

# SOMEHOW I DOUBT IT



**JOHN O'LOUGHLIN**

**Centretruths Digital Media**

# SOMEHOW I DOUBT IT

Aphoristic Philosophy by  
JOHN O'LOUGHLIN  
Of Centretruths Digital Media

CDM Philosophy

This title first published as a Centretruths eBook 2025 by John O'Loughlin of  
Centretruths Digital Media

Copyright © 2025 John O'Loughlin

All rights reserved. No part of this title may be reproduced in any form or by any  
means without the prior written permission of the author/publisher

ISBN: 978-1-291-87064-0

\* \* \* \*

# **CONTENTS**

**Preface**

## **STRUCTURE 1**

**COLLECTIVIZED VERSION**

**COLLECTIVIZED APPENDICES**

## **STRUCTURE 2**

**INDIVIDUALIZED VERSION**

**INDIVIDUALIZED APPENDICES**

## Preface

In this, my latest and hopefully last, book, comprised as usual of a collection of loosely composed aphorisms, or 'supernotes', I have replicated the stylistic and thematic unity of each section on contrasting structural terms, beginning with a collectivized approach to the aphoristic material and concluding with an individualized approach not untypical of poetry, even prose poetry, but still distinctly the product of a philosophical text the intention of which is to encourage the reader – or student – to judge for himself as to which approach he prefers, thereby effectively judging himself as one for whom either the collectivized version or the individualized version, structurally corresponding to collectivism and individualism, is the more acceptable format, even if both formats would, I contend, be more cooperative than competitive – a theme which has been explored, particularly in the appendices to each version, in some detail, thereby establishing the basis for a comprehensive assessment as to the differing emphases which competition and cooperation bring to their respective kinds of collectivism and individualism. For this book, despite its arguably enigmatic title, leaves little room for doubt as to the conflicting natures and nurtures that are always in play on contrary collectivistic and individualistic terms.

John O'Loughlin, London 2025

# COLLECTIVIZED VERSION

1

'Liberty Leading the People' (Delacroix) – on down towards the socialistic sewers of equalitarian totalitarianism, where unisexuality is the androgynous norm.

2

Being against capitalism from a socialistic point-of-view is less about putting the proverbial cart before the proverbial horse than about removing the cart and leaving only the horse, who pulls nothing because there's nothing there to pull.

3

There was a time when, through extrapolation from itself, the ecclesiastic lost out to the secular in terms of the gradual displacement of its extremism by moderation, relativity superseding absolutism. Now is the time when, through extrapolation from itself, the secular loses out to the ecclesiastic in terms of the gradual displacement of its moderation by extremism, absolutism superseding relativity.

4

Whereas the ecclesiastic extrapolation from itself was pulled-in to an amoral middle-ground compromise between the genders, the secular extrapolation from itself is pulled asunder to immorally-biased and morally-biased amoral incompatible gender positions

resulting in the paradox of secular extremism.

## 5

Pluralism is inherently amoral, like liberalism, whether with a political or an economic bias. Both democracy and plutocracy are inherently amoral, reflecting their secular – and therefore plebeian – origins in lower-order relativity.

## 6

Collectivism can be competitive or cooperative, upper order or lower order, but either way it appertains to the female side of the gender divide, in contrast to individualism which, whether competitive or cooperative, lower order or upper order, appertains to its male side.

## 7

In general terms, autocracy and democracy are collectivistic on opposite, or competitive/cooperative, terms, whereas plutocracy and theocracy are individualistic on such terms.

## 8

Devils and women (to generalize) are collectivistic; men and Gods individualistic, if, once again, on opposite terms – as between competition and cooperation on the one hand, and competition and cooperation on the other hand.

## 9

Devils don't fall into women, and neither do Gods fall into men.

They fall relative to their class standing and therefore within either upper order (noble) or lower order (plebeian) parameters, as from sensuality to pseudo-sensuality on the female side of the gender divide and from sensibility to pseudo-sensibility on its male side, thereby becoming subordinate to the hegemony (depending on the context) of either males or females.

