Panagiotis Kondylis

The decline of the bourgeois thought form and life form

The liberal modern and the mass-democratic post-modern

(or: Liberal modernity and mass-democratic post-modernity)

Translated into the Barbarian Idiom from P.K.'s German and Greek texts in a non-friendly literalist fashion by the Krazy Man

Panajotis Kondylis

Der Niedergang der bürgerlichen Denk- und Lebensform

Die Liberale Moderne und die massendemokratische Postmoderne

VCH Acta humaniora

Weinheim, 1991

ΠΑΝΑΓΙΩΤΗΣ ΚΟΝΔΥΛΗΣ

Ἡ παρακμή τοῦ Ἀστικοῦ Πολιτισμοῦ

ἀπό τή μοντέρνα στή μεταμοντέρνα ἐποχή καί ἀπό τό φιλελευθερισμό στή μαζική δημοκρατία

Θεμέλιο. Ἱστορικὴ Βιβλιοθήκη. Β΄ ἔκδοση /

Α΄ ΑΝΑΤΥΠΩΣΗ, 1995

(Α΄ ΈΚΔΟΣΗ, 1991. ΤΟ ΓΕΡΜΑΝΙΚΟ ΚΕΙΜΕΝΟ ΕΙΝΑΙ ΤΟ ΠΡΩΤΟΤΥΠΟ)

Dear (imagined) reader, the order of proceedings is as follows :

1) Krazy Man's translation of the Précis (Abstract) on p. II of the German edition, followed by a translation of the blurb on the back cover of the Greek edition.

2) Krazy Man's translation of the Introduction to the Greek Edition by P.K.. Whilst this may not be of much interest to somebody outside of the (former) Orthodox Christian or "underdeveloped" non-Western world, it nonetheless constitutes, in itself, an "ethnological" classic, and P.K. did not, or no-one else has hitherto, produce(d) a German version of it. In actual fact, there is much in this introduction of great significance for all of historical sociology, incl. re: "the West", feudalism / the bourgeoisie.

3) Krazy Man's translation of the German and Greek texts both by P.K. as one Barbarian Idiom text by the Krazy Man.

The contents page will be done "as we move along" throughout the whole of the text … if we get through it, let alone to its end …

P.K.'s text has no footnotes or endnotes.

Krazy Man will be providing many Krazy Man footnotes, and they will be up to very *KRAYZEE* and have absolutely nothing to do with P.K.,

whom I know much better by translating his every word than if I had known him personally and had done no such translations.

CONTENTS

[[German edition précis (abstract)]]

The debates over the modern (modernity) and the post-modern (post-modernity) were hitherto chiefly held by literary scholars, literary theorists and philosophers, whose positionings and stances stood under the aegis of normative and aesthetical options. In this book, such a wide option (choice) will not be formulated, but the attempt will be undertaken for the whole debate to be looked at from the outside and put into order in a broader social-political framework pertaining to the history of ideas. The mass-democratic character of post-modernistic ideologem(e)s will be worked on and processed and simultaneously it will be shown that the modern / modernity stamped, embossed, minted and shaped in a bourgeois manner, already long ago, belongs to the past.

This evidence will be provided (vomited (up)) on the basis of a multi-dimensional analysis which records the social and intellectual-spiritual changes and transformations since the final quarter of the 19th century until today [[1991]] in their structural unity. The investigation of the developments in literature and art, science and philosophy from this point of view, produces, and results in, the image of a paradigm-shift, which has put in the place of the bourgeois thought form and life form, the mass-democratic thought form and life form. The discussion of the paradigm-shift at the level of the ideational is, for its part, underpinned and supported by the representation and depiction of the upheavals (cataclysms, revolutions) which in the same period of time have taken place inside of the social organisation [[of "Western" and other societies]].

In conclusion, perspectives will be thought about, which after the end of the bourgeois age (era), opened up planetary society and planetary politics. The book makes, however, not only a historical claim pertaining to the history of ideas, but also a methodological claim by wanting to illuminate interrelations between the social, cultural and spatiotemporal perception of the world.

[[Blurb on the back cover of the Greek edition]]

The recent international discussion about the “modern” and the “post-modern” happened on an aesthetic and philosophical basis without tracing the social preconditions and correspondences / analogies of those terms. This book researches the evolution / unfolding / development of Western societies in the last one hundred and fifty years [[to 1991]] and shows how the collapse of the bourgeois way of thinking and of life went along with the formation of “post-modern” ideologemes and stances. The analysis moves at multiple levels; it embraces both political changes which took place during the transition from classical liberalism to mass democracy, as well as the changes which contemporary technique (technology), the contemporary division of labour and youth movements brought about to social and personal life. Particular weight is given to the world-theoretical / world-view shifts, which are located, detected, tracked down and found, with structural analyses of the newer / more recent / modern literature, art, philosophy and science. An introduction written especially for the Greek edition examines the texture and the fortune, luck, fate of bourgeois culture in our country [[Greece]].

INTRODUCTION TO THE GREEK EDITION

The cachexia, i.e. weakened condition, general debility and chronic disease of the bourgeois element in modern Greek society and ideology

The understanding / comprehension of that historical-social and ideological process, which we can characterise as the decline of bourgeois culture (civilisation), presupposes clear perceptions and concepts as to what "bourgeois culture" means more generally and "bourgeois class" or "bourgeois social regime" more particularly (specifically). Nonetheless, such perceptions and concepts, as much as they are – in terms of theory – (clearly) delineated, constitute a necessary, but not a sufficient condition of understanding / comprehension. Understanding proceeds in depth only provided that the historical and sociological categories or typologies are (ful)filled (met) with monitoring (supervision, oversight) and presentations able to give life, – inside of their direct existential and experiential references–, to those individual and collective human situations, from whose concentration (condensation, compaction) on this or that level of abstraction our conceptuality came[1]*. If, however, they are the fundamental conditions of understanding, then no deeper understanding of bourgeois culture and its historical course is possible on the basis of as much of / all of the data modern Greek reality provides. Because at no moment (of it,) was this reality formed exclusively, definitively and irrevocably by one social class which we could call "bourgeois" without diverging from the specific-difference meaning of the term*[2]*; and never did it*

[1] An ideal type in the Weberian sense is intensified / accentuated reality which is characterised by (a) differentia(e) specifica(e) / differentia specifica or differentium specificum compared to other ideal types of or from comparable historical social formations or from the same social formation, as the case may be. See footnote 3 below.

[2] E.g. as opposed to "feudal / aristocrat(ic)", "proletarian", "peasant", "mass democratic" etc. etc. etc.. P.K. is also telling us that the Hellenic / Greek world was a world totally, or at least, greatly different to the Protestant-Catholic (versions of) the West, wholly outside of historical capitalist development, which from its beginning circa the 12th / 13th century was in part, in some places, ***ZIO***-ANTI-CHRIST-MAMMON-DEVIL-EVIL-

(modern Greece from 1821, or earlier, post-1453) also bring forth from its womb a consolidated (composed) social class which would embody from all points of view and at all levels the specific differences / differentia specifica (neuter plural) / differentiae specificae (feminine plural)[3] of the bourgeois class with the Western-European and central-European signification / meaning. That loose and heterogeneous social grouping, which from time to time was called "the bourgeoisie / bourgeois class" in Greece, embodied at different times with, on each and every respective occasion, different sectors of it features of bourgeois morals, ethics and practices (customs) – never simultaneously and all of them; moreover it never was able to create an indigenous and self-contained (independent, self-sufficient) bourgeois culture with a broader social refulgence and radiancy, although – again with its, on each and every respective occasion, different sectors – it adopted in a manner more or less irresponsible, careless, frivolous and incoherent, blithering various in-part elements of European bourgeois culture. Under these circumstances (conditions), the use of the term "bourgeoisie / bourgeois class" inside of the Greek political and sociological vocabulary or lexicon of the last 100 years [[up to 1991]] was only fleetingly and secondarily connected with monitoring (supervision, oversight) and presentations corresponding essentially to its (i.e. the bourgeoisie's) specific historical content. For reasons which we shall explain immediately, it (i.e. the bourgeoisie in Greece) was widened so as to mean –having positive or negative connotations, in accordance with all the respective sympathies (i.e. one's respective sympathies on each and every respective occasion)– "well-to-do

JEWISH-SATANIC and especially from the 16th and 17th century (the end of feudalism as such and the beginning of pre-1789 conservatism), and definitely from the 19th century, up to totally ***ZIO***-ANTI-CHRIST-***GREAT SATAN***-DEVIL-EVIL-***JOO***-ED.

[3] The Langenscheidt Latin dictionary informs me Latin for "specific" is "peculiaris" or "certus", but because the neuter plural "differentia specifica" (of the singular "diffentium specificum") is in use (e.g. Oxford Reference online : "Differentia specifica n. pl. "Specific difference." [[to be accurate, it should read "specific differences" since it is plural !!!]] A basis for discriminating between two or more alternatives"), I've gone totally KRAYZEE and have made up my own feminine plural of the feminine singular "differentia specifica" as "differentiae specificae". Either way, same difference.

(well-off, affluent, wealthy, rich) citizens", "plutocrats", "landlords, householders", "reactionaries" or the "enemies of socialism" etc.. There is no doubt that the bourgeoisie is made up of (constituted by, composed/comprised of) more or less rich individuals who as a class stand for the capitalist economy (whatever that may mean in every case) and therefore (so, consequently) are inimical to socialism (whatever socialism might mean on each and every respective occasion).[4] However, the rich and enemies of socialism can wonderfully and fabulously also come from social groups which not in the least is it possible to characterise as bourgeois, if we do not want to violate, infringe, encroach upon the historical and sociological meaning of words; they, that is, can come from groups which do not procure (acquire, obtain) their wealth from "purely" capitalistic methods, nor have they internalised bourgeois axiology and the bourgeois world view. In any case, the difference between the bourgeois on the one hand, and the by-descent noble(man), the landowner with origins in the Ottoman Empire, the "householder" / landowner or the eagle-eyed, deceitful businessman, entrepreneur and contractor, on the other hand, can become obvious and constitute the thread of scientific comprehension only where it is given and self-evident inside of social reality. And precisely this did not take place, at least not to a sufficient degree, in modern Greece.

Notwithstanding all the ambiguity of the language use, at the latest from the beginning of the 20th century, in Greece there was constant talk of the bourgeoisie / bourgeois class. The term was naturalised [[in Greece as a Greek term]] and spread / disseminated / propagated not so much as the self-characterisation of those who had the consciousness, apperception that they belong to that class, but rather in the context of the first analyses of Greek

[4] Given the degree of state intervention in the "capitalistic" economy, even from the 19th century of the "laisse-faire" heyday, P.K. is rightly pointing to the real-world lack of a clear distinction between "capitalism" and "socialism" (even during Soviet(-style) socialism, the West had highly state-interventionist, dirigiste, social-welfare-state economies, continuing up until today in post-Soviet times, all under ***ZIO***-Great Britain and later ***ZIO***-USA (from ***ZIO***-1945) imperialistic control (**KONTROL**)).

society of that time on the part of moderate or extreme leftist / left-wing sociologists and publicists. This means that for the most part it suggested a direct or indirect polemic, and indeed it was used from the beginning in order to define and determine in a wholesale manner a collective polemical target – and not because the empirically erudite, profound and conceptually strict analysis of the data, in the comparison and evaluation of differences with regard to the corresponding European data, showed that its use was definitely to be imposed and compelled.[5] *It is noteworthy that in Greece the term "bourgeoisie / bourgeois class" is introduced actually already burdened with negative connotations when already, that is, the bourgeoisie is considered by friends and foes as the great rival of the rising working class – whereas, conversely, in Western and Central Europe, the bourgeois, before he already confronted the worker and was connected in the eyes of a large part of the intellectuals and of the masses with all kinds of negative qualities, properties and characteristics, was for a long period of time the main social opponent of the aristocracy and of clericalism (the rule of the clergy), the bearer of a new positive perception for the organisation of life and of a strong, robust new world view. Even though in Greece a bourgeoisie / bourgeois class was not found to play a similar role and, hence, neither (literary) writers nor historians were found to praise it respectively*[6]*, nevertheless, neither would the view hold water / up that the use of the term "bourgeoisie / bourgeois class" by the more or less left-wing / leftist modern Greek sociology was exclusively due to polemical needs, to*

[5] And this is exactly the point upon which Greece died. Unable to take part amongst the leading bourgeois countries in their transition to mass democracy, since Greece had no bourgeoisie or bourgeois development of its own comparable to the leading European nations, the only hope for Greece to survive as Greece was through the successful communistic or theocratic radicalisation of tradition, which never happened, and, thus, all that remained were ***ZIO-JOO***-LEFT, ***ZIO-JOO***-RIGHT words, words, words, an absolutely pointless ***ZIO-JOO***-LEFT, ***ZIO-JOO***-RIGHT Civil War and absolutely useless excrement of parasitic (and bankrupt) consumerism, as the productive part of the population from the villages and countryside and proletariat was blood-sucked into ***ZIO***-ANGLO-GERMANO-ET AL.-***JOO***-imperialistic countries and suffered **SAVAGE TRIBE KIDNAPPING, ETHNIC CLEASNING AND GENOCIDE.**

[6] In Greece and the Balkans of the (formerly) Orthodox world emanating from Eastern Rome / Byzantium, the "main issue" was "emancipation from the Ottoman yoke" and not from "feudal (papal) bondage".

which we have just referred. Beyond them, or more correctly in connection / interrelation with them, an ineluctable epistemological necessity or rather an inescapable epistemological paradox was acting. The conceptuality of modern sociology was formed in the 18th and 19th century as the theoretical crystallisation of developments which were acted out in Western-European societies; it was, in other words, a conceptuality with a specific, concrete historical charging, a conceptuality historically saturated, and outside of its historical context / framework, it could not be understood, but also not be used with (absolute) success as (an) analytical tool. On the other hand, however, there was no other conceptuality except for that and –since every analysis explicitly, expressly or implicitly, without being stated presupposes a conceptuality– that is why even also sociologists or historians occupied with social formations more or less different from Western-European social formations were in principle obliged to have recourse to its use. Of course, sociologists and historians of the European periphery (to say nothing at all about Asians or Africans, for instance) saw or felt that the object of their research and investigations differed at many points from the model cases, where concept and thing/object fused more or less effortlessly; however, to the extent that their analysis abutted or adjoined a political strategy standing for the cause of serving "development", that is to say, the gradual equalisation of the periphery with the above-mentioned model cases[7], it appeared to them that the application of the conceptuality of the model in the case of the (still incomplete) copy was legitimate, precisely because they considered the equalisation of the latter (copy) with the former (model) not only simply desirable, but historically necessary. The perception of the stage-by-stage and the deterministic course of history made easier in that way the generalised use of a scientific conceptuality, tried and tested in the historical reality of the "developed" countries as the

[7] I.e. above all, ***ZIO***-Great Britain, ***ZIO***-France, later ***ZIO***-Germany and ***ZIO***-USA.

models for the future course of the "undeveloped countries". Instead of then, continuing old disputes at ethical and moralistic levels, imputing to left-wing sociologists for the umpteenth time the censure, reproach of the mechanical transfer of foreign schemata etc., it would be better to understand the plexus both of the polemical-political motives as well as of the epistemological necessities which compelled them to attempt such a transfer. In any event, as we shall see below, they were not the only ones: even the diverse variations of Helleno-centrism were also constituted conceptually on the basis of positions and ideas widespread in the broader European realm / space during the 18th and 19th century, even though in that case the foreign origins of the ideologemes (in question) was forgotten much more easily, since the purpose of their adoption was precisely for Greece to be shown as the mother of everything and essentially did not owe anything (and) to anybody, whilst, conversely, those who embraced and espoused the evolutionary schemata automatically accepted that Greece is a retarded, i.e. behind-the-times country and that consequently its most pressing duty is modernisation, like that which had already in general terms been done / achieved elsewhere. The unchanged, uncut or corrupted, bastardised, distorted introduction of central elements or viewpoints of modern Greek ideology from Europe ought not perplex and surprise us as a phenomenon, if we think about (the fact) that it went / proceeded jointly with the wide importation of goods, productive methods, legal and political institutions. Greece, a rather insignificant country of the periphery, could be from an ideological point of view just as little self-sufficient / autarkic as also from a material and political point of view. Thus, its social data or problems came into consciousness most frequently inside of ideological or theoretical prisms brought in from the outside, and that had as a consequence of undergoing also a second refraction beyond their primary inevitable refraction inside the consciousness of the ideological subjects. In other words, the social fermentation [[in Greece]] did not itself give birth to various theoretical or

ideological forms, with which it (i.e. the said Greek social fermentation) passed into the consciences / consciousnesses [[of Greeks]], but these forms came from the outside as ready-made vessels, urns, wherein the local actual problems were poured, taking the respective theoretical or ideological schema / form.

