galactic order, and so halt
The everywhichway divergence of anarchic stars?
We know that polytheism preceded monotheism,
Since the Jews were once pagan.
They thought-up the idea of
A monotheistic Creator, from which
All the other stars 'fell',
In a 'fallen-angel' revolt against
The 'heavenly unity' of the primary star.
No doubt, most small stars
Did emerge from a larger source,
But not necessarily from only *one* larger source!
And today, when the Big Bang theory
Is so fashionable, we're induced to believe,
Compliments of pseudo-scientific subjectivity,
That the galactic universe is expanding (!)
Away from a central void
Which is assumed to be its place of origin,
Much as though an explosion
Once took place there
And the consequence, many millennia later,
Is an expanding universe of fully-formed galaxies,
Replete, we may suppose, with
Advanced life on certain planets!
Ah, how very neat from a mystical viewpoint,
But (quite apart from the fact that galaxies
Are never born fully-formed), somewhat baffling
From a rational or factual one!
For what *is* there about a central void
That should induce galaxies to tend away from it?
And why should such a divergence
Be regarded as an expansion?
And how do millions of galaxies
All diverge in the same way from a central source?
Ah, we should not be so churlish!

They no longer react against one another,
As stars used to do in the bad old days
Of Newtonian objectivity; on the contrary,
They expand mystically outward
Towards some as-yet-unglimpsed horizon
Which – though space is supposed to be curved –
They'll never reach,
Since that would halt their expansion,
And an expanding universe
Cannot suddenly cease to expand.
Our sun, too, is apparently expanding outwards,
And must continue to expand until ... bah!
You know my views by now, and I won't conceive of
The diabolic universe in divine terms,
Lest I end-up regarding
The divine one diabolically,
Or altogether overlook
The existence and possibility of a divine universe!
Regarding the diabolic as *though* it were divine
Is a poor substitute for a truly divine orientation,
And indicates an inability or unwillingness
To abandon evil for the realm of good.
Those of us capable of a higher allegiance
Should never confound
That which contracts and diverges
With that which expands and converges.
We shall reserve the former tendencies
For the flaming stars
And the latter ones for pure spirit.
And we shall know that it's the destiny of
The expanding/converging universe to tend towards
The divine unity of 'Point Omega'.

A True Fight

They fight for a hard-line People's Republic,
But it isn't from the Marxist illusion
That the truth can emerge, since atheistic Communism,
Whether national or international,
Prohibits 'God building'
And won't hear of a theocratic way.
As the furthest reach of democracy,
The pseudo-democracy of a totalitarian exclusivity,
Communism signifies the materialist decadence of
A state absolutism, albeit a pseudo-state.
It will dismantle the 'bourgeois' state
In the name of the proletariat
And, if possible, destroy the Church,
Though not to put a successor in its place
(Since it regards religion as a closed issue,
Never to be resurrected
On different or superior terms).
There is only the people's state,
And in such a state only the spurious gods
Of Marx and Lenin count for anything –
A pseudo-theocracy dovetailed into
The autocratic essence of Communism.
Ah, they fight for a People's Republic,
Oblivious of the fact that such a republic,
Once established, would be a betrayal of
The true Irish people, with their theocratic bias,
Their Catholic opposition to Protestant mores.
If Catholicism were to survive in
A People's Republic of Ireland, it would be
An illogicality, Catholicism and Communism
Being ideologically incompatible.
If truly Communist, they'd have no option but
To root it out in the name of the People,
So that only democratic materialism remained.
This wouldn't, I fancy, be a popular move with

A majority of the Irish people, who traditionally identify
With the Church more than the State.
They wouldn't care for a materialist vacuum,
A state absolutism rooted in secular values.
Only the decadent, the lowest elements,
The enemies of the true Irish people,
Would be content with that!
They'd relish the triumph of the Antichrist.
Not I, however! But then, in all honesty,
I don't see a so-called People's Republic
Ever coming to pass in Ireland, since
The majority of Irishmen would never tolerate
The undermining of their religious bias,
Their bias for theocracy, but would resolutely oppose
Any move in that materialist direction.
What, us, sell-out to Protestants,
Socialists, Communists? Never!
Better an old, moth-eaten theocracy than
A newfangled democratic absolutism!
Ah, I can just hear them! And talk of
A hard-line People's Republic *with* Catholicism –
What's that if not arrant nonsense,
A veritable contradiction in terms?
We've had enough nonsense, in the past,
Not to require any more of it in the present!
We'll stick to the existing soft-line republic
Which, in its liberal pluralism, at least
Allows us to continue upholding our religious bias.
In fact, the Church is stronger than the State in
The way it subtly influences our lives.
This is, after all, the way we like it.
And you? Well, what can I tell them?
Those others fight in vain for a People's Republic.
Maybe one day I shall fight – democratically – for
The dismantling of republicanism in
The interests of an extension and expansion
Of theocracy towards the absolutist level of
A Social Transcendentalist Centre.
I'd encourage the true Irish people