## 10

Hence Devils can become pseudo-Devils (subordinate to Gods) and Gods become pseudo-Gods (subordinate to Devils) in the upper-order contexts, whereas women can become pseudo-women (subordinate to men) and men become pseudo-men (subordinate to women) in the lower-order contexts. In neither case does the fall cross class boundaries.

## 11

Anyone familiar with my work from certain previous publications will know that I normally avoid generalizations in favour of ratio-specific dichotomies on both hegemonic and subordinate, representative and pseudo-representative, terms, deeming anything less to be misleading and, frankly, false, including concepts like God, the Devil, man, woman, Truth, Beauty, knowledge, strength, etc., when not qualified as either an extrapolation or pseudo-extrapolation from the representative or pseudo-representative positions, be they upper order/pseudo-

upper order or lower order/pseudo-lower order.

## 12

Such ratio-specific dichotomies, whether 3:1 superlative – and upper order – or  $2\frac{1}{2}:1\frac{1}{2}$  comparative – and lower order – in both hegemonic and, on reverse-ratio 'pseudo' terms, subordinate contexts, are much too sophisticated for the common mind, which can only think in terms of generalizations, remaining ignorant of how things actually stack-up in a multiplicity of contexts.

## 13

One thinks of Baudelaire's allusion to the common people as so many 'generations of ants' who, for the most part, remain beholden to crass generalizations and expedient delusions without ever realizing it, hating those who step out of line by thinking for themselves and refusing to endorse what most people regard as true or factual.

## 14

Those who think for themselves may well become or actually be philosophers, who aren't, as a rule, particularly happy, because thinking, together with writing or recording what is thought about, induce mental pressures which make life more problematic if not difficult to endure in the face of the manifold challenges which original thought engenders.

## 15

If you want to remain calm and effectively at peace with yourself, with your mind, you'd be well-advised not to think and/or write too much, since you'll soon lose what peace of mind you had to the demons of problematic tensions, and may well find yourself unable not to think and/or write.

## 16

I, of course, am used to such a situation, but it doesn't conduce to a relaxed state-of-mind but, rather, to one burdened with conflicts and tensions arising from deep and challenging thought, it being necessary to 'iron our' contradictions and remain as thematically and stylistically consistent as possible.

## 17

Take the fall of man from economics to pseudo-economics in consequence of becoming – or actually being – a pseudo-man (subordinate to woman). Such a fall is effectively from capitalism, which is competitive individualism, to socialism, which loses its competitive edge from being subordinate to politics and, hence, to the cooperative collectivism of democracy, wherein the 'happiness of the greatest number' takes precedence, through universal suffrage, over the interests of the individual and, in this case, his competitive instincts, rendering his approach to economics compromised by political considerations to an extent whereby it ceases to be anything but pseudo-economic (socialist) and therefore bad from a masculine standpoint.

## 18

Socialism is not the solution to the hegemony of economics over pseudo-politics, as of capitalism over pseudo-democracy, but merely a kind of antithetical fall from it which usually results in a failure, on the part of socialists, to generate sufficient capital to meet the demands of the democratic hegemony which, in any case, is mainly concerned with political issues in relation to the cooperative collectivism of what effectively stands on the female side of the gender divide, thereby vitiating such individualistic competitiveness as may formerly have accrued to economics before it fell, not least through Marxism, into the pseudo-economic subordination of pseudo-men to women.

## 19

If socialism isn't the solution to capitalism, then what is? I'll tell you what: Social Theocracy, a new and radically evolved approach to religion which should stand as much above plutocracy or, more correctly, its superplutocratic extrapolation ... as Autocracy, extrapolated from Superautocracy, formerly stood above democracy – at least until the French unseated it and gradually brought democracy to the fore in a secular repudiation of ecclesiastic authoritarianism.