Whatever the case may be, the Helleno-centrists, who rather tended to always disregard or downgrade class distinctions in order to maintain in a united and whole, integral, undivided fashion the vision of Hellenism, did not talk of a bourgeoisie / bourgeois class systematically, but rather the leftists and or the liberal modernisers, commencing with the evolutionary philosophy of history. But their orientation towards this schema, precisely because it was politically and epistemologically inevitable, obstructed them from attempting a specific, concrete determination, definition of the character of the Greek "bourgeoisie" / "bourgeois" class both on the basis of such an all-encompassing knowledge of the data, as well as on the basis of a comparison with analogous social strata of several countries of a different social level on each and every respective occasion: because solely a multiple comparative analysis allows the refinement of a conceptuality brought in from the outside; however, the conducting of analyses of such a type and of such depth was hampered, beyond the convenient fixation on the "schemata", also by the general provincialism of Greek social and historical science expressed, inter alia, in the essential ignorance of European history as well. Hence, the research tried more so to prove that in fact a bourgeoisie / bourgeois class existed in Greece rather than to trace its synthesis and texture, that is to say, to present its work/labour-related organisation in a differentiated manner, as well as the related work/labour-related / industrial relations, its cast of mind, its ideology and its culture etc.. Talk lightly and uncritically occurred about a bourgeois class and bourgeois relations –and indeed in the modern European sense of the terms– wherever the existence was ascertained of the production and or of the trading of goods

outside of the economic circuit of agriculture. However, the activities of the ship owners and of the craftsmen, artisans, tradesmen [[in Greece]] rather constitute phenomena which thrive in differentiated pre-capitalistic societies, especially when these undergo the influence of external factors[8]*; whether such phenomena ought to be characterised as "bourgeois" or not, is decided not in advance, but retrospectively, namely, based on the criterion of whether they institute and set up hearths, i.e. focal points of primary accumulation which later feed in an unbroken continuity mechanisation and industrialisation*[9]*. In themselves, at any rate, they are not in a position to break up the handed-down noose of patriarchal relations and of the patriarchal cast of mind. This means that in their context / framework, instrumental calculus (i.e. calculation) which weighs things up carefully, the impersonal formation of labour / work relations on the basis of offer / supply and demand and the accumulative intention in the capitalistic sense do not prevail and dominate*[10]*; economic activity is interwoven rather with pre-capitalistic motives of social prestige, whereby labour relations are also governed and ruled over in large part by unwritten patriarchal laws of give and take, that is to say, of the provision of obedience with consideration / recompense being (a) certain (amount of) protection in return. From this perspective, the significant expansion / extension of trade-artisan(al)/craft works in the Greek space / realm around the end of the 18th century basically means a (meta-)evolution of pre-capitalistic forms of economising in accordance with the needs of integration into a certain position of the expanding external capitalistic market, not an evolution of theirs (i.e. of the Greek pre-capitalistic forms of economising) in a manner such that they themselves constitute the trigger and stimulus and the nucleus / core of a self-*

[8] As we shall see forthwith, we are talking about the 18th century looking forward to the 19th century.
[9] As occurred in ***ZIO***-Western and ***ZIO***-Northern Europe, chiefly, though, in ***ZIO***-Great Britain.
[10] Do not forget, P.K. is talking in terms of ideal types here.

active / self-activating [[Greek]] capitalistic market[11]*. The quantitative expansion of pre-capitalistic economic activity with a destination in the external market was never converted into the qualitative mutation of a capitalistic character with the aim of the internal market (as well). The introduction of capitalistic economic relations in Greece from the end of the 19th century was not realised as the straight and direct continuation of that which started one century beforehand, but took place from new roads, paths and with new bearers*[12]*. Integration into the international capitalistic circuit did not suffice, at least in the first of these two phases, so that a national capitalism and a national bourgeoisie / bourgeois class were created. On the contrary, the dependence of the trade-artisan(al)/craft activity on the capitalistic abroad / overseas / external (world) assisted the survival of the patriarchal labour / work relations domestically, because the economic product of these relations could increase and grow and be absorbed in a market indifferent to its social origins, namely, its increase, growth and absorption did not demand the overhaul, revamping, remodelling of the internal, domestic economic space / realm and the overturning of its own social preconditions. After all, the study of the way of living, cast of mind and of the world-theorising / world(-)view(ing) of the bearers of this economic activity can show, beyond any doubt, that culturally and ideologically it moved totally (with)in the familiar context / framework of the Balkan tribe of related extended families tied to home soil / the native country, and they neither created, nor did they also come to meet and experience something analogous with that which was known as the bourgeois culture of the Europe of those times. As regards the spreading, diffusion, dissemination of certain elemental motifs of bourgeois ideology in the circles of*

[11] It is exactly this which has been achieved by China on a massive scale since circa 1980, i.e. integration into the world/global economy giving China pre-eminence in that global economy, along with massive growth in the domestic economy, since China had / has the numbers, the discipline, the resources (esp. with Russia) and the stewardship to successfully "pull such a thing off", especially given the short-sighted let's super-exploit "cheap labour" idiotic greed of Jews.

[12] I.e. ***grossly disproportionately and vastly asymmetrically***, Jews.

Greeks (Greek merchants, traders) of the European diaspora, we shall speak below. However, we must note in advance that historically more characteristic and more important / significant than the existence of such phenomena in the abroad (in the exterior to Greece), stood / was the inability of even their long-term transplantation or transfusion into the interior of Greece / domestically. As the latter / subsequent (partial) development of capitalistic relations in Greece did not exist as the rectilineal / (recti)linear continuation of the economic flourishing / blossoming of the final decades of Ottoman Rule / the Rule of the Turks, so too the (partial) modernisation of ideology from the end of the 19th century did not at all constitute a rectilineal / (recti)linear continuation of the lean / thin / slim modern Greek Enlightenment[13].

The ascertainment of the pre-bourgeois or pre-capitalistic character of the economic rise of the Greek space / realm in the final pre-revolutionary period [[i.e. prior to 1821]], means something essentially different to the widely disseminated / promulgated position that this rise, being limited, did not stand / was not able to overcome and surpass the feudal contexts / frameworks of the economy and of society, and thus, finally, was reconciled with them. Such a position presupposes the evolutionary schema which was drawn from Western-European history, and ignores from the very beginning the crucial difference of this history from the history of the space / realm ruled by the Turks / Ottomans. If in this latter (Turkish) realm, the economic rise did not create a bourgeois class / bourgeoisie of a Western-European texture / nature, the reason is precisely that neither did feudalism of the Western type exist here. Because bourgeois development and the bourgeois class / bourgeoisie, with the specific-difference (differentia specifica, differentium specificum) meaning of the terms, constituted precisely the dialectical negation of the feudal economic and social order of things and only of this – and wherever this was missing, its negation

[13] P.K. wrote a book in Greek entitled "The modern Greek Enlightenment", published in 1988.

could not, naturally, arise. As we know today, feudalism of the Western type was the necessary negative precondition for the development of a bourgeois class / bourgeoisie, also of a Western type; this is the answer to the much discussed / debated question, why did capitalism constitute, initially and essentially, a European phenomenon, why, namely, did it not thrive in Asia or in Africa, for instance, in some of whose regions, the productive forces, from a technical, at least, point of view, were by no means inferior to and behind those of pre-capitalistic Europe[14]*. All of that means that we shall understand the peculiarity, oddity of the economic and of the social development of the Greek space / realm circa 1800, starting not –explicitly (expressly) or implicitly (silently), consciously or unconsciously– from the antithesis "feudal-bourgeois", but by describing specifically and concretely its peculiar, idiosyncratic patriarchal social organisation and, at the same time, the way it differentiated itself and reacted when certain of its sectors were found under the influence of capitalistic relations developing at the international level. This influence, reaching a certain intensity, forced relatively small groups of patriarchal Turkish-ruled society to detach themselves from it and integrate themselves straight and directly into the international capitalistic circuit, especially in its mercantile (trade) and maritime, shipping manifestation, exercising now from the outside smaller or greater pressure for the reformation / anamorphosis of the space / realm of their descent. Nevertheless, this pressure was ineffective precisely because the bearers of the economic ascent / up-swing, who continued to act domestically [[in Greece]], had never shed and dispelled their central patriarchal features*[15]*, namely, they were never bourgeois-capitalistic, no matter how much the existence of an international capitalistic market constituted the*

[14] Obviously, the Jews as an incestual-in-bred, hyper-conspiratorial and organised criminal, rat-tunnel primitive secret society anti-Christ savage tribe could only drive capitalism and the bourgeoisie ***grossly disproportionately and vastly asymmetrically*** only where Christianity tolerated them, and did not exterminate them **in toto**, as we should have done.

[15] Notice how P.K. uses "patriarchal" historically-sociologically to refer to patrimonial relations of a pre-capitalistic type, involving an extended oikos, and not narrowly in terms of feminism from c. 1900 onwards.

precondition of their own advancement and prosperity. Their essential abidance and staying with and in the patriarchal context / framework of labour-work organisation and cast of mind or ideology made possible, after the establishment / inauguration of the Greek state, their political and social co-existence with other social groups, which played even more traditional patriarchal roles; that is to say, the local community leaders/hegemons/ lords/masters-landowners, the former leaders of the more or less irregular militias of the Struggle [[of 1821]] etc.. Of course, this co-existence was frequently strained, but the clashes were not due to unbridgeable anti-theses in relation to the economic orientation and the social arrangement, structure of the country [[of Greece]], but rather to attempts at the re-distribution of political power and national wealth inside of the existent economic-social framework / context; for that reason, besides, the array of the forces during these clashes was not determined by fixed social-political and ideological factors, but altered, changed and varied ceaselessly in accordance with the, on each and every respective occasion, interests of every one of the many patriarchal centres of power[16]*. This, in principle, plexus or mesh with no way out presented with crevasses and rifts and was obliged to enter into a process of differentiation, not so much for pressing, compulsive endogenous reasons as for the reason that the Greek space / realm, as a result of the intense political and economic interest of Western-European imperialistic forces for the Near and Middle East*[17]*, found itself from the second half of the nineteenth century, as it found itself about one century beforehand, at the epicentre of international realignments and fermentation(s). Individuals and groups of communitarian / community-related Hellenism [[outside of Greece]] obtained noteworthy economic power precisely thanks to the interweaving of their activities or, more*

[16] This means that no effective Greek centralising state existed after 1821 / 1830. What existed, which remains until this day, is a lame, bankrupt vassal-state totally subordinated to ***ZIO***-ANGLO-GERMANO-GALLO-ET AL.-***JOO***-IMPERIALIST POWERS.

[17] Which all comes back to pressuring and limiting Russian influence, incl. Orthodoxy.

literally, thanks to the equating of their interests with the interests of English, especially, large companies / firms (corporations). In this context, they could, of course, prosper, but they could not play historically groundbreaking roles; rather they got involved in and took to, in the first place, mediative, broker-like and transit-hub-related works, operations, jobs, businesses, tasks. The transplantation of a part of their activity on the ground, terrain, soil, territory of the Greek state had a corresponding character, where industry and the production of goods more generally, developed less, or much less, than what was the case with shipping, trade and the banking system[18]*. The transplantation of elements of the capitalistic economy simultaneously meant the transplantation of elements of bourgeois culture as well, which the wealthy Greeks had made familiar to themselves [[and adopted]] in the cosmopolitan environment of the diaspora [[i.e. Greeks living abroad, outside of Greece]]. But these elements were for the most part fragmentary and superficial, without tying into / being tied between one another on the basis of a cohesive world-theorising, world(-)view(ing) able to inspire a stable behaviour with exclusively bourgeois features, traits and characteristics. Because here, an essential dimension of the bourgeois economy, of bourgeois culture and of bourgeois self-consciousness / self-awareness was missing; the Promethean dimension, which, particularly at the economic level and particularly from the times / epoch of the Industrial Revolution*[19]*, was connected primarily with the form of the innovative industrialist as the bearer and practical transmuter of the spirit of contemporary science and technique (i.e. technology), of the spirit of progress and of rupture with the sterile traditionalism of agricultural patriarchalism*

[18] Which, of course, means Jews, including Jews (lizards) posing as "Greeks".

[19] The bourgeois period has its roots in the beginnings of the flouring of capitalism circa 12th to 15th / 16th centuries, though it was only with the Industrial Revolution from circa 1800 that the bourgeoisie (***grossly disproportionately and vastly asymmetrically*** Anti-Christ Jews) as a nationally and imperialistically minded class established up to complete control of economy, state and culture in the relevant Western / Northern European countries, including Italy, of course, especially from Rome northwards. In the next sentence, P.K. absolutely correctly identifies grosso modo the beginning of the Renaissance (circa 1300 to circa 1400 / 1500) as the beginning of the bourgeois period.

(patriarchy). If to that lack [[of the Promethean dimension]] we also add the absence of the elements which bourgeois culture created in its still pre-industrial phase (that is to say, from the Renaissance up to the 18th century[20]), then we have no difficulty understanding why as many and whichever elements of bourgeois culture which penetrated, infiltrated and permeated the Greek space / realm did not constitute poles of attraction and a context or framework for the integration of heterogeneous elements, but rather were themselves fused with the most refined manifestations of patriarchal ideologies and stances.