To vote-out democracy and vote-in
The highest theocracy, to extend their interests to
The level of the ultimate theocratic allegiance –
That of the Holy Spirit. I shall know that
Those who've remained loyal
To the true Christian Church will favour
The development of transcendentalism,
Not Marxist fundamentalism,
Such as would seem to have been derived from
That other – and false – Church.
The true Irish people are a majority in the Republic,
And a majority of that majority will favour
Centric salvation to Communist damnation,
Thus confirming their theocratic bias.
The Centre would take over from the Catholic Church
And arrogate state responsibility to itself,
In accordance with the absolutist requirements of
A free-proton stage of evolution.
The Centre is the only means to
The final end of the State, to the overcoming
Of state/church relativity.
We true Irishmen of good faith should view
The existing State as the means to a higher end
And, instead of foolishly deriding it, utilize it
For our higher purposes.
The Church won't step down of its own accord,
Nor should it! We need the Church,
Just as we need the existing State.
And one day the miraculous may come to pass:
The Tonean tricolour will be lowered
And the Y-like emblem of what is potentially,
If not, at this point in time, actually the
True world religion of Social Transcendentalism
Be raised to take its bankrupt place.
The liberal State would've served its purpose,
And the Irish Social Transcendentalist Centre will be born!

The Divine Right

Make no mistake, when sovereignty passes from
The people to a leader, when society passes from
The neutron and/or electron/proton level of Christ to
The free-proton level of the Holy Ghost,
It's 'all up' with republicanism.
You don't have a republic in which
A sovereign leader exists.
The emergence of such a person presupposes
The end of democratic republicanism,
And signifies the beginning of
Theocratic centralism and the age of theocracy.
As autocratic sovereignty preceded republicanism,
So should theocratic sovereignty succeed it.
If the autocratic ruler, as the earthly embodiment of
The Father, ruled by so-called 'Divine Right',
Then the theocratic leader, as the earthly
Embodiment of the Holy Spirit, leads by 'Divine Right'.
The people's representative represents the people by
Natural right, derived from the Christian notion of
The equality of all souls, and, in a sense,
He may be regarded as
The earthly embodiment of Christ who, likewise,
Must be crucified and resurrected,
Or undergo periodic General Elections which
May result in his removal from office (crucifixion)
And due replacement by
A new people's representative (resurrection)
Under an alternative government.
No such relativity, however, can apply to
A leader, who, on account of his 'divine right',
Isn't democratically accountable to the people,
But uses them to further his divine ends,
And must remain in power on a permanent basis,
Since his absolutist status entitles him to
An 'eternity' commensurate with the Supernatural,

Is but a reflection of an Eternal Order
Beyond the comings and goings,
Risings and fallings of the temporal.
The monarch also has his 'eternity', derived from
A so-called 'divine right' appertaining to the stars
And, originally, to the central star of the Galaxy.
He is akin to a quasar on earth,
And his noblemen derive their lordly sovereignty from
The smaller stars, directly ruling over a peasantry
In microcosmic reflection of
The direct rule of stars over planets.
Trees also reflect this galactic-world-order,
And may, in some degree, be regarded as
The blueprint for an autocratic society.
However, at the opposite extreme of evolution,
The theocratic society intimates of
The otherworldly Beyond,
The leader supremely sovereign
And his closest followers, or party comrades,
Deriving their regional sovereignty from him.
These regional leaders are responsible for
The execution of such administrative tasks as
The leader deems fit to authorize,
And are directly accountable to him,
Much as the feudal nobility
Were accountable to their monarch,
To whom they swore a direct oath of allegiance.
These regional leaders, on the other hand, lead
The people on terms specified by the leader.
In a democratic society, however,
The representatives of the people, including
The prime minister, are directly accountable to
Those who elected them
And are, in no way, entitled to sovereign judgements,
All men being considered equal in reflection of
The humanist criteria applicable to
A natural order, an order
Which, with the growth of anti-naturalism, is
Steadily undermined, as some men (proletariat)

