



# FINAL THOUGHTS



JOHN O'LOUGHLIN

Centretruths Digital Media

# FINAL THOUGHTS

JOHN O'LOUGHLIN

This edition of *Final Thoughts* first published 2023 by  
Centretruths Digital Media

Copyright © 2023 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: 978-1-4478-5684-9

\* \* \* \*

# CONTENTS

## FOREWORD

## PART ONE

*Upper-order negative and positive Atoms in  
hegemonically Representative and  
Extrapolative perspective*

*Pseudo-upper-order pseudo-negative and  
pseudo-positive pseudo-Atoms in  
subordinately pseudo-Representative and  
pseudo-Extrapolative perspective*

*Lower-order negative and positive atoms in  
hegemonically representative and  
extrapolative perspective*

*Pseudo-lower-order pseudo-negative and  
pseudo-positive pseudo-atoms in  
subordinately pseudo-representative and*

*pseudo-extrapolative perspective*

## **PART TWO**

*Upper-order negative and positive Atoms  
and pseudo-Atoms in hegemonically  
representative and extrapolative Antialpha  
and Alpha perspective*

*Upper-order negative and positive Atoms  
and pseudo-Atoms in hegemonically  
representative and extrapolative Antiomega  
and Omega perspective*

*Lower-order negative and positive atoms  
and pseudo-atoms in hegemonically  
representative and extrapolative antialpha  
and alpha perspective*

*Lower-order negative and positive atoms  
and pseudo-atoms in hegemonically  
representative and extrapolative antiomega  
and omega perspective*

## AFTERWORD

\* \* \* \*

## ADDENDUM

## FOREWORD

When the Subvanity of the Substate moderates the Supervanity of the Superstate, in Cardinals to Monarch-like vein, such that transforms it into pseudo-Supervanity, then can the Subrighteousness of the Subchurch, duly transformed into pseudo-Subrighteousness, defer to the Superrighteousness of the Superchurch, in Princes (of the 'Blood Royal') to Pope-like vein. In such fashion a virtuous circle is established between 'Church' and 'State', to the greater glory of the (Catholic) Faith traditionally. But this not how it is with heretics and the secular offshoots of heresy that typify the 'modern' world in its egotistical repudiation, via reason, of ecclesiastic criteria.

\* \* \* \*

# PART ONE

## *Upper-order negative and positive Atoms in hegemonically Representative and Extrapolative perspective*

### *1*

Vanity and Righteousness (to generalize) typify upper-order, or ecclesiastic, criteria, if in fulcra-based terms of Supervanity/Subrighteousness on the one hand, and Superrighteousness/Subvanity on the other hand. More comprehensively, however, one should allow for Supermeekness-in-Supervanity/Subjustness-in-Subrighteousness in the one case, and Superjustness-in-Superrighteousness/Submeekness-in-Subvanity in the other case, since such dichotomies are in reality Subatomically comprised of Primary (fulcra) and Secondary (nonfulcra) aspects along Superior/Inferior lines, the former aspects being *most* Superlative ('Superstandard') and the latter aspects being *least* Superlative ('Substandard') in what amounts to a 3:1 ratio differential between the two sides of what, compared to the pseudo-Atomic inauthenticity of their subordinate counterparts, are hegemonically Atomic.

## 2

Hence Supermeekness-in-Supervanity/Subjustness-in-Subrighteousness would be equivalent to Superhell-in-the-Superdevil/Subgod-in-Subheaven, as to Superid-in-the-Superwill/Subego-in-the-Subsoul, whereas Superjustness-in-Superrighteousness/Submeekness-in-Subvanity would be equivalent to Supergod-in-Superheaven/Subhell-in-the-Subdevil, as to Superego-in-the-Supersoul/Subid-in-the-Subwill.

## 3

One can and, I believe, should interpret the above terms positively, since positivity would imply Superlove-in-Superbeauty/Subtruth-in-Subjoy in the case of what I am wont to call Supermetachemistry/Submetaphysics, in contrast to Supertruth-in-Superjoy/Sublove-in-Subbeauty for what I have in the past identified with Supermetaphysics/Submetachemistry. Their negative counterparts – and effective preconditions – would of course be Superhatred-in-Superugliness/Subillusion-in-Subwoe in the case of what can be called Antisupermetachemistry/Antisubmetaphysics and, in contrast to that, Superillusion-in-Superwoe/Subhatred-in-Subugliness for the Antiatom called Antisupermetaphysics/Antisubmetachemistry, both of which would be negatively – as opposed to positively –



upper order and, hence, antiecclesiastic.