Just as the objective / de facto / as a matter of fact integration of Greece in the international capitalistic system had essential consequences for its economy, thus also its parallel integration in the international political system, and indeed in times / an epoch of the continuous aggravation / escalation / sharpening of the Eastern question, decisively influenced the formation of its political structures. The introduction of monarchical (reigning) parliamentarism in the country [[of Greece]], and indeed on the basis of catholic, i.e. universal suffrage[21], was not the necessary and inevitable corollary, aftereffect of internal processes, but in the first place the answer / response of the Western Powers to the disobedience of the Ottonic (i.e. of King Otto of Greece, r. 1832-1862) government in regard to crucial matters of foreign policy (support for the unsaved / unredeemed / unfree homelands (i.e. historic homelands of Greeks in the Balkans and Near East / Ottoman Empire and Cyprus etc. where a substantial number of Greeks still lived) etc.) and at the same time the means with which these Powers imagined that they would from then on be able to exercise more effectively their influence. But, irrespective of its causes, the introduction of parliamentarism set in motion processes which proved to be

[20] See previous footnote.
[21] None of this has absolutely anything to do with really true democracy which was pre-Modern, pre-mass, pre-industrial, of the Hellenic/Greco-Roman-Italian worlds from ancient times up until the end of the Ottoman Empire in its various variants and meta-evolutions, totally outside of ***ZIO***-Great British, ***ZIO***-French, ***ZIO***-American etc. imperialisms.

crucial for the shaping, configuration and formation of the particular physiognomy of the modern Greek state. In other words, the mechanism of the functioning of the state was formed as an in part teratogenic, malformed and in part tragicomic, hilariously tragic result of the intersection of the most advanced then political institutions, like parliamentarism and universal suffrage, with a society governed by patriarchal relations, stances, casts of mind and values. Prior to the introduction, or rather the imposition, of parliamentarism, the state was rudimentary, inchoate and, despite the oftentimes simply graphic, picturesque veneer, guise, pretence of royal autocracy, just barely did it retain, hold, keep in check in one unity the local poles of power, as / since it did not even possess at all the monopoly of armed violence; in relation to the state of the Ottoman period, it had taken, of course, certain steps towards / in the direction of the contemporary lawful, legitimate, legal, rule of law state, however its laws and decrees, edicts in most cases did not even reach society's base, where life was regulated by patriarchal customary law / right. Parliamentarism, in connection / combination with universal suffrage, brought about a social mobility perhaps even more intense than that which the development of capitalistic relations gave birth / rise to, brought into being, because not only did it create chances, opportunities of a political and social career for individuals with the corresponding ambitions, but also opened up to wider masses the road from the countryside to the cities. And both of these sides of social mobility, which stemmed, sprung, derived, flowed from the parliamentary game, automatically meant the swelling and expansion of the state mechanism and in parallel the reinforcement of the guiding role of the state – even if this intensification, as we shall see, most often occurred in a way which favoured the satisfaction, gratification of partial interests to the detriment of general interests, and hence from many points of view undermined the contemporary separation of state and society instead of consolidating it, making the state at the same time the mandatary, mandatory or trustee (accepter of the

commands) of the general interest. The swelling, expansion of the state mechanism as a result of the parliamentary system and of universal suffrage was inevitable, because that which the [[political]] parties had to offer for the attraction or the retainment of voters were state / government positions, which were all the more sought-after as long as the cachexia, i.e. weakened condition, general debility and chronic disease of the economy, and generally, (the) social sparsity, scarcity, limited resources, squeeze, narrowness, made the rest of the professional ways out / outlets / vents / recourses / alternatives very few and uncertain. Since the state remained the most certain and durable, resilient employer, job-giver, the first concern of a [[political]] party was the conquest and the occupancy, possession of the state, otherwise it would lose the faith of its supporters in its ability to defend their interests. When the patriarchal relation is transferred from society to politics, then it is changed, modified, altered, transformed into the so-called customer, i.e. patron-client relation(ship), retaining, however, its fundamental feature, characteristic, namely the necessary (cor)relation of obedience and protection; the parliamentary patriarch, whether he is a [[political]] party leader or the local head of a [[political]] party, demands from "his people" obedience (inspired less by abstract-world-theoretical/world-view motives, and more by specific-concrete-personal motives), however, simultaneously, he undertakes to "act in favour of their matters", that is to say, he helps them to "be put into order, arranged and regularised" and he secures for them with his influence advantages in (regard to) the competition, rivalry with the supporters of other [[political]] parties.

The patriarchal and patron-client character of parliamentarism, and at the same time the dearth, lack and shortage of positions in the free (labour) market (of labour / work) had as a consequence of the state mechanism in Greece playing a role analogous to that which the industrial urban centres played in the

West; it absorbed masses of an agrarian, peasant, agricultural, rural origin, but in order to channel them and to use them in a manner very different and especially much less productive. In relation to our problem, namely, the bourgeois class (bourgeoisie) and bourgeois culture in Greece, we must stress that such an expansion, swelling and formation of the Greek state was not incited, fomented by some local bourgeoisie, nor did it benefit the bourgeois class [[i.e. bourgeoisie of Greece]]; on the contrary, indeed, the bulk (mass, growth), rigidity (calcification, stiffness) and the costliness of the [[Greek]] state constituted a brake, block, obstacle, obstruction for the channeling of resources and energy (energies) in accordance with the needs of an unmixed, undiluted capitalistic development. It is a fact that, and for reasons which are explained below (see ch. IV, 1), the consolidation of bourgeois rule / dominance in the developed countries of the West brought about a swelling, expansion of the bureaucracy way beyond that which any absolutist / despotic regime[22] had known; it is also true that this swelling, expansion [[of the bureaucracy]] was done very often with patron-client methods and not in the slightest with meritocratic methods[23]. But the difference from Greek developments remained essential, because there [[in the West]] this swelling, expansion was counter-balanced by the continual growth of economic output (performance) and the continual differentiation of the social body / corpus, whilst in parallel, the bureaucracy contributed also positively to the institutional promotion of capitalistic development. In this sense, the state was –for a large period of time at least– the state of the bourgeoisie (bourgeois class)[24]. In Greece,

[22] In Europe, this meant (almost) invariably an imperial or royalist / monarchical regime or princedom as compared to a liberal parliamentary regime, with or without universal suffrage. All regimes are forms of despotic rule and of authoritarianism / autocracy, no matter the degree thereof.

[23] This appertains to both the remnants of the landed hereditary aristocracy and (later) Jews being co-opted into the centralising state. The extent of Jewish domination of the state (incl. revenues, tax, business administration, foreign and domestic / education, public health etc. policy, the justice system etc.) varies, of course, from state to state.

[24] I.e. partially-***JOO***-ed, until it became up to totally ***JOO***-ed in the mass-democratic phase of the West from c. 1900 onwards.

contrariwise, the divestment and selling off of the state within the framework / context of the parliamentary game was inaugurated and founded and cultivated with ways infinitely inventive, imaginative and enterprising by the political "hearths / fireplaces" with their pre-bourgeois-patriarchal cast of mind, and their methods became binding and exemplary for all the Greek political factions until today, irrespective of their ideological signs on each and every respective occasion. The analyses of modern Greek society and politics usually fall into error in respect of restoring (recti)linear / (recti)lineal relations between the "classes" and the "[[political]] parties", interpreting the politics / policy of the parties as the expression of more or less composed / constituted social classes and currents. Yet such a thing constitutes an exaggeration even also for countries with rough, rugged, broad, crude, loose, rough-and-ready societies in which the class poles of collective convolutions, coiling i.e. cohering, adhering to one another and consolidations appear with clarity and lucidity. In no case, and all the more in the Greek case, ought the extensive autonomy of the political-party-political game as a patron-client relation(ship) between politician and voter, during which the voter provides support in anticipation of protection, whilst the politician divests and sells off the state to the voters with a quid pro quo of he himself possessing it (i.e. the state), that is to say, of founding his power in the possibility of distributing – he, and no-one else – profitable positions and offices, to be overlooked[25]*. This autonomy of the of the political-party-political makes, as a rule, secondary and or simply ostensible, apparent, dissembling the "ideological" etc. antitheses, namely the so-called antitheses "of principle"; in the ideological spectrum, a politician occupies a certain position because all of the rest of the positions are occupied, and he is willing, if he judges it to be in his interest, to abandon the position which he occupied initially, if another position becomes vacant. Only from this perspective can the*

[25] This has happened continuously until today with the state being bankrupt and dependent on other Powers / states to the point of no return.

characteristic – for modern Greek politics – phenomenon of the continuous displacement, relocation, moving of politicians to various positions of the above-mentioned spectrum be explained satisfactorily. Far less was the specific, concrete political praxis / practice moved, displaced, relocated, namely the exercising of politics as a patron-client relation(ship). The swelling, expansion of the state mechanism for purposes of party-political benefit was just as much the task / work / doing / deed of "right-wingers" as much as it was of "liberal" or "democratic" political parties; all the Greek political parties existed, hence, in that very tangible sense, as statist political parties, regardless of how they encountered and dealt with the state at the level of their programmatic principles.

The patron-client character of the [[Greek]] political parties did not make them, however, only statist in practice, but also "popular / of the people", since the simultaneous need to be of service to a great many individuals, but also to different groups or "branches" by means of the state, rendered essentially impossible the exercising of an unambiguous (with only one meaning) and consistent class politics. A matter of class politics did not enter, in any event, pressingly and compellingly into a country where the gradual decomposition of the patriarchal structures created, as the main sector of the social trunk (i.e. social body / core / base), a most broad mass of petty-bourgeois and small(-scale [[business, shop, land etc.]]) owners, who could equally well belong to a "right-wing", to a "liberal" or to a "left-wing" political party. Whatever can be called the Greek bourgeois class / bourgeoisie[26], that is to say, the businessmen, the bankers, the shipowners and certain sectors of the liberal (self-employed) professions, as a rule interspersed, likewise from a political point of view, into different political parties, according to their preference

[26] All, if not Jews ("Greek" ***ZIO-JOO***-LIZZARD-JEWS), in the final analysis, under total and absolute ***ZIO-JOO***-economic-state and other control (**KONTROL**).

however, into the two – on each and every respective occasion – largest political parties. The different groups, which constituted this loose, lax, slack, flaccid "class", satisfied their demands with the essentially same patron-client methods as in the case of simple voters too, even if at this level, the relation(ship) of obedience and protection could present with multiple complications which often reached up to the reversal of the roles. Moreover, it must be noted that these demands did not go/run counter to the general statist tendency, since their realisation almost always meant more state intervention – regardless if this took place in favour of the bearers of the "private initiative". On the basis of these fundamental data, we can say that the Greek "bourgeois class" was never consolidated enough, homogeneous[27] *enough and powerful enough in order to identify indubitably with the political governance of the country [[of Greece]], even though frequently its political influence could be (to a large extent) greater than that of other social strata or pressure groups. In the area / realm of the political parties, the retreat of patriarchal structures of the old type, which totally ruled and dominated until the beginning of the 20th century, did not mean the rapid rise of politicians with bourgeois descent, bourgeois consciousness and bourgeois interests, but, to a much greater extent, the possibility of political careerism / a political career path of elements of a petty-bourgeois or peasant / rural origin with a university education and, from time to time, good relations with the (former) (local community) lords, masters, leaders, hegemons of politics; these elements often had the air of tendencies of petty-bourgeois radicalism ("the right(s) of the poor / the pauper's rights"), and confronted the bourgeois class (bourgeoisie) in accordance with the expediencies of the moment and with the needs of their political rise, without, at any rate, being flesh of its (i.e. the [[Greek]] bourgeoisie's) flesh. Even less suitable for the exercising of a clear bourgeois politics / policy was the state mechanism, as it*

[27] ***AAAA-HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA !!!***

was being formed under the influence of political-party competition and of patron-client relations. The fact that the great mass of the public-sector / state employees / civil servants of all gradations and tiers came from strata which were retarded / behind / deficient from a cultural point of view[28], had serious repercussions for the quality / character / nature of the state mechanism, whose functioning ceaselessly stumbled upon and was obstructed by not only illiteracy, narrow-mindedness, stupid and or nonsensical kinds of cunning, guile and slyness, or various complexes, but also upon / by the insurmountable inability of the average state employee / civil servant to orientate his activity towards impersonal, general and abstract principles, since his cast of mind was characterised and dominated by the values of a patriarchal society, namely, his primary loyalism towards his local patria (fatherland, motherland), his relatives, his friends, the friends of his friends, his protectors and those under his protection. From the meeting of a human type breast-fed and nourished in a pre-state and pre-bourgeois environment with the mechanism of contemporary bureaucracy, which embodies and demands a rational[29] stance and behaviour, combinations arose at times uproarious, hilarious, at other times tearful, combinations which still await their satirist and short-story writer.[30] The great demand for state (public-service) jobs / civil-servant positions in theory gave to the state the possibility of choosing with meritocratic criteria of a high standard its civil servants, and to thus continually improve its functioning, but the distribution of positions / places / jobs through patriarchal-patron-client procedures did not allow it, whose additional consequence was the continual increase in contested positions beyond the boundaries and limits of objective

[28] Obviously, in terms of bourgeois culture sociologically / historically, and not in terms of cultural social-ontologically seen.
[29] I.e. as to achieving ends/goals in line with a bourgeois state.
[30] Of course, what are known ideal-typically as "impersonal", "rule-of-law" institutions do not amount to anything much without a country having a relatively high place within the global production and distribution of wealth "chain", network, plexus, mesh. Ῥοΐδης and Σουρῆς were satirists of the second half of the 19th century up to circa 1900, but do not fit anywhere near fully into the mould of what P.K. is referring to here.

functional needs. Thus, the following paradox was created: in order to satisfy as much as possible numerous (patron-)client demands, the state was obliged to give on average low salaries, in other words, its misery, poverty and stinginess was the necessary reverse side and the precondition of its magnanimity. Its apparently inexhaustible capacity to allow everyone "to get by" (slowly) consolidated and imbued(, slowly, slowly,) in the popular imagination the impression that it was a very rich and omnipotent donor / giver, as long as it wants to give, whilst in parallel there also existed serious reasons for it to be considered as a cheat, fraudster, swindler and a tyrant so great that the use of any detours / "side streets" / roundabout ways whatsoever would have to be reckoned as an understandable and a forgivable petty offence. On the basis of such and similar performances, those most multifarious mechanisms were formed, thanks to which the inflexibility and the ineffectiveness of the state were counter-balanced. Whatever the keeping to orthodox procedures did not achieve, the "small window" and the "special favour" [[of unorthodox access to state services via payment to a civil servant for his own pocket[31]*]] achieved it. The sideways (i.e. furtive, surreptitious and irregular (illegal)) means did not constitute anymore the breaking / infringement of the rules, but the only possible way they could function; they did not bring about the lifting, i.e. abolition of the system, but provided it with a safety valve whenever it got blocked, jammed. Furthermore, the "special favour" had the additional general quality, property or characteristic of specialising and atomising every problem and every solution so that long-term collective convolution, coiling i.e. cohering, adhering for the purpose of the open and at-law, legally founded championing of collective interests lost its attraction in the eyes of those directly*

[31] Whereas Jews in the former West just deal amongst themselves, totally out of view, as they see fit inside and outside of all relevant state and other institutions.

interested [[in "sideways personal business-state relations"]][32]. And in this case, what barriers and obstacles the constitution of the main mass of the social body by petty bourgeois and small-holders with a cast of mind formed by the terms of patron-client politics put in place in the exercising of any "class" politics whatsoever is seen.