Are considered more equal than others (bourgeoisie),
And a class war duly ensues,
Resulting, if taken to its ultimate conclusion, in
A communist so-called democracy.
What distinguishes a divine right from
A natural right or, for that matter,
An anti-natural right ... is
The absolutist integrity of the former,
Whether on the subatomic electron level
Of autocratic rule or, alternatively, on
The supra-atomic proton level
Of theocratic leadership.
Divine rights are either sensual or spiritual,
In contrast to the materialist relativity of
An atomic natural right of liberal representation
Or, alternatively, the materialist absolutism of
A pseudo-atomic (neo-electron) anti-natural right
Of communist representation.
The sensual so-called 'divine right'
Is aristocratic and feudal, rooted in the Light.
The spiritual 'divine right', by contrast,
Is meritocratic and centric, centred in the Heat.
The relative materialist natural right
Is plutocratic/capitalist, and the absolute materialist
Anti-natural right ... bureaucratic/socialist.
Profane rights, whether natural or anti-natural,
Take place within a republican context,
Where the people are politically sovereign.
Divine rights, whether sensual or spiritual,
Take place outside such a context, either in
The pre-democratic Royalist context or in
The post-democratic Centric one,
Where the people aren't politically sovereign,
Either because they're subjects of
The reigning monarch or because they're
Religiously sovereign, depending on the context.
The end of profanity is the beginning of divinity.
Where the Centre is concerned, it's
The true divinity inspired by the leader

Rather than the false divinity accruing to the ruler.
The omega divinity of the Holy Spirit
As opposed to the alpha divinity of the Father.
Self-realizing salvation of the people
And not their worshipful damnation.
We've lived long enough
In the purgatory of democratic profanity.
Let us now welcome
The coming salvation of the leader's Heaven!

An Absolute Sovereignty

A leader leads the people towards
The goal or goals he has set for them.
He doesn't consult them,
Like a people's representative,
Because he isn't politically accountable to them
On account of sovereignty being vested
In himself instead of in the masses.
He leads by 'Divine Right', and is, in effect,
The embodiment of the Holy Spirit,
Free from earthly bourgeois attachments.
Thus he's the antithesis of a monarch,
Whose sovereignty derived from
A very different kind of divinity –
Namely, that of the Father – and whose status
Was accordingly autocratic rather than theocratic.
The monarch ruled, he didn't lead;
He upheld natural determinism, not free will;
Respect for the primal Creator,
Not an aspiration towards an ultimate Creation.
A leader, appertaining to an antithetical absolutism,
Has nothing in common with a ruler
Other than his absolute sovereignty.
There's no point of contact
Between the two extremes.
The Father and the Holy Ghost must remain separate
And indifferent to each other,
The former symbolic of pure sense,
The latter ... of pure spirit;
The one reflecting an electron-electron reaction,
The other a proton-proton attraction;
The former before matter, the latter beyond it.
Whereas Christ, who was said (with reason)
To signify the 'Three in One', was man
And therefore material,
A combination of electrons and protons,

A neutronic synthesis of sensuality and spirituality
In the atomic flesh, torn between electrons and protons,
Closer to the electron-biased atomicity of
The Mother in the Catholic context,
A diluted Father and Holy Ghost, relative to
The compromise between State and Church,
The one stemming from the autocratic Kingdom,
The other aspiring, no matter how indirectly, towards
The theocratic Centre of 'Kingdom Come',
A democratic materialism the mean,
Though never more so than in
The preponderating intellectuality of
The Protestant Christ, who fights shy
Of both electron and proton extremes,
And whose neutron bias accordingly elevates him
Above the biased atomicity of the Mother in
A uniquely purgatorial materialism
Which is its own lunar end.
Thus as the 'Son of God',
The second, or democratic, deity in
The evolution of religion
From autocratic beginnings towards
A theocratic culmination, Christ symbolizes
An atomic relativity appropriate to
A materialist age. Since relativity is ever
A compromise between disparate interests,
Whether State and Church
Or party within the State
And denomination within the Church,
There can be no absolute sovereignty on
The Christian level of evolution.
Sovereignty is accordingly relative,
Which is to say vested in the masses,
Who are broadly divisible
Between bourgeois and proletarian interests,
And entitled to elect representatives
To govern on their behalf.
As Christ taught that all men were equal,
Irrespective of their elemental bent,

No one man can rule or lead in
A democratic society; though
The representation of the people's sovereignty by
One man, functioning as prime minister or president,
Is obviously permissible.

And this no less in a radical democracy
Than in a liberal one.

Only with the emergence of a Messianic equivalent,
Appropriate to the absolutism of the Holy Ghost,
Does this notion of human equality and its
Political concomitant (of democratic sovereignty)
Become questionable, subject, in the event of
His attaining power, to refutation and abandonment.

Those on the side of theocracy
Will approve of an absolute sovereignty.