#### 4

It is logically convenient to regard this distinction between negativity and positivity as proceeding or, rather, receding from most negative to least negative via more – relative to most – negative and less – relative to least – negative in the one (Antiatomic) case, and as proceeding from least positive to most positive via less – relative to least – positive and more – relative to most – positive in the other (Atomic) case, although the distinctions between what is most and more – relative to most – negative and least and less – relative to least – positive would fall within what is 'anti', whereas those between less – relative to least negative – and least negative and more – relative to most – positive and most positive would qualify for a 'pro' status, since the most and more – relative to most – negative overlap with the least and less – relative to least – positive, whilst, in contrary vein, the less – relative to least – and least negative overlap with the more – relative to most – and most positive. In other words, the least and less – relative to least – positive will be characterized by the dominance of negative criteria, whereas the less – relative to least – and least negative will be influenced by the prevalence of positive criteria. Hence, in general terms, both the most and more – relative to most negative and the least and less – relative to least – positive will qualify for the status of antiatoms, whereas both the less

– relative to least – and least negative and the more – relative to most – and most positive will qualify for the status of atoms, albeit, in each case, with contrasting gender implications, as in respect of the negativity of what is female vis-à-vis the positivity, by contrast, of what is male.

## 5

Based on the above contentions, one should argue that what is least positive in terms of being least Supertruth-in-Superjoy/Sublove-in-Subbeauty (3:1) is effectively Superillusion-in-Superwoe/Subhatred-in-Subugliness, while what is less – relative to least – positive as Truth-in-Joy/Unlove-in-Unbeauty ( $2\frac{1}{2}:1\frac{1}{2}$ ) is effectively Illusion-in-Woe/Unhatred-in-Unugliness, with an omega-centred (male-biased) ecclesiastic distinction, in consequence, between superlative and comparative criteria. Contrariwise, what is least negative in terms of being least Superhatred-in-Superugliness/Subillusion-in-Subwoe (3:1) is effectively Superlove-in-Superbeauty/Subtruth-in-Subjoy, while what is less – relative to least – negative as Hatred-in-Ugliness/Unillusion-in-Unwoe ( $2\frac{1}{2}:1\frac{1}{2}$ ) is effectively Love-in-Beauty/Untruth-in-Unjoy, with an alpha-based (female-biased) ecclesiastic distinction, once again, between superlative and comparative criteria.

## 6

In short, these atoms are least positive and less – relative  
to least – positive in Cosmic

Antisupertranscendentalism/Antisubfundamentalism and  
Naturalistic

Antitranscendentalism/Antiunfundamentalism, but less –  
relative to least – negative and least negative in

Humanistic Fundamentalism/Untranscendentalism and  
Cyborgistic Superfundamentalism/Subtranscendentalism,  
in contrast to anything more – relative to most – positive  
and most positive in Humanistic

Transcendentalism/Unfundamentalism and Cyborgistic  
Supertranscendentalism/Subfundamentalism on the one  
hand, and most negative and more – relative to most –  
negative in Cosmic

Antisuperfundamentalism/Antisubtranscendentalism and  
Naturalistic

Antifundamentalism/Antiuntranscendentalism on the  
other hand – both of which, being categorically positive  
and negative respectively, remain self-explanatory.

## 7

Hence a devolution, on overall corporeally-conditioned  
divergent terms, from most negative in Cosmic

Antisuperfundamentalism/Antisubtranscendentalism to  
least negative in Cyborgistic

Superfundamentalism/Subtranscendentalism via more –  
relative to most – negative in Naturalistic  
Antifundamentalism/Antiuntranscendentalism and less –  
relative to least – negative in Humanistic  
Fundamentalism/Untranscendentalism, as from  
Superhatred-in-Superugliness/Subillusion-in-Subwoe to  
Superlove-in-Superbeauty/Subtruth-in-Subjoy via  
Hatred-in-Ugliness/Unillusion-in-Unwoe and Love-in-  
Beauty/Untruth-in-Unjoy.

## 8

Hence an evolution, on overall ethereally-conditioned  
convergent terms, from least positive in Cosmic  
Antisupertranscendentalism/Antisubfundamentalism to  
most positive in Cyborgistic  
Supertranscendentalism/Subfundamentalism via less –  
relative to least – positive in Naturalistic  
Antitranscendentalism/Antiunfundamentalism and more  
– relative to most – positive in Humanistic  
Transcendentalism/Unfundamentalism, as from  
Superillusion-in-Superwoe/Subhatred-in-Subugliness to  
Supertruth-in-Superjoy/Sublove-in-Subbeauty via  
Illusion-in-Woe/Unhatred-in-Unugliness and Truth-in-  
Joy/Unlove-in-Unbeauty.

Such, on superlative and comparative negative and positive 'upper-order' terms, is how the gender-conditioned distinction between devolutionary divergence through successive stages of the corporeal 'Alpha' and evolutionary convergence through successive stages of the ethereal 'Omega' actually transpires, the one regressively away from what is actually a Cosmic Antisuperalpha/Antisubomega dichotomy, and the other