As the swelling, expansion of the state was, at least to a large extent, the result of the rule and dominance of patriarchal-patron-client relations within the sphere of the parliamentary game, the separation of state and society, instead of being intensified by the strengthening, reinforcement of the former (state), on the contrary, was / became blunted. In other words, the quantitative strengthening, reinforcement of the state did not primarily express its qualitative differentiation from society and its volition / will to impose itself upon it (i.e. society) as the bearer of economic development and institutional modernisation; rather it echoed the degree to which a society, in its totality rather inert, sucked dry, sponged off, eviscerated, drained, sapped, plundered the state mechanism in order to perpetuate itself. The distinction between state and society, which in Western and central Europe was inaugurated by the absolutist state and opened the road for the development of capitalism and of the bourgeoisie (bourgeois class), in Greece remained half-finished, unfinished because the state bureaucracy reflected society more and the rule and dominance still of its patriarchal-pre-bourgeois cast of mind instead of countering it in order to guide it and transform and remodel it. Thus, the state by/of itself could [[to a]] very little [[(slight) extent]] cover for the lack of a ruling class, [[which was also]] coherent and at the same time dynamic from a productive and from an ideological point of view. To play that role it had to have been a firm, strong, robust, beefy, rugged, sturdy, well-built and at the same time enlightened

[32] The only reason Jews have gotten away with such and much worse behaviour in the countries within the orbit of ***ZIO***-Great Britain and later ***ZIO***-USA is because of the huge, massive, colossal surpluses from all the financial and other "skimming" extracted world-wide via ***ZIO***-CAPITALISTIC-IMPERIALISTIC DOMINANCE.

despotism; but it was, on the contrary, parliamentary[33] *and it had to fight with all its might with the consequences of an indigenous parliamentarism which was not only the organ of imperialistic influence*[34]*, but also a conduit of the traditional, contrary to radical modernisation patriarchal forces and casts of mind. It is characteristic —and eloquent for whomever has practised the comparative study of historical phenomena on the basis of absolutely clear, unambiguous and unequivocal concepts and conceptual distinctions— that the first and socially most important opponents of "despotism" and advocates of the "constitution" in post-revolutionary [[i.e. post-1821]] Greece came from the circles of the local community leaders/hegemons/ lords/masters-landowners, who in no way wanted to cede and assign their patriarchal rights to the modern state. The "hearths / fireplaces [[of the said local community leaders]]" reconciled themselves with the state only from the moment they could control it, either by exercising influence on the monarchy or —even more so— through patron-client parliamentarism. But they controlled it to make it inert and to inactivate it, just as, in any case, their social character dictated them to do it, which had its roots in pre-state conditions, circumstances and habit(ude)s. Hence, the bureaucratic mechanisms were condemned to hypoplasia, i.e. underdevelopment (if we look at them in regard to the criterion of their modernising functionality) and at the same time to hypertrophy (i.e. massive enlargement, augmentation, expansion) (if we regard them with respect to the criterion of their particular weight inside of the totality of modern Greek reality). This phenomenon did not disappear when the "hearths, fireplaces", with the old meaning of the term*[35]*, had their time and moved on, in part at least, to the margins, because their successors were equally unable to dynamically*

[33] Here P.K. is clearly indicating both a form of the radicalisation of tradition as a means towards relative national and state sovereignty via the despotic centralising state, as well as the parliamentary state, which has absolutely nothing to do with really true democracy, and which is an absolutely dependent and authoritarian vassal state under ***ZIO***-ANGLO-ET AL.-***JOO***-CAPITALISM-IMPERIALISM.

[34] FOONOTE 33 IMMEDIATELY ABOVE – **CONFIRMED !!!**

[35] P.K. is still referring to the 19th century, whereas contemporary usage of "hearths" in "Greece" relates to Jews like the ***JOO***-AND-RE-OOZ and Jew-Stooges like the ***JOO***-TSO-***JOO***-KI-DES.

manoeuvre, control, steer and manipulate a flexible state as well, by putting it in the service of clear social ends/goals/purposes. The hypoplasia of the mechanisms continued, therefore, to reflect the flaccidity and limpness or fluidity of the classes, whereas their hypertrophy exercised an in part inhibitory and suspensory and an in part deformative influence on the clashes between these flaccid, limp and fluid social classes. This means that antitheses which under the conditions of the separation of the state and society would have constituted antitheses of a class texture, nature, now became blunt(ed) and (in part) changed character as they appeared as the confrontation, face-off of different possible directions of state politics. The hypertrophic state became, in other words, the field of conflict or battlefield of different "branches", every one of whom struggled to detach more / the most / as much as possible from the state / public coffers, kitty, purse. The class struggle was blunted because all of the "branches" turned simultaneously towards the side of the state, supplicating, begging, imploring, entreating or threatening it, and [[did]] not [[act]] primarily [[as]] one ("branch") against another ("branch").

The incomplete separation of state and society is equally characteristic for modern Greek society as the unclarity and ambiguity of the relations between nation and state. The coincidence of nation and state inside of the limits and boundaries of the contemporary nation-state, which in its interior had surpassed every kind of feudal and patriarchal fragmentation or localism, whilst towards the outside projected itself as a homogeneous and compact economic and cultural whole, constituted the form with which bourgeois nationalism was realised and by extension the political rule and dominance of the bourgeoisie / bourgeois class, in typical at least historical cases. From this it is entailed negatively, but absolutely clearly and unambiguously, that the perpetual divergence, dissociation of nation and state in modern Greek history, namely, the impossibility of their coincidence in the form of the nation-state (or

national state) constitutes in itself a point of deficient development of the bourgeois element[36]*. Of course, one could imagine at the theoretical level the possibility of the creation of a contemporary (in the bourgeois sense) state, which would not, on the one hand, embrace the totality of the nation (in the cultural and racial sense), nevertheless it would constitute its pole of attraction, being its most advanced, from a social and political point of view, sector. If this possibility had materialised, then the divergence, dissociation of nation and state would simply have meant that some sectors of the nation would not have been able to follow the state, and thus the nation could be modernised, that is to say, become bourgeois ("bourgeois-ised"), solely in that limited and restricted area which the limits, boundaries of the state dictated. In reality, however, something essentially different happened; the state was constituted mainly on a pre-bourgeois, that is to say, patriarchal social basis, and the continuous pressure which the always unsolved national problem/question exercised upon it (i.e. the state) had an inhibitory influence both on the social as well as the ideological unfolding of the bourgeois element*[37]*. The fact that the nation remained a magnitude wider than the state, and consequently independent of the idea of modern / contemporary institutional organisation, allowed and assisted its disconnection from the bourgeois perception of the bourgeois state*[38]*. But when the nation is not assembled nor is it also comprehended as a state in the modern / contemporary sense of the state, as it was formed from within the abolition, demise of feudal society in Europe, then it is first of all a patriarchal concept, it rests, therefore, upon real or imaginary, fantastical racial and cultural (language, religion) factors, whereas the aspect of its economic base,*

[36] Which means we / Greeks had neither the numbers nor the ability to survive in the modern era, given we were essentially dead from times (circa 1071 / 1204) before the modern era.

[37] What all of this essentially means is that Greeks *qua Greeks* had absolutely nothing to do with "the West", and that if we were going to survive the 20th century, we would have had to have had far greater numbers and a state organisation, *mutatis mutandis*, of radicalised tradition as occurred in the Iran of our ancient foes the Persians from 1979, but on an Orthodox Christian basis, none of which had the remotest chance of occurring, and hence our collective death.

[38] Obviously, we're still talking 19th century here.

its social texture and its institutional organisation moves to the margins / goes by the wayside. As is bleedingly obvious, pre-bourgeois-patriarchal social groups can embrace and adopt such a concept of the nation, turning it, in parallel, against the bourgeois modernising coupling of nation and state[39]. These forces did not exist either as the initial ideological creators of the concept of the nation in its a or in its b version, nor did they identify themselves from the very beginning with it. Since, however, this concept, particularly after 1789, proved to be politically functional, they (i.e. the said forces) were forced with greater or lesser hesitation(s) to co-opt it, simultaneously re-interpreting it in such a manner so as to subtract from it as many elements which came to be opposed to their social interests, and to present it as a footing for, and reinforcement of, their leadership role. This was the case of the great majority of the local community leaders/hegemons/lords/masters-landowners and (armed) chieftains, whose political horizon was much more local than national, and this was also the case of the Church, which during the whole of the duration of Turkish Rule never understood itself as the Head and Champion of an enslaved nation, but as the shepherd and spiritual leader / father of Christian populations forced to live under the other-religious (i.e. of another religion) hegemon[40]. In accordance with its Byzantine tradition and cast of mind, the Church was an institution alien to the nation[41], [[it was]] a multi-

[39] This is the 19th century version of "reaction" (radicalised tradition in one nation-state), which in the 20th century became either communistic or theocratic multi-national-state or nation-state radicalised tradition. Cases like Japan and South Korea are also variants of radicalised tradition, but under ***ZIO***-USA imperialism.

[40] Of course, none of this about the Church excludes the fact that ethnic Greeks made up the greater part of the (Greek-language) "Byzantine" Church under Turkish Rule, notwithstanding the ecumenical-inter-national / multi-ethnic positioning of the Church itself.

[41] See footnote 40, immediately above. This anti-ethnic / anti-national and ecumenical / universalist stance of the Church dates back to New Testament times when in one context there were three main groups of people: 1) ethnikoi / nationals, i.e. 12-God, pagan / heathen Greeks, 2) Christians (who included ethnic Greeks and other nationalities / ethnicities of the Middle-Eastern and North-African regions and initially Southern Europe under, or close to the boundaries of, the Roman Empire, and 3) Jews. An excellent cinematic depiction of such an ethnological, political and religious state of affairs is contained in Roberto Rossellini's *Acts of the Apostles* (1969), which obviously pre-dates the "Byzantine" Church by at least 2-3 centuries.

national institution and consequently non-national[42], in whose eyes the confession of faith counted more than race or even than language as well: the Orthodox Russian was a brother, the Greek who turned into a Frank (i.e. became a Catholic or Westerner) was not. It is, then, an error for the Church to be considered both a "national institution" and that it "betrayed" the nation; because it had nothing to do with the nation[43], and indeed it had to, from its position and its viewpoint, fear that the creation of a national state / nation-state would break up its crew (i.e. multi-national, multi-ethnic Church membership), which was broken up in a number of nations, and would thus reduce its influence — all the more because, for as long as a (Christian) state did not exist, only it (i.e. the Church) could demand from Christians submission, loyalty and taxes[44]. The Church appropriates nolens volens the nation when the dynamics of the facts [[on the ground]] have put it (i.e. the appropriation of the nation) at last on the (daily) agenda; then it (i.e. the Church) remembers and stresses the real fact that since the conqueror was not only of another nation, but also of another religion, the [[Greek-Orthodox religion]] carried out de facto a function of national convolution, coiling i.e. cohering, adhering, only because some others ex post facto discovered and projected the nation. From the moment, though, the nation comes, in any case, to the fore(ground), the Church, having lost in the meanwhile the central social role which it played in the epoch / times of Turkish Rule, and seeking a new role in the new conditions and circumstances, often holds up the national banner and asks to drive and take control of both national ideology as well as the struggles of the unredeemed and in bondage (i.e. those Greeks who lived outside of the new Greek nation-state under Turks et al.), in order to not leave any gaps which

---

[42] Again, in terms of specific-difference ideal-typical analysis and at the formal-nominal-programmatic-ideological-theological level, but the reality is that Church members all had an ethnicity either as to descent and or as to day-to-day life in terms of language and culture and ways of living.
[43] In the sense the Church was programmatically multi-national, ecumenical, internationalist, universalist, not that it wasn't made up of believers from many nationalities.
[44] ***AAAA-HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA !!***

social groups with consistent secular and or anti-religious tendencies could exploit[45]*. It (i.e. the Church) achieved this to a great extent, to such a great extent, indeed, that not only could it maintain until today [[1991]]*[46] *alive the connection of the concept of the nation with pre-bourgeois mythology and metaphysics, but also, invoking precisely such a nation, obstruct for ever (and ever) the consistent separation of society and state*[47]*. And only the fact that still today as well, not even the so-called "Left" dares to (cleanly and) clearly call for the separation of Church and State or, even more characteristically, that the very same "progressive" members of parliament, who are indignant and exasperated about obligatory church (mass) attendance of students, for instance, have themselves given oath with religious observances, formulae to consciously fulfil their duties — and only this fact shows the extent of the imposition of pre-bourgeois patriarchy on modern Greek society and the modern Greek cast of mind*[48]*.*

As the nation and the state always remained asymmetrical magnitudes in modern Greek history (as much as the nation shrunk with successive amputations and mutilations), as the nation, that is to say, never wholly and

---

[45] Again, we're still in the 19th century here, but by the middle of the 20th century, the complete takeover and **ethnic cleansing and genocide** of Greeks was in place with their conversion into ***ZIO-JOO***-ZOMBIE-CONTROLLED-ANTI-CHRIST-STERILE-ABORT-CONTRACEPTIVE-FUCK-SLUT-POOFTA-TRANS-LESBIO-GAY-QUEER-SELF-RACIST-EXOTICIST-PORN-DRUGS-MAMMON-DEVIL-EVIL-SATANISTS.

[46] By 2024 this has totally changed "on the ground". In 1991 still up to 97% of "Greeks" identified as Orthodox, but today in 2024 after more than three decades of non-stop ***ZIO-JOO-ZIO***-USA-***ZIO***-EE BRAIN-WASHING AND FULL-SPECTRUM ***ZIO-JOO***-DAS-PSYCHO-OP-***ZIO-JOO***-LOBOTOMISATION, INCLUDING ***ZIO-JOO***-MONKEY-APE-OTHER-SELF-RACIST-EXOTICISM-WORSHIP AND ***ZIO-JOO***-POOFTA-LEZZO-DRUGS-PORN-TRANZ-GAY-QUEER-***ZIO-JOO***-DAS-FREAK SHOW life stances, which got their first big wave of ***ZIO***-ANTI-CHRIST-***JOO***-DAS-MAMMON-DEVIL-EVIL-SATAN promotion in the 1960s, next to no-one of younger "Greeks" identifies with Orthodoxy (as synonymous with Hellenism) anymore, thus breaking the identitarian continuation of the Genos going back some 4000 years (yes, idiots, Hellenic Orthodoxy was not just a break from 12-God worship, but also a continuation of it, incl. in language, Church drama / theatrics, iconography, certain customs etc.). Part of the whole process of ***ZIO***-ANGLO-GERMANO-ET AL.-***JOO***-ANTI-CHRIST-***GREAT SATAN***-de-Hellenisation are the 1970s and 1980s ***ZIO-JOO***-driven movements against the Greek language and its millennia of continuation in the forms of the ***ZIO-JOO***-abolition of Katharevousa and poly-tonic writing.

[47] P.K. is not saying that Church and State ***ought*** to be separated. He is simply stating **a fact.**

[48] See footnotes 46 and 47, immediately above. Suffice it to say, someone with a normative position would e.g. call for the total separation of Church and State, or, contrarily, for a Theocracy or rather parallel National State with Nuclear Weapons pointed at least to the ***ZIO-JOO***-Satan State, ***ZIO***-Germany and the ***ZIO***-UK with Total Orthodox Rule in Culture and Ideology as I would as a Greek Orthodox Roman.

totally entered the boundaries and limits of the state in order to suffer or experience the rationalisation of modern, contemporary institutions, it was held in the sphere of the myth, or rather it constituted the same myth, which was useful as the axis of modern Greek ideology[49]*. The modern Greek myth refers, then, to the nation and not to the state, it is the product of the historical and ideological triumph and predominance of a conceptually ambiguous, unclear nation vis-à-vis the bourgeois national state / nation-state, and is called, with one ambiguous term of up to many meanings, "Helleno-centrism"*[50]*. The ambiguity (of up to many meanings) of this term corresponds with the ambiguity (of up to many meanings) of a nation historically and conceptually disconnected from the bourgeois national state / nation-state, and it has as a consequence of being charged with whatever on each and every respective occasion is characterised as "Greek", with elements and features not possibly accepting clear historical and sociological determinations and definitions. Helleno-centrism could be basically unambiguous (of one meaning) if it had been subjected and subjugated absolutely and permanently to the demands of a contemporary, modern bourgeois nationalism, in order to be of use as the means of the convolution, coiling i.e. cohering, adhering of the whole of the nation for bourgeois purposes and ends/goals. But from the given circumstances, the opposite occurred: bourgeois nationalism was absorbed by Helleno-centrism and in its context / framework was mixed and reconciled with pre-bourgeois perceptions as regards the nation, race etc.*[51]*, without being able to, in parallel, impose its specific, distinguishing, distinctive features, whereupon this mixing rather strengthened it (i.e. Helleno-centrism) instead of*

[49] In 1991, P.K. was still taking about the Greek nation of the Greek Genos of the Orthodox outside of Greek State boundaries, and today in 2024 the ***JOOZ*** and their ***ZIO***-ANGLO-GERMANO-ET AL.-***JOO*** allies are calling for MONKEY-APE-LATHRO-PITHIKIA-***ZIO-JOO***-SATANIC CIRCUS MONKEY-***ZIO-JOO***-DAS-BOING-BOING-BOING-MONKEY-APE INVADERS-COLONISTS-PAWNS to become "Greek" when the ***Kopros*** / Excrement of "Greeks" in "Greece" is not in the slightest bit Greek anymore!!!

[50] See footnote 46, above.

[51] We are still talking primarily about the 18th and 19th centuries !!!

weakening and debilitating it. Inside of the positive or negative, partial or complete contradistinction, collocation or covering, overlaying, overlapping of bourgeois and patriarchal nationalism, the ambiguity (of up to many meanings) of Helleno-centrism was formed, which allowed it to fulfil its function of the par excellence modern Greek ideology, since in its ambiguous, unclear and vacillating language it could articulate many and varied tendencies. But since every one of these tendencies sought, as is well, fully understandable, to monopolise the areas, realm of Helleno-centrism, projecting its own interests and demands as interests and demands of the whole of the nation, Helleno-centrism did not constitute only the common denominator, but simultaneously also the battlefield upon which anyone who wanted to raise, make claims of social, political or ideological dominance in the Greek environment had to prevail, rule and dominate. There existed, of course, (left-wing[52]) minorities as well, who supported their own claims of dominance with internationalist ideologemes, but these could not, precisely for this reason, exercise a broader influence — and whenever they exercised it, this happened because they adopted patriotic or national slogans (as well)[53]. Today [[1991]], at any rate, the Left, which for decades had the vigour and valence to say that the modern Greek nation is the racial and cultural product of recent centuries and that its history is not understood outside of its (kinds of) interweaving(s) with the history of the rest of the Balkan nationalities[54], has taken on board and embraced in its totality, expressly or silently, the Helleno-centric positions and completely stopped every ideological polemics in regard to the matters of the chosen-by-God people and of the three-thousand year-old History[55], making,

---

[52] Obviously, including the forces of TOTAL EVIL ***ZIO-JOO***-TSKY and ***ZIO-JOO***-TSKY-***ZIO-JOO***-SATANIC CIRCUS MONKEY ANTI-CHRIST ***GREAT SATAN*** ***ZIO-JOO***-MAMMON-DEVIL-EVIL-***ZIO-JOO***-INTERNATIONALIST-SATANISM.

[53] Now we are more so in the 20th century than in the 19th century, without leaving the latter fully.

[54] This is by no means entirely wrong, nor, however is it anywhere nearly completely correct.

[55] I, personally, have never believed the "chosen" bullshit. All that is completely ideological, and belongs to psycho-paths, especially ***JOOZ***, but also to some Greek ***ZIO-JOO***-NEO-NAZI-***ZIO-JOO***-FAR-RIGHT nut-jobz of the ***ZIO-JOO***-JUNTA-K.P. ilk, who, nonetheless, has pointed out some facts about ***JOOZ*** the "Greek"

thus, a direct or indirect retreat (folding back) on this crucial point[56]*. In reality, the ideological imposition of Helleno-centrism was inevitable inside of the concrete, specific modern Greek circumstances and conditions. Because only this (Helleno-centrism) could, precisely because of its ambiguity and unclarity, bridge the different perceptions of the nation, which were in parallel active, and thus unify towards the outside heterogeneous forces towards the inside; only this (Helleno-centrism) could surround, encompass with high legitimising titles and make ethically interesting for international public opinion Greek national claims and assertions, and indeed in areas and realms ethnologically and politically contentious*[57]*; only this (Helleno-centrism) could, in the end, give the entirely essential psychological and rationalising counter-balances to a weak, debilitated nation, which, despite the Grand / Great Idea which it had of itself, repeatedly tasted humiliations, obtaining in this manner the sense that it is a play-thing in the hands of the powerful of the Earth, and which, moreover, did*

ZIO-JOO-mainstream mass ***ZIO-JOO***-media in "Greece" dares not state. The "academic" form of ***ZIO-JOO***-JUNTA-***ZIO-JOO***-SATAN STATE worship and subservience is found in the "thought" of D. Kitsikis who makes about as much sense as a "political scientist" as the ***ZIO-JOO***-RODENT-PARASITE-***ZIO-JOO***-"LEFT-RIGHT"-HYPER-***ZIO-JOO***-IMPERIALIST AND HYPER-***ZIO-JOO***-NATIONALIST-***ZIO-JOO***-DAS-SATANIC CIRCUS MONKEY would want to him to make, which is about **NONE**. **Obfuscation** along with ***Divide and Rule, Divide and Conquer*** (talk about everyone and anything, but not about me, da ***JOO***) is the name of the game when the ***ZIO-JOO***-SCUM-BAGZ with the ***ZIO***-ANGLO-ET AL.-***JOOZ*** want to remain in power.

[56] See footnote 46, above. Things changed extremely rapidly (after being consolidated during much of the 20th century) during the ***ZIO***-decade of the ***ZIO***-1990s when the ***ZIO-JOO***-DAS-***ZIO-JOO-ZIO***-USA-"UNIPOLAR ***ZIO-JOO***-DAS MOMENT"-RAT-RODENT ANTI-CHRIST SATANISTS IMPOSED TOTAL AND ABSOLUTE ***ZIO-JOO***-ANTI-CHRIST ***GREAT SATAN*** DEVIL-EVIL-MAMMON-EASY-CREDIT-***ZIO-JOO***-BANKRUPT-***ZIO-JOO***-HEDONISMUS-***ZIO-JOO***-KONSUM SATANISM on all of the former West, when all the totally insane, sick-fucking-crazy-psycho-path ***ZIO-JOO***-GLOBALIST-INTERNATIONALIST-"ONE WORLD, GLOBAL VILLAGE" ***ZIO-JOO***-IDEOLOGICAL BULLSHIT, this time UNDER ***ZIO***-USA IMPERIALISM-SATANISM, made a huge ***ZIO-JOO***-CUM ***ZIO-JOO***-BAK, or rather simply got a massive, historically unheard-of ***ZIO-JOO***-DAS-BOOST. Strictly speaking, there can be no internationalism without nationalism, but the ideological-practical use of the term "internationalism" has always served the purpose of ***grossly disproportionate and vastly asymmetrical ZIO-JOO***-HYPER-IMPERIALIST / ***ZIO-JOO***-HYPER-NATIONALIST ***ZIO-JOO***-"LEFT / RIGHT" power claims, especially from ***ZIO***-GREAT BRITAIN to ***ZIO-***USA.

[57] E.g. in relation to Skopje. The only way that matter could have been resolved in favour of a Greece which represented Greeks and not ***ZIO***-USA-***JOO***-ZOMBEEZ … (P.K. as an absolutely consistent social scientist does not concern himself with "how Greek" are "Greeks"; only as a Greek, and not as a social scientist, could he possibly do such a thing, and when he wrote more so as a Greek, and not primarily as a social scientist without ethnicity, he did not act like a KRAZY-MAN MONKEY as I do) … was if Greece had a militant and hard-working indigenous population of 20+ million Greeks and we simply conquered and occupied that territory as part of Greek Macedonia, including slaughtering all ***JOOZ*** who got in the way.

not offer anything either to theoretical thought, or to technical culture (civilisation)[58].

The first form of Helleno-centrism and at the same time the first form of modern and contemporary national consciousness was / existed as classicism, namely the turn towards ancient Greece as the source of drawing upon essential world-theoretical and bio-practical opinions and as well as a model, whose creative mimesis (i.e. imitation, copying) appeared to be the best path for the renaissance of the Greek nation. This classicist-humanistic Helleno-centrism, which attributed the (potentially) privileged place of modern Hellenism to the fact of its direct[59] *descent from the natural bearers of a culture / civilisation of pan-human significance*[60]*, that is to say of the ancient Greek culture / civilisation, first appeared and experienced its first theoretical processing in the pre-revolutionary [[i.e. pre-1821]] centres of Greek communities in Western Europe, especially in circles of merchants, traders who were disposed to open themselves up ideologically to the European Enlightenment and to circumvent and go around the non-secular, unworldly Byzantinism of the Church in order to be re-connected with the worship of the "this world" / worldliness of ancient times*[61]*. We do not need to particularly stress that this schema did not present any originality, since it reflected, and indeed rather dully, the basic construct,*

---

[58] As always, perfectly put. All the intellectually disabled and mentally retarded "push-back, play-back" midgets writing as "Greek patriots" today, whether of the ***ZIO***-"LEFT" or the ***ZIO***-"RIGHT", no matter how much in favour of the ***ZIO***-EU, the ***ZIO***-SATAN STATE and or of ***ZIO***-USA, belong to this broad category. Of course, as the world of humans ends, we did offer our P.K., who perfectly complements some of the High Points of human thought in our ancient phase, surpassing Everyone in the end.

[59] Obviously factually wrong, even though "ideologically correct" to the extent such an ideology wielded influence. The connection between the modern world and the ancient world in the case of Greeks and Italians vis-à-vis ancient Greece and Rome, or Chinese vis-à-vis ancient China, or India vis-à-vis ancient India etc., is in the Greek / Italian case up to very indirect (but by no means without connection, including in relation to Christianity, and not just to DNA), whereas in the case of the Asian civilisations the link is still indirect, but in some respects not as indirect, owing to the greater amount of historical-cultural intervention by ***ZIO-***ANGLO-ET AL.-***JOO***-SATANIC POWERS in the Mediterranean worlds.

[60] That's **TOTAL BULL-SHIT**. No culture or civilisation is of "pan-human" significance. All cultures and civilisations are bound by place and time and are relative, no matter the length and breadth and depth of continuity.

[61] As an ideology obviously, because in the actual ancient world, other-worldly world views and life stances were not exactly a small part of cultural life.

which supported in Europe the ideological struggle of the up-and-coming, ascendant bourgeois or, in any case, popular (of the people) and secularising forces. Worship of antiquity, and indeed Helleno-worship, constituted from the Renaissance and afterwards the typical weapon against traditional Christianity and also against the epoch, times of its undisputed ideological rule and dominance, namely the Middle Ages. When, then, certain groups of modern Greeks during the 18th century adopted Helleno-worship in the form of the worship of antiquity in order to express themselves ideologically, they were acceding to an already formed European tradition, which precisely then was being enriched and widened by the Enlightenment. Ancient Greece —as a symbol of a constituted cultural perspective with specific, distinguishing, distinctive features, and not simply as memory and the use of certain texts— was discovered, then, (or was invented), in Western Europe also by Western European thinkers to be introduced from there in the Greek-speaking realm, initially as a bourgeois, and indeed as a bourgeois-national, ideology by bourgeois, or, as it were bourgeois, bearers. Greek ancient-worshipping Helleno-centrism would not have ever projected its ideological claims —and it is doubtful that it would have even been formed— if the classicist and humanistic ideal had not cropped up, appeared and been spread, been disseminated in Western Europe for reasons exclusively referring to the particularities and the turns, changes of Western-European history. Only the already accomplished fact, fait accompli of its appearance and its spreading, dissemination at a European level gave to the Helleno-centric, ancient-worshipping modern Greeks the possibility to contend, assert that their locus, place, country, fatherland, motherland is the cradle[62] of civilisation, culture etc., and that consequently today's Greece should be looked upon and dealt with

[62] Which is **TOTAL BULL-SHIT** (as if a ***JOO*** was talking), of course.

analogously by "civilised humanity"[63]; but this claim, assertion would have provoked as much of a wry smile / ironic laughter as a corresponding claim, assertion by Kyrgyz people or by Eskimos, for instance, if the vanguard of "civilised humanity" had not discovered ancient-Greek civilisation / culture (that is to say, an ideologically useful version of it[64]) before modern Greeks even existed[65]. In any event, it should not be forgotten that the modern Greek scientific contribution to the investigation of ancient civilisation / culture was negligible. There were, of course, [[Greek]] philologists and scholars of antiquity who were the equal of many good Western European colleagues of theirs (they also, again, can be counted with the fingers of one hand), but from modern Greece, no total way of looking at and viewing and interpretation of ancient civilisation / culture, able to inspire and activate in practice the classical-humanistic ideal on an international scale, stemmed, flowed.

Ancient-worshipping Helleno-centrism in its bourgeois-national version, as it appeared in the womb of pre-revolutionary [[i.e. pre-1821]] modern Greek Enlightenment, and as it inspired as many fighters of the [[1821 Greek]] Revolution as considered themselves a descendent of Leonidas [[i.e. the Spartan of Thermopylae]][66], could not be formed autonomously and hold sway, dominate, rule in its pure, unmixed, undiluted form, since its bearers neither

---

[63] All humans have civilisation, so the phrase is ***TOTALLY ZIO-JOO***-ED-**BULLSHIT**, even though all great civilisations, including without ***JOOZ***, tended to see the "primitive" Other as, at least in some respects, inferior.

[64] This clearly indicates that the mainstream ***ZIO***-ANGLO-GERMANO-GALLO-ET AL.-***JOO***-view of ancient Greece and Rome is not only totally obfuscatory, but totally ideological in order to support ***ZIO***-ANGLO-ET AL-***JOO*** power claims, and in recent decades co-existing (e.g. "Gladiator" the movie) with the "de-construction" of antiquity by ***JOOZ*** and their ***ZIO-JOO***-STOOGEZ-ZOMBEEZ, (including in relation to totally non-existent ***as such*** "whiteness"), who (da ***JOOZ***) "de-construct" everyone and everything except for themselves !!! ***OH, WHAT A FUCKING ZIO-JOO-DAS-SURPRISE !!!***

[65] P.K. is defining a modern Greek here as existent from 1821, and not 1204 or 1453, which is not wrong, even if it's not the only possible definition.

[66] Obviously, nobody is a direct descendent of anyone going back some 90+ generations, but neither is an ideological, factually wrong, view of the world unrealistic if it "moves" political-cultural power, nor is a modern Greek of the Peloponnese biologically-genetically further from Leonidas than an Anglo-Saxon, a German, a Scandinavian, a China Man, a Hindu, a Pakistani, an Arab, a "black" African, a ***JOO***, a Pacific Islander, an Aboriginal, a Japanese, et al., and very likely is much closer to Leonidas biologically-genetically than all of ***them.***

were transplanted as is, unchanged, unaltered (in)to the free[67] state, nor did they determine its ideology. The national idea was adopted, as we saw, by social strata initially alien to this (ancient-worshipping Helleno-centrism in its bourgeois-national version), in order to now be interpreted with pre-bourgeois-patriarchal criteria, and Helleno-centrism suffered or underwent corresponding modifications. Its patriarchal re-interpretation / meta-interpretation demanded its widening, expansion, namely its disconnection from the one-sided, unilateral worship of antiquity, and its attachment to Christian values and Christian ideals; its widening, expansion occurred, therefore, in a manner so as to satisfy, to a great, at least, degree, the Church as one of the most important patriarchal-pre-bourgeois social players, agents, factors, subjects with clear and express ideological claims. This wider, broader Helleno-centrism, which corresponded (in large part) with the expectations of the patriarchal social forces and cut back, cropped, abridged, trimmed (in large part) the radical viewpoints, standpoints of bourgeois ancient-worshipping Helleno-centrism[68], was codified with the historical construct(ion) of the unbroken, unbreakable three-thousand-year-long history of the Greeks[69], namely, on the one hand, of their racial continuity and, on the other hand, of the essential unity of the Greek and Christian spirit(-intellect). This contstruct(ion) rendered possible the organic inclusion of Byzantium, the primary historical embodier / incarnator / incarnating / embodying vehicle of Christian ideas and values, in Greek history and, thus, restored the Church not only ideologically, but also historically. The vast majority of the representatives of the pre-revolutionary [[i.e. pre-1821]]

[67] Conventional use of the term "free", not without irony, in regard to a typically-legally "independent" state.
[68] We're still mostly in the 18th and 19th centuries here.
[69] When a history of a people carries on for many centuries up to millennia, there are obviously many breaks, but there are also aspects of biological and or cultural continuity, and in the case of the Greeks, there is every reason to talk of 4000 years or more of breaks and continuity in Greek forms of collective identity and group formation. P.K. is absolutely correct in what he is saying about a certain ideological view of history, but 1) that does not mean that that ideological-mythological view of history does not contain up to many truths, and 2) if the ideological-mythological aspects of that history help shape a collective identity, then they are rationally used as to defining one collective identity against other collective identities, notwithstanding their ideological-mythological factual bullshit.

modern Greek Enlightenment, agreeing on this point with their Western European like-minded fellow thinkers, had kept and held vis-à-vis the Byzantium a stance which was either hesitant or rejective, rejecting and dismissive, considering it (i.e. Byzantium) to be a manifestation and a figment of obfuscation and superstition; they frequently connected, of course, ancient-Greek and Christian ideals, but they did not do this by constructing an unbroken Helleno-Christian / Greco-Christian civilisation / culture avant la lettre, but by rather following a fixed argumentative tactic of the Western-European Enlightenment generally: they interpreted Christianity in terms of Modernity and whilst worshiping worldly things, in order to show in this manner that the Church forges and misrepresents its (i.e. Christianity's) "true" spirit and that only the Enlightenment is the "genuine" interpreter of God's commands, precisely because it repels, beats off both superstition as well as the sterile negation and denial of worldly things / affairs; but few things separated this (enlightened[70]) religion from (moderate) paganism. The approach of Hellenism and Christianity in the context of the historical construct(ion) of the three-thousand-year-long racial and intellectual(-spiritual) continuity of the Greek nation takes (on) / has a totally different meaning and content. In the ancient Greek world view and bio-theory, the paganistic and worldly-worshiping / worshiping-worldly-things elements are not extolled, glorified, honoured, praised, but those ideocratic and spiritual-intellectual-cratic / spiritualistic aspects which are interpreted as preparatory forms and forerunners of Christian truths (are extolled and glorified). With these terms, the Church

[70] Obviously, the term "enlightened" here is being used as understood by its bearers in those times (and e.g. also in the case of »ἀβασίλευτη δημοκρατία«, for instance, in another context, which scientifically is just another form of (authoritarian / despotic / autocratic) "political organisation" as seen in ***DPudM***), and not as a non-normative, scientific statement / descriptor by P.K. himself. This occurs often in P.K.'s texts (and it couldn't be otherwise because then he'd have to explain what I just said a trillion, gazillion times over), so the reader is always assumed to be contextually and inter-contextually "switched on" and not ***ZIO-JOO***-ZOMBEE-MENTALLY RETARDED-***ZIO-JOO***-DAS-INTELLECTUALLY (THE INCEST HAS GONE TO ITS BRAIN) DISABLED. Also, see footnote 67, above and footnote 85, below.

assents to Helleno-centrism, seeing, anyway, that the free[71] *Greek state constitutes a reality and that it (i.e. the Church) itself needs its (the Greek state's) support. As one of the central pillars of national ideology, this theologically hued / tinted / tinged Helleno-centrism from now on concentrates its polemical firepower against every kind of "materialism", "Darwinism" etc. — tendencies which entered somewhat more systematically into the Greek intellectual(-spiritual) realm only from the beginnings of the 20th century and thereafter, limited, nevertheless, to the reading public of various translations, without infiltrating and permeating the education system.*

Thus, Helleno-Christian Helleno-centrism, resting and being based upon the construct(ion) of the historical continuity of the [[Greek]] nation, outflanked ancient-worshipping Helleno-centrism, which put (set) aside (discarded, eliminated) Byzantium and related (to Byzantium) values. We should note that the patriarchal-Helleno-Christian ideologem(e) as well, in the same way as with the bourgeois-ancient-worshipping ideologeme too, had its antecedents in the European realm, from which it was transplanted in order to satisfy, naturally, local (in situ, on-site) needs. The approach or convergence, coming together of Hellenism and Christianity, in the form which interests us here, was attempted to a wide, large extent during the epoch, times of the [[French, Bourbon, 1814-1815-1830]] Restoration by the rallying, regrouping anti-revolutionary forces, which attempted to neutralise the modernistic and radical elements of ancient-worshiping Jacobinism, delineating an image of antiquity compatible, reconcilable with patriarchal-feudal Christian ideals. But also in the 20th century, the Greek ideologues of Helleno-Christian civilisation / culture found props, supports, pillars, footholds, anchors in corresponding European tendencies, trends, which appeared when bourgeois ideology, in the face of the socialist danger, fell back and retreated and came close to Christianity,

[71] See footnote 70.

juxtaposing and contrasting the "Helleno-Christian spirit of the West" to "Asiatic Bolshevism"[72]. Even though, however, Helleno-Christian Helleno-centrism, in various variations, exercised a determinative ideological influence on the whole of the up till then life of the free Greek state, and although the simultaneous pressure of the radical and Christian tendencies caged and encircled the moderate ancient/antiquity-worshippers in a tug-of-war, preventing, blocking, obstructing, hindering, impeding them from insisting as much as they would have desired upon (and persisting with) the paganistic and worldly-worshiping / worshiping-worldly-things aspects of the ancient-Greek world view and bio-theory — nevertheless the historical and conceptual dimension of the constituent elements of the "Helleno-Christian" hybrid continued to exist, and most often to explode, as at one time its "Greek", and at another time, its "Christian" side was connected with self-contained, self-sufficient, independent social ends/goals and purposes and particular claims of social power, seeking to become autonomous. But this autonomisation could not anymore mean that the (ancient) Greek and the Christian element undertook the functions which they fulfilled in the pre-revolutionary [[i.e. pre-1821]] period, before they could be fused and merged (with)in the framework and context of the construct(ion)[73] of "Greco-Christian" civilisation / culture. On the contrary, as the ideological differentiation of the Greek realm proceeded, so much the more were they (i.e. the said (ancient) Greek and Christian element) used to legitimise varied, diverse more or less contemporary and modern social-

[72] Even though the 20th century was the century of mass democracy, remnants of the bourgeoisie were still ideologically-culturally fairly strong for the first few decades of the 20th century, e.g. the fact that the Classics were part of University and elite Secondary education until circa ***ZIO***-WW2-***ZIO***-1960, just as "the (traditional, patriarchal) family" was still viewed by many "as the bedrock of society" etc..

[73] A "construct(ion)", as far as the scientific observation of human affairs is concerned, is neither "good' or "bad". It is simply a reality. There is not one society ever in the history of humans and human societies that was not characterised by ideological construct(ion)s, inter alia, concealing real-world, tangible group interests and cohering society under a particular ruling oligarchy / elite. Hence, in today's "Greece", "Greekness" is "de-constructed" by rabidly anti-Hellenic and anti-Christ SATANIC-DEVIL-EVIL-MAMMON ***JOOZ*** and their allies, whereas it is absolutely forbidden and prohibited to de-construct, by simply stating **FACTS** about !!!, ***grossly disproportionate and vastly asymmetrical ZIO-JOO***-rule/power all over the formerly Christian "West".

political and world-theoretical positionings. Thus, with the invocation of ancient Hellenism, in its – on each and every respective occasion – suitable interpretation, both autocratic and dictatorial sympathies were expressed (the glorification, exaltation, praising of ancient Sparta or Macedonia), as well as democratic preferences (the idealisation of Ancient Athens)[74]; both racial and fascist-friendly dogmas (particularly with an anti-Slavic tip, spike, spearhead) as well as advocacy and defences in favour of socialism (socialism as the demand of the ethical Idea etc.) were expressed. Equally polymorphous, multiform was the invocation of the Christian element, which was stressed in its self-containment, self-sufficiency and independence for reasons of reaction, whereupon Helleno-worship took extreme forms or, in any case, incompatible and irreconcilable with the demands of the construct(ion) of the "Helleno-Christian spirit". And here a noteworthy internal differentiation can be ascertained, as at one time, the conscription (i.e. enlistment / call-to-arms) of Christian values is pitted or set against and opposed to variations and changes of casts of mind and of mores, morals contrary to the patriarchal social perception of "(clean and tidy and economising) home and property owners", whereas at another time, Christian values are interpreted in such a manner that they articulate the ethical protest or remonstrance of petty-bourgeois intellectuals against alienating, estranging, expropriating materialism and of the inhuman immorality of a society ruled and dominated by the pursuit of consumption and of profit[75]. Such Christian-Orthodox kinds of Helleno-centrism, which frequently come to kinds of friction and of rubbing against the official Church[76], are as to their content as little original as the rest of the kinds

[74] All of this of course amounts to ideological BULLSHIT, given that all polities are forms of authoritarianism, and the ancient world has very little, if anything to do with the world emerging from the two NOVA of circa 1800 (the Industrial Revolution) and circa 1900 (mass democracy).

[75] The critique of culture is something as old as ideology and societies, but for scientific observation all such critiques are axiologically and aesthetically indifferent and neutral, i.e. the same, neither "good" nor "bad".

[76] The official "Greek" Church today is under total and absolute ***ZIO-JOO***-DEIC-***ZIO***-USA-ANTI-CHRIST-***GREAT SATAN***-PAPAL CONTROL (**KONTROL**) and is the organ of the ANTI-CHRIST ***JOO***-DAS ***GREAT SATAN*** TOTAL EVIL DEVIL.

of Helleno-centrism; in essence they renew and vary the fundamental motifs of the Slavophiles and pan-Slavists from the beginnings of the 19th century in setting the "spiritual" East against the "materialistic" West and "love" and the "gifts, donations of Grace" against the dry intellectualism of philosophical and religious metaphysical dogmas. These motifs filtered into and permeated Greece already from the previous [[i.e. 19th]] century, in order to initially resonate in monastic circles and thereafter amongst a rather small number of intellectuals, upon whom the influence of Russian theologues and philosophers is determinative, albeit often unconfessed and not admitted[77].

On the basis of the aforesaid criteria, that is to say, by following the formation of the basic theses of Helleno-centrism and by analysing the process and the phases of its differentiation, an almost complete, full index of modern Greek ideology could be drawn up and compiled[78]*. If the morphology, the history and the sociology of modern Greek ideology has not been written yet, not even in the form of a satisfactory draft, outline, the reason is not only the deficient supervision, monitoring, stewardship of the variety, diversity of the currents, which, instead of being seen in their internal many-sidedness, multi-lateralism, are rapidly schematised and thereafter are attributed to fantastical, imaginary "classes", but also the use of another uncut, easy, effortless way out, namely, the equating of the point of view of the studiers, scholars with the idea the various antagonistic, competing factions have of themselves. Thus, e.g. because*

---

[77] All of this refers to a fundamentally Christian critique of ***ZIO***-ANGLO-ET AL.-***JOO***-capitalistic-imperialistic-massifying-atomising ***ZIO-JOO***-ANTI-CHRIST-SATAN-MAMMON-DEVIL-EVIL culture based on a mostly still agricultural world of a peasanty "rooted in tradition". We all know that in the 20th century "things happened and turned out differently", Greece died as Greece and became a ***ZIO-JOO-KOPROS***-EXCREMENT-PITHICUS-APE-MONKEY-BANKRUPT STATE OF ***CONTRA NATURAM*** DEGENERATE AND PARASTIC-CONSUMERIST-TOURISM CRAP AND ANTI-HELLENISM WITH TODAY NO HELLENISM (BOING-BOING-BOING), whilst Russia had its 1917, had its massive upheavals and had the breadth and depth and will to survive them and still exist today.

[78] It is notable that P.K. does not consider "Greece" post ***ZIO***-WW2 as anything to do with Hellenism, since what came to dominate was totally ***ZIO-JOO***-DAS-ANTI-CHRIST-***ZIO***-USA-CONTROLLED (**KONTROL**) parasitic consumerism, self-racist exoticism and a whole host of ***CONTRA NATURAM*** PORN-STERILE-FEMINO-FAGGOT-DRUGS-ETC. life stances leading to all-round bankruptcy, **SELF-ETHNIC CLEANSING** and **SELF-GENOCIDE**, which has now (i.e. by circa 1960-1990) occurred completely, absolutely and irrevocably.

the protagonists of the strife, conflict, dispute about the [[Greek]] language imagined that this conflict, dispute has to do with fundamental national and social-political choices[79], many were driven / led to an erroneous sociological assessment of tendencies, trends and people, personages, personalities on the basis of their positioning vis-à-vis the language question / problem / issue[80]. And here the many-sidedness, multi-lateralism of the real data was disregarded, with the result of mono-semantic reductions, i.e. reductions of one meaning. If we wanted to definitely, for reasons of emphasis, choose one of the two possible extreme formulations[81], we would probably have to say that the language preferences cut across / diagonally / transversely / crosswise the social-political factions rather than characterising them. Just as the defence of Katharevousa did not constitute everywhere and always a "reactionary" stance, but in part was dictated by practical needs (as someone would ascertain by examining, for instance, the significance of the translation / lectic conversion of all kinds of legal codices for the composing, i.e. centralising state), and in part was inspired by a genuine belief/faith in the vital strength of classical models, thus also demoticism was connected, and indeed for valid reasons on each and every respective occasion, with factions otherwise different up to inimical as between themselves[82]. Generally, it can be said that the expected social results from the imposition of the demotic language was a function of the way in which the [[Greek]] people was defined every time. For socialists[83], the demotic language especially / in particular, and the popular / people's tradition more generally

[79] It is obvious that any "language question" can only be an extremely tiny part, at most, of what makes up sufficient 1) **primary energy** and sufficient 2) **geo-political potential / dynamism** necessary for collective survival.

[80] Principally of Katharevousa (modern Greek with up to many older or ancient elements) versus Demoticism (the language spoken by the Greek people, up to the use of defunct topical-demotic variants-elements). Obviously, there should have been no dispute whatsoever. The people will speak the way they speak, and the state had a duty to make as many Greeks familiar with the ancient history and great variety of form of the Greek language as far as possible. That means first and foremost: **NO JOOZ AND NO BARBARIAN IDIOM.** Now it's way too late. No hope. No future. Nothing.

[81] Ancient-leaning "hard-core" Katharevousa and (Psiharis-like or Kazantzakis-like) "malliari" Demotic.

[82] Including, but not limited to, communists and fascists.

[83] Again, here we're in the 19th century, and at most, the first half of the 20th century.

were, at least over the long run, elements of the class consciousness of the repressed strata, and at the same time essential components of a new culture / civilisation after popular / the people's liberation [[of 1821]][84]*. For moderate educational demoticism, which could and wanted to move in the context / framework of bourgeois parliamentary democracy*[85]*, the adoption of (the) demotic [[Greek]] amounted to a severance from a scholasticism contrary to modernising tendencies*[86]*; here the people became perceived as the totality of progressive(-friendly), hard-working, diligent, and peaceable farmers, workers and artisans, craftsmen. However, demoticism was connected also with a third view of the [[Greek]] people, which approached and converged with European conservative Romanticism and saw the popular / people's community as a totality assembled / structured patriarchally, a compact and like-minded / same-spirited totality thanks to its insistence on its traditions, a totality, finally, coiled i.e. cohered behind and in support of the supreme patriarch, namely, the king, above the heads of the little clown-politicians and the essentially stateless / without-a-fatherland plutocrats*[87]*, beyond and outside of the apeisms (i.e. kinds*

---

[84] And what ***ZIO-JOO-ZIO***-USA ANTI-CHRIST-SATANISM-IMPERIALISM did post-***ZIO***-WW2 was to promote the **SELF-ETHINIC CLEANSING** and **SELF-GENOCIDE** of the Greek people, such that any BOING BOING BOING ***ZIO-JOO***-DEPENDENT-*ZIO-JOO*-SATANIC CIRCUS MONKEY totally irrelevant to Hellenism APE-PITHICUS-MONKEY BOING BOING BOING became "Greek", and "Greeks" were people "into" the BARBARIAN IDIOM and ***ZIO***-USA "culture" of ***ZIO-JOO***-CONTROLLED (**KONTROL**) PORN-DRUGS-FEMINO-TRANS-LESBIO-FAGGOTISM-SELF-RACIST EXOTICISM-ABORT-FUCK-CONTRACEPTIVE-FUCK-SLUT-STERILITY-BRAIN WASHING-"MOOVEEZ"-TV-PARASITIC AND BANKRUPT-SIT ON MY ARSE-DO NOTHING CONSUMERISM-ETC..

[85] See footnote 70, above. P.K. is here using the terminology as used by the actors themselves "(bourgeois) parliamentary democracy", and is not discussing what democracy actually is and isn't as a polity and means of necessarily authoritarian / despotic / autocratic political organisation, and in the "West's" case, ***grossly disproportionately and vastly asymmetrically*** under ***ZIO-JOO***-ECONOMIC-STATE-CULTURAL CONTROL (**KONTROL**). Moreover, this "way of handling things" by P.K. was an absolutely deliberate strategy of deflecting ***ZIO-JOO***-accusations of anti-Satanism, though in the not very long run, the ***JOOZ*** still exterminated him through "medical error" by 55 years of age. If he had lived until today (80 years of age), he would have completed his three or more volume social ontology and God knows what other FUN would have eventuated !!!

[86] This is precisely one aspect of the death of Hellenism under ***ZIO***-ANGLO-ET AL-***JOO***-driven (post-) modernism. Hellenism was of the pre-industrial world and had neither the numbers nor the (eventual) organisation like the Chinese, for instance, to adapt and survive in a ***ZIO***-SATANIC-***JOO***-DAS-world.

[87] Obviously, ***grossly disproportionately and vastly asymmetrically*** Jews. European conservative Romanticism, broadly defined, is the source of central anti-capitalistic motifs of socialism / communism such as alienation, exploitation, solidarity etc.. Socialism, even in its Marxist form, until circa ***ZIO***-WW2 never denied the existence of peoples, nationalities, genoses etc., even though some very typical ***ZIO***-Marxist confusion ensued from the intersection of anti-imperialist national liberation and Progressivism. ***ZIO***-genocidal and ***ZIO***-ethnic cleansing forms of Leftism only came to the fore under ***ZIO***-USA-Imperialism-Satanism after ***ZIO***-WW2.

*of mimicking of others, aliens like an ape / monkey) of those schooled in the ways of the [[to Greeks up to the 19th and early 20th century]] Franks, i.e. Westerners [[**ZIO**-ANGLO-GERMANO-GALLO-ET. AL.-**JOOZ**]].*

The intensity and the extent of Helleno-centrism as modern-Greek ideology becomes visible par excellence precisely in the only intellectual-spiritual sector where newer, i.e. modern Hellenism gave, sure enough, prominent, eminent and outstandings works: we mean in the sector of poetry[88]. The vast majority of the great modern Greek poets connected the content of their poetry with visions and convictions where(by) the idea of Greece appeared as the condensation of the highest, most supreme, paramount ethical and aesthetical values[89], irrespective of the morphological means with which that content was expressed every time; even the poetry of modernism too, to the extent it draws from the irrational element and from myth (see ch. III, 1), chose Greece in top, leading cases, instances as its myth[90]. It was not of course paradoxical that the Helleno-centric visions, as they overflowed in torrents of lyricism, totally covered over/up much more prosaic bourgeois ideas and values. If, however, such ideas and values had an essential existence inside of modern-Greek reality, if they constituted the determinative element of the cast of mind and of the behaviour [[of Greeks[91]]], then they should have at least been expressed in prose, especially in the novel as the bourgeois literary genre par excellence[92]. Something like that does / did not occur, at any rate, it does / did not occur to the extent that we are permitted to talk of the bourgeois novel in Greece — except if we mean by that simply the

---

[88] Obviously, "being good at poetry" as such has absolutely nothing to do with the 1) **primary energy** and the 2) **geo-political potential** required for survival in a world of the most intense forms of international political rivalry.

[89] Solomos, Kalvos, Palamas, Kavafis, Karagiotakis, Sikelianos, Kazantzakis et al.

[90] Ritsos, Gatsos, Seferis, Elytis, Anagnostakis, Eggonopoulos, et al. This poetic Helleno-centrism continued until circa 1960-1990, when it was decided by **JOOZ** and **ZIO**-ANGLO-GERMANO-GALLO-ET AL.-**ZIO-JOO-ZIO**-USA-ANTI-CHRIST-MAMMON-DEVIL-EVIL-SATANISTS that Greece and Greeks should be **ethnically cleansed and genocided** out of existence, and we just "went along with that", BOING, BOING, BOING.

[91] Especially, in the second half of the 19th century to circa 1940.

[92] By far Modern Greece's greatest prose author, Papadiamantis, was primarily a short-story writer, and of the post-Byzantine-Orthodox, in large part, still pre-(post-)modern world. Likewise in the case of Vizyinos.

transcendence, overcoming of the old ethography and the transference of the scenery from the country-side to the city[93]*. The modern-Greek novel describes, as a rule, the fate of individuals from the middle strata who are crushed inside of narrow, tight and miserable circumstances, conditions under the pressure of unfulfilled dreams and vain, futile expectations; even those who reach high up, realising for the time being hyper-substitutionary/surrogate/vicarious fantasies of power, pass by like meteors, without leaving behind them a (wholly or well) composed-constituted-formed work as a crystallisation of a (wholly or well) composed-constituted-formed person(age), but rather only disparate memories, disparate loves and disparate kinds of hate. In/On this tableau, the bourgeois with his disciplined life and his long-term aims, objectives, with his typical vacillating between feeling, sentiment, affect and duty, patriotism and cosmopolitanism, intellectual-spiritual cultivation and material wealth, appears only marginally. In particular, the specific, distinguishing, distinctive values of the work ethic found [[only]] the slightest resonance in theoretical and the rest of modern Greek letters, since / as they came into direct contrast, antithesis towards/with Helleno-centrism and towards/with the basic elements of Greek tradition, that is to say, orthodoxy (contempt and disdain for worldly goods, things and tendencies towards communal / joint / common ownership) and antiquity (loathing for brutal, crude jobs [[of vita activa]] and the supremacy of theoretical life (vita speculativa, vita contemplativa))*[94]*. To find precise, albeit somewhat faded, Greek counterparts of the bourgeois world view and bio-theory we must have recourse to the pre-revolutionary [[i.e. pre-1821]] texts of the modern Greek Enlightenment*[95]*. Their conceptual re-composition, re-construction gives us the general schema of the bourgeois view of the world and of man — from the attempt at a syncretism, mixing (of an enlightened*[96]*) religion*

[93] E.g. Xenopoulos.
[94] This also explains "why we didn't make it" in the (post-)modern world.
[95] See footnote 13, above.
[96] See footnote 70, above.

and science right up to the pursuit of the reconciliation between the commands, imperatives, dictates of Reason and the voice of the passions (see ch. II). In the philology of the modern Greek enlightenment, works referring to the work ethic and more generally to the behaviour which the conditions, circumstances of the free market[97] *impose upon the active individual, if he wants to remain honourable, upstanding, respectable, but without being materially destroyed as well, also appear. These motifs, which had meaning and specific, concrete reference in the surroundings, milieu of the merchants, traders of Hellenism outside of the state of Greece, weakened, of course, in the environment of the free [[Greek]] state. However, even though the official ideology organised the myths*[98] *of Helleno-Christian culture / civilisation around the axis of the unity of Genos and religion*[99]*, in parallel, in the context and within the framework of the social and secular life of the "hearths / fireplaces [[of the said local community (up to national) leaders]]", mores, morals and ways of living were developed which often were inspired by the reading of sentimental novels (a reading in parallel, then, with an indulgence in prolix, wordy, long-winded narratives about brigands or fighters of the Revolution [[of Greek independence, 1821-1830]]), and which from one point of view could be characterised bourgeois. These mores were reinforced and in part refined with the subsequent inflow of elements coming from the Hellenism of the Greek communities living outside of the state of Greece, so that gradually a code of social life of the upper, higher strata was formed which was held in force (and continued) until the second world war and, in certain cases, even later. Bourgeois culture / civilisation manifested itself here in only its more elemental and its more external forms,*

[97] Ditto. We also note that an ideal type as accentuated reality also includes the ideological aspects of the way actors see things, even if such a view of the world is up to very far from "on-the-ground" specific, concrete, situation-related reality.

[98] **REPEAT** because most people are FULL-SPECTRUM ***ZIO***-LOBOTOMISED ZOMBEEZ and don't get it: all i.e. **ALL** collectivities, states, nations etc. proceed on the basis of MYTHS, so from the scientific point of view, a "myth" / normative ideology and the "story" around it, is simply a necessary part of the formation of ***any*** collective identity, i.e. ***all*** collective identities.

[99] Which in part at least factually existed.

that is to say in certain ceremonious, traditional, conventional rules, in certain unwritten laws of the mingling, associating, interaction, socialising between "gentlemen, sirs" and "ladies, mesdames" and the obtainment of a "European" education; in any case, the domestic [[to Greece]] bourgeois cultural needs never became so imperative, mandatory that an opera or an art gallery be created of some requirements (i.e. high standards)[100]. Moreover, many of the members of the social stratum which was the main bearer of these habits continued to be actuated/animated by and wrapped up in patriarchal casts of mind being / which were translated, in terms of world views, into perceptions of an essentially pre-bourgeois texture, nature or character. Thus, this stratum could appear as "bourgeois" rather / more likely from the standpoint of its opponents, who with the term "bourgeois" meant generally and undifferentiatedly / in an undifferentiated manner, but erroneously from a historical and sociological point of view, that they were opposed to the socialistic transformation of Greek society.

The rapid social rearrangements which accompanied the years of occupation, the [[Greek]] civil war [[1942-1944-1949]] and of the monstrous, freakish, odious, horrendous, abortive modernisation of the following decades meant the transition of Greek society from the regime of patriarchism / patriarchy and of an illegitimate, misbegotten, fake, counterfeit or contrived, devised, planned urban and "bourgeois" state of affairs to an equally illegitimate, misbegotten, fake, counterfeit mass democracy, namely a democracy[101] with much more social mobility than before, but simultaneously unable to rid and free itself of patron-client casts of mind and relations which the previous situation bequeathed it; indeed, on the contrary, the undoubted widening and expansion

[100] Like those by Verdi, Wagner, et al., and like the Louvre, The National Gallery etc..
[101] Obviously, sociologically as in mass democracy, and nothing to do with the polity, except ideologically and superficially.

of democracy and of pluralism[102]*, especially in the years of the post-dictatorship period [[i.e. after 1967-1974]], led, finally, to the intensification of the structural weaknesses of the system since the directly interested "branches" used it (i.e. the said Greek mass democracy) in order to consolidate and increase, enhance all that the patron-client interchange, transaction(s) of [[political]] parties and voters had brought in and yielded. Before we persist on this point, we must say that the occupying and post-war rearrangements influenced, one after the other, all social strata. First of all, they significantly changed the composition of the stratum which pre-war was called "bourgeois", so that this today is comprised of – to a degree determinative of its quality, nature and character – the nouveau riche / newly rich, and indeed the nouveau riche thanks to contractor-related and middle-man-transactional activities, which, –after the black market–, "reconstruction" and the "large, great public works", as well as the channelling of an increasingly greater mass of imports into the internal, domestic market, bred and reared. But also, the rest of the "businessmen", not with numerous exceptions anymore, [[and]] notwithstanding the differences and the diverse pre-history of their in part / particular / individual pursuits, minimally differ from the nouveau riche / newly rich as to their cultural level and their spiritual-intellectual horizon, at whose epicentre most often is found everything that happens at [[soccer, basketball]] stadia or at night club entertainment venues*[103]*. Thus, generally, even the antecedent / preceding / previous illegitimate, misbegotten, fake, counterfeit urban and "bourgeois" state of affairs became eliminated / extinct*

---

[102] Ditto. The more racially-religiously-culturally homogeneous Greece of pre-***ZIO***-WW2 and pre-***ZIO***-1960-1980 obviously had its great local differentiations / pluralism, but P.K. is referring to the kind of pluralism which is associated with ***ZIO***-controlled (**KONTROL**) mass democracies under ***ZIO***-USA imperialism, including orgies upon orgies of **self-ethnic-cleansing** and **self-genocidal** ABORT-FUCK-SLUT-CONTRACEPTIVE-FUCK-SLUT-PORN-DRUGZ-HOMO-LEZZO-TRANZ-FAGGOT-GAY-QUEER-BOING-BOING-BOING self-racist exoticism-***ZIO***-HEDONISMUS-***JOO***-DAS-KONSUM.

[103] The cultural change from circa 1960-1990 to today is a shift from modern Greek-centred (to a large extent vulgar) entertainment to totally ***ZIO***-USA-***ZIO-JOO***-DAS controlled (**KONTROL**) ***ZIO-JOO***-PORN-DRUGS-STERILE FUCK SLUT-POOFTA-LEZZO-TRANZ-FREAK SHOW MONKEY-APE-SELF-RACIST-EXOTISMOOS-***ZIO-JOO***-DAS-***ZIO-JOO***-ANTI-CHRIST-KOST WORSHIP.

too[104]*. On the other hand, tourism and the broadest migratory wave [[of Greeks leaving Greece for* ***ZIO****-USA,* ***ZIO****-GERMANY, the* ***ZIO****-KANGAROO PENAL COLONY etc.]] of 1950 and 1960 constituted the third great modern Greek integration and incorporation in the international circuit of the capitalistic economy and definitively catalyzed, i.e. broke up and abolished the patriarchal social structure / arrangement, as they created in a direct or indirect way (namely in contributing and leading to the widening and expansion of the services sector [[at the same time reducing the agricultural and industrial sectors]]) a more and more multitudinous middle strata characterised by mimicking consumerism and by the conceit, vanity, arrogance of newly obtained affluence and of also newly obtained sciolism (i.e. a very superficial form of "half" learning and general idiocy)*[105]*. It can be said that on the basis of the values of as far as possible quick enrichment and of hurried, precipitant consumerism, Greek society is today culturally perhaps not better, anyhow more homogeneous that what it was in the pre-war [[i.e. pre-****ZIO****-WW2]] period*[106]*. From an aesthetical and sentimental point of view, firstly the "discovery" and thereafter the broader acceptance and the musical ennoblement, refinement of the "popular" [[Greek]] song realised (the said) cultural homogenisation*[107]*,*

---

[104] I.e. of the pre-war period.

[105] THIS WAS ALL PART OF THE ***ZIO***-ANGLO-ET AL-***JOO***-"CARTHIGINIAN PLAN" OF THE **SAVAGE TRIBE KIDNAPPING**, **ETHNIC CLEANSING** AND **GENOCIDE** OF THE GREEK NATION AND THE DE-POPULATION OF GREECE AND ITALY BY ***JOOZ***, ANGLO-SAXONZ AND GERMANZ AND THEIR LACKEYZ (CF. *THE STRANGER*, 1946), INCLUDING BREAKING ANY HISTORICAL CONTINUITY (AS FACT AND OR AS MYTH) AS TO DESCENT AND OR CULTURE / IDENTITY GOING BACK CENTURIES UP TO MILLENNIA, SO THAT ALL THAT IS LEFT IS THE UNSPEAKABLE FULL-SPECTRUM-***ZIO-JOO***-LOBOTOMISED-***ZIO-JOO***-BRAIN-WASHED-**KOPROS / EXCREMENT** ONE CAN SEE IN "GREECE" TODAY (THEY DON'T HAVE ABSOLUTELY ANYTHING TO DO WITH GREEKS ANYMORE AS THE CONTINUATION OF EASTERN ROME AND ANCIENT GREECE).

[106] Cf. footnote 102 above. P.K. is referring to Greece as it was circa 1990, and before the GREAT ***ZIO-JOO***-DAS-ANTI-CHRIST-MONKEY-APE-INVASION-COLONISATION-***ZIO-JOO***-PAWN-WAVE INCLUDING EVEN MORE RAPID DE-HELLENISATION VIA ***ZIO-JOO***-PORN-DRUGS-***CONTRA NATURAM*** LIFE STANCES-HOMO-POOFTA-LEZZO-TRANZ-FUCK-STERILE-ABORT-FUCK-SLUT-SELF-RACIST-EXOTICISM-APE-MONKEY-***ZIO***-KOST-WORSHIP had shown its results from circa 2000 / 2010 until today.

[107] Just as quickly as such cultural homogenisation came into being post-***ZIO***-WW2, just as quickly has it disappeared from sight today, i.e. in the 25+ years after P.K.'s death in 1998, as the ***ZIO-JOO-ZIO***-USA-IMPERIALIST-ANTI-CHRIST-SATANISTS impose COMPLETE ***ZIO-JOO***-MONKEY-APE-OTHER-***ZIO***-KOST-FREAK SHOW-HOMO-POOFTA-LEZZO-TRANZ-STERILE-FUCK-ABORT-SLUT-PORN-DRUGS-SELF-RACIST-EXOTICISM-***JOO***-DAS-ANTI-CHRIST-WORSHIP ON WHATEVER FULL-SPECTRUM-***ZIO***-LOBOTOMISED-***ZIO***-BRAIN-WASHED ***KOPROS*** / EXCREMENT HAS REMAINED IN "GREECE".

apart from the rapid spreading of Kitsch. This [[kind of Greek popular]] song enjoyed tremendous success [[with Greeks inside and outside of Greece[108]]], and indeed in the decades which were crucial for the social turning point, critical juncture, crossroads which we are examining here, precisely because it moved on a scale so broad that it could address simultaneously all the strata of a society[109] which was just leaving behind it the patriarchal demarcations and was entering the melting pot of a [[social]] mobility which was unprecedented and unheard-of until then — that is to say, of a society which was seeking great equalising common denominators. In this sense, the "popular" [[Greek]] song in Greece, starting with the narrating of the woes of the drug-addict, stoner, pothead[110], and ending in the musical accompaniment for / musicalisation of high poetry[111], greatly contributed to the catalysis, i.e. breaking up / down of the old basic distinction between "bourgeois" or "learned, lettered, scholarly, erudite" and "popular" culture, and did something which, as we shall see below (ch. IV, 5), the theoreticians of post-modern culture[112] consider to be optative, desirable, hoped-for. We must, nonetheless, add that inside of this process, the concept "popular / of the people" essentially was/became disconnected from the concept "peasant, agricultural"[113], in order to be connected mainly with the way of looking at things and the tastes of the lower

---

[108] Krazy Man still listens mostly to this kind of song, even though I also listen to lots of other kinds of demotic Greek songs, Church-related "singing" as well as opera, lieder etc..

[109] All the related major record companies / labels, including from before ***ZIO***-WW2, Columbia, His Master's Voice / EMI, Capitol, Odeon, Philips etc. etc. etc. were / are all under up to TOTAL AND ABSOLUTE ***ZIO-JOO***-CONTROL (**KONTROL**), even for the Greek popular song.

[110] See footnote 109 !!! Wherever ***JOOZ*** can control minds with DRUGZ, they'll promote that.

[111] Theodorakis, Hatzidakis, Xarhakos, Markopoulos et al..

[112] I.e. **JOOZ** and their ZOMBEE-tools.

[113] This is key. Having lost one's peasant-agricultural base (which many non-Western countries today still keep alive), and given the centralising of economic-political-cultural power in the hands of ***JOOZ*** and their ***ZIO-***ANGLO-ET AL.-***JOO***-IMPERIALIST-ANTI-CHRIST-SATANIST allies, and absent a **radicalising of Tradition** as in the case of communist regimes, Iran or in its on-going variants in e.g. India and Russia etc., then for a country like "Greece", there goes Jesus, there goes Tradition, there goes racial and cultural Continuity (including as Myth), there goes everything, HERE COMES ***JOO***-DAS, HERE COMES THE ANTI-CHRIST, HERE COMES ***ZIO-JOO***-DAS-SATAN AND ***ZIO-JOO***-SATANISM, HERE COMES THE TOXIC-FEMINO-STERILE-FUCK-ABORT-SLUT, HERE COMES THE HOMO-TRANZ-LEZZO-POOFTER, HERE COMES THE PORN, HERE COME THE DRUGZ, HERE COMES THE MONKEY, HERE COMES THE BOING-BOING-BOING-APE, HERE COMES SELF-RACIST EXOTICISM, HERE COMES **SELF-ETHNIC CLEANSING**. HERE COMES **SELF-GENOCIDE**. OVER. DEAD. ***ZIO.***

strata of cities, which were able to achieve their conversion into strata of contemporary, modern consumers in the same way that the zeibekiko [[dance]] became the "syrtaki" [[dance]] or the shanty / opium den a "bar"[114].

The social rearrangements, realignments, upheavals of recent decades [[up to circa 1990]] generally reinforced the country [[of Greece]] as a country of small-scale owners and of the petty-bourgeoisie. But this reinforcement took place on the basis of totally new consumer(ist) habits which were not covered by the existent productive potential. Precisely because affluence, prosperity was, in (this) its essential sense, precarious, the patron-client system was made obligatory / extended instead of shrinking as a result of the retreat of patriarchism / patriarchy at the social level. That is to say: the voter gave his vote primarily expecting from a political-party faction that it will secure him/her his/her level of consumption and or it would raise it over the short term, irrespective of the economic means. This new criterion and the related conversion / transformation of a large part of the formerly "destitute, indigent, needy" into demanding and often overweening, arrogant consumers had as a consequence the partial at least change of the conditions under which the patron-client system functioned. As the direct patriarchal dependence of the old form retreated before the rise in the standard of living and also before the equally significant rise of social mobility, now, the dependence of the political parties on their voters gradually, slowly-slowly, grew, that is, the patron-client relation in part was reversed. The political parties —as organisms with their own self-contained, self-sufficient, independent interests and with their main concern being the occupation of the state and the distribution / allocation of higher state positions (of public office) to their rather impatient ((top) executive) members— were obliged to compete against one another in the adoption and the defence, championing of any demands whatsoever from

[114] See footnotes 105 to 107, above.

wheresoever they came. In the circumstances and conditions of the differentiated domestic (i.e. within Greece) (monstrous, freakish, odious, horrendous, abortive) mass democracy, the appointment of "(those who are like) our own selves", whose indigence, pauperism, neediness made them feel gratitude, gratefulness for the favour (of being appointed to a position of public office), did not suffice anymore; apart from the appointment, apart from the giving of a loan [[to them]], apart from the mediation, the patron-client game had to now be played at the level of not only the "branches", but also of the "masses", at the level of pseudo-ideological demagogy with the succour of the newly appearing means of mass information, updating[115]*; populism, which is endemic in every modern, contemporary mass democracy (see ch. IV, 2), was fused and merged with the long-established, traditionary, traditional, handed-down by fathers and grand-fathers social and psychological features of the domestic (i.e. within Greece) patron-client system, and thus a situation arose, in which demagogy was unavoidable precisely because those to whom it was addressed desired it, believing that if they take it at its nominal / face value, they would be able to use it as a payable promissory note / bill of exchange. Since the patron-client needs had to now be satisfied at a consumer level higher than the productive possibilities of the country [[of Greece]], the specific, concrete function(ing) of the Greek political system, which, as we have seen, was from the beginning anti-economical, ended up constituting the basic level in national economic and social development — indeed something above that: it became the conduit for the selling off / divestiture of the country with the only quid pro quo being its (i.e. the said Greek political system's) own perpetuation, namely its possibility of proceeding to material provisions, allowances, supplies, taking [[in return]] provisions, supplies of a vote / votes. Even the simplest of thoughts and knowledge also reveals that national development can occur only with the*

[115] E.g. privately owned and directly or indirectly totally and absolutely ***ZIO***-CONTROLLED (**KONTROL**) "Greek" TV channels from circa 1990 onwards.

increase of productive investment(s), that is to say, with the analogous, commensurate restriction and limitation of consumption, especially when the country does not produce, but imports the consumer goods, and in order to import them, it borrows money, namely it assigns and cedes the decisions for its future to its loan-givers, lenders[116]*. The road, path of development is the road, path of accumulation, of intensive labour and of the at least temporary (partial) (de)privation, hardship, going without, whilst the road, path of (short-term only) prosperity, affluence is the road, path of parasitism and of the selling off of the country. This harsh, hard-edged, unsparing economic truth applies regardless of the social and ethical problem of the distribution of the loads, burdens, weights and of the hierarchisation of the deprivations. As harsh, hard-edged, unsparing, however, as it is, the political and psychological needs which repel, repulse it are even more powerful. Broad masses, who for the first time in the history of the place, locus (i.e. Greece) "oiled their intestine, i.e. ate their fill" and furthermore obtained the intoxicating, heady feeling of the sovereign, ruling ascendant, overlord and of the refined consumer, will always deny becoming conscious of it (i.e. the said harsh economic truth), just as political parties, whose first concern was, is and will be the distribution of governmental power for the sake of their ambitious and (self-)complacent, smug, self-important, self-satisfied (executive) members, will also deny to blurt it out and make it the criterion of their acts; the position of "the Left" presents as particularly tragicomic from this point of view, which, being as it were condemned to defend "popular" demands (the demands of the people), is obliged to become the standard-bearer of every consumer demand as long as whoever puts it forward gives himself / herself the title of "the people" — he / she is obliged, namely, as*

[116] I.e. to Jews. It's quite obvious in this passage that if Greece were ever to have been a relatively independent nation of the Greeks and not a totally dependent MONKEY-STATE of ***KOPROS*** / EXCREMENT, it would have ***radicalised its tradition*** on a sovereign, tyrannical-dictatorial and non-voting basis outside of the forms of political organisation which ineluctably lead to suicidal-self-genocidal dependence on Jews, first primarily via ***ZIO***-Great Britain, and then via ***ZIO***-USA.

a matter of fact, objectively, to promote the selling off and divestiture of the country as long the "people" ask(s)/call(s) for this selling off. There exists, nevertheless, one more reason as well for which such a simple truth is stubbornly and spitefully buried under a myriad of rationalising contrivances, inventions. A people, –who under the long-lived, long-standing and deep influence of Helleno-centric drivel, nonsense has learnt to consider itself as a "chosen by God" genos / people and as the salt of the earth–, refuses to put in its mind / denies thinking that it itself can do something so humiliating as selling off its locus, place, country, fatherland, motherland in order to consume more. Thus, a psychological stance was created which only minimally differs from collective schizophrenia[117]. In their great majority, today's Greeks[118] with their everyday act(s) do anything / whatsoever they can to adjust as far as possible more quickly and better to the circumstances, conditions of parasitic(al) consumption (and this includes any activity whatsoever which has as its final consequence the widening and expansion of the chasm between everything / all that is produced and everything / all that is consumed), whilst simultaneously they (i.e. today's Greeks) remain ideologically stuck to a "touch-me-not, touchy, think-skinned" nationalism, which makes even all those who work directly on account of foreigners or who barely survive, scrape by indirectly from them (i.e. foreigners) to verbally attack, hit out at, assail, inveigh/speak out against them. Nonetheless, it is something above / much more than doubtful if the same (Greeks) would be willing to shoulder the practical consequences of this nationalism as it concerns the performance of labour[119] and the height