Those on the side of democracy
Will reject it and strive to prevent its emergence.

He'll know how and where to succeed, separating
The majority theocratic wheat from
The minority democratic chaff, as he leads
The former into His 'Kingdom', and banishes
The latter in accordance with
The theocratic principles of a Last Judgement.

Only the wheat shall be saved,
To enter the 'Kingdom of Heaven'
At its lowest level, which is to say,
The Centric society of Social Transcendentalism,
The Centre succeeding both State and Church.

Centro-complexification

Those who understand little about theocracy oppose
The centripetal principle of centro-complexification
With the centrifugal principle of decentralization,
Commensurate with the degeneration of politics
From liberal and/or socialist to radical Marxist levels,
And the furtherance of participatory democracy.
Instead of encouraging an evolutionary progression
From the Many to the Few or, preferably, the One,
Such political degenerates favour
A devolutionary regression from the Few to the Many,
The centre to the periphery, which is to say, from
Government to themselves, politicians to people.
Little do they realize what degree of chaos
This would engender; though W.B. Yeats
Had some inkling of it when, in *The Second Coming*,
He wrote of 'Mere anarchy' being 'loosed upon the world'
In consequence of things falling apart from 'the centre',
The sort of situation that would doubtless appeal to
An undisciplined mob, but hardly to
Men of good sense! And yet,
The 'centre' to which Yeats was alluding in
The above-mentioned poem wasn't the ultimate Centre,
Identified by me with Social Transcendentalism,
But, rather, a bourgeois democratic centre,
And it's perhaps inevitable that before
A new and higher centre can be created,
The old one has to be undermined
Through centrifugal action, in accordance with
The oscillatory and relative progression of
Evolution towards a more absolutist goal.
What one must ensure is that such centrifugal action
Doesn't get completely out-of-hand,
Else it may become its own master
And not the unconscious servant of a superior end!
For, eventually, there'll be a new

Centripetal principle, leading to
The utmost centro-complexification of
A civilization superior, in every respect, to
The previous one, a truly theocratic civilization,
In which sovereignty is vested in the Centre,
In the person of the Leader, who becomes
The executive hub around which the various
Administrative departments of government
Revolve, in deference to his overall will.
In such a civilization, there can be only
One leader, one party, and one people – namely,
The people capable of theocratic upgrading
And allegiance; though, eventually, there's no reason
Why other such peoples shouldn't come under
A similar system within a supra-national framework of
Uniform ideological identification, so that
Centro-complexification goes ahead
On a worldwide basis under the aegis of
A unified regulatory body.
We cannot, in this overly nationalistic age, expect
Much progress towards supra-national unity just yet.
But we can certainly look towards a time
When, with the development of a more
Transcendent consciousness, nations draw closer to
That ultimate centro-complexification of global unity
In the most radical theocratic allegiance.

Independent Mind

Mind is in the brain and a part of the brain
No less than wavicles are in matter and
A part of matter, while yet being distinct from particles.
If the brain is material, then it, too, is divisible into
Particles and wavicles, particles predominating
In the old brain, wavicles in the new one,
The brain itself being a combination of matter and mind,
Neither wholly one nor the other.
Without brain there is no mind.
Consequently there can be no mind
Without brain on the human level.
Every brain has a mind and every mind a brain.
One day, however, mind will be capable of
An autonomous existence, independent of the flesh,
And then it will be pure and truly divine.
The salvation that Christianity has long promised
And prophesied – namely, a brainless mind,
Commensurate with the Holy Spirit, in a free-proton,
Supra-atomic blessedness of absolute *Being*,
The pure awareness of a wavicle absolutism.
Such pure mind won't arise, however, from man,
Who's ever atomic, but, more probably, from
The second of our two projected post-human life forms,
The new-brain collectivizations of the Superbeings,
Those hypermeditating successors to
The hypercontemplative Supermen, or brain collectivizations.
This second Millennial life form, antithetical to a tree,
Will cultivate the spirit to such an intense degree,
In its superconscious absolutism, that spirit will
Eventually become autonomous and break away
From new-brain matter, to float freely into space
Where, in conjunction with similar
Free-proton transcendences, it will converge
And expand into larger wholes, tending, in a process
Embracing potentially millions of Spiritual Globes

And extending over eternal tracts of heavenly space,
Towards the definitive unity of
The ultimate Spiritual Globe – universally complete.
The objective of evolutionary progress
Is therefore to free the wavicle essence of
The new-brain from its atomic appearance,
And thus bring about the independence of
Mind from brain. But, before this can be achieved,
The brain will have to be made independent of ...

END OF PREVIEW