## 20

The time has come, it seems to me, for an ecclesiastic repudiation of secular totalitarianism, since the superplutocratic extrapolation from plutocracy, being lower-order-derived, can only be as

unacceptable if not obnoxious to anyone calling himself, from a Supertheocratic standpoint, a Social Theocrat ... as the Autocratic extrapolation from Superautocracy, being upper-order-derived, was to the champions of democracy within what became the French Republic.

## 21

In fact, I would go so far as to say that the superplutocratic, as an extrapolation from the plutocratic repudiators of Nonconformist Theocracy, would be even more unacceptable if not obnoxious to a Social Theocrat, granted an upper-order Supertheocratic disdain for such plebeian freedoms as capitalism and its corporate extrapolation allows those whose plutocratic egos take precedence over their souls, their pleasure in knowledge a direct contradiction to any Truth in Joy which, with Theocracy, corresponds to God in Heaven, so to speak, as opposed, with plutocracy, to earth in man.

## 22

Hence the Theocratic are no less if not more the enemies of the plutocratic, as God of man, than the democratic were – and still are – the enemies of the Autocratic, as woman of the Devil. I generalize non-ratio specifically or, rather, with an emphasis upon only the superior, or main, ratio side of each atomic position, whether upper-order extrapolative or lower-order representative, but the point is nonetheless valid and adequately comprehensible.

The only way to get rid of plutocracy and its superplutocratic (corporate) extrapolation is through this new and more radical kind of Theocracy here – and in a number of previous books – dubbed Social Theocratic; not, emphatically not, through socialism, which merely equates with the fall of man (over woman) to pseudo-man (under woman), even if this Social Theocratic revolution could only happen in countries (like Ireland) with a more or less genuine religious tradition, and would still take some time to significantly emerge.

On the subject of religion, it's perfectly clear to me that religion in the West, particularly in its Catholic and Puritan guises, has traditionally been bedevilled by collectivism to such an extent, not least in relation to mixed-gender congregations, that its advocacy of cooperative individualism, of cooperation with the Self, the Soul in the interests, especially for males, of mental peace, has often been subverted and undermined, if not lost track of, under pressure from collectivistic inputs of a competitive nature, bearing in mind that cooperative collectivism is less ecclesiastic than secular and no friend, in any case, of the Devil, least of all the Devil (hyped as God) at the roots of Western religion in the guise of the so-called Creator, the so-called Father, Who is merely the Subreligious element bound to a Superscientific 'First Mover' in a kind of Supermother/Subfather superlative (3:1, most:least) dichotomy in which the Superwill calls the shots at the expense of the Subsoul (to cite only the superior/inferior primary aspects, or fulcra, of this particular atomic context.

Only the democratically-mandated repudiation of such a competitively collectivistic basis to Western religion can free religion from the Devil's clutches, as it were, and enable it to leave Catholicism behind as it soars to the radical heights of a Social Theocratic liberation from what is fundamentally the oldest form of conservatism, where competitive collectivism has its vacuously-conditioned particle-based roots, if not, with Christianity, in terms of a kind of Supersatanic/Subjehovahesque negative dichotomy based in the Cosmos, then almost certainly in terms of a kind of Supermarian/Subjosephesque positive dichotomy based in Humanism where, either way, the Superwill predominates over the Subsoul to a superlative (3:1, most:least) ratio extent – Superhatred in Superugliness/Subillusion in Subwoe in the negative context, Superlove in Superbeauty/Subtruth in Subjoy in the positive one, the one with which most Christians or persons of Christian descent would tend to identify.

Because Social Theocracy upholds the concept of religious sovereignty at the expense of political sovereignty (in the people), it would be necessary for the electorate of appropriate countries to vote for what I hold to be an ultimate sovereignty, one beyond republican politics and all forms of secular freedom. For unless they become religiously sovereign, the people of such countries will continue to be the victims of both the economic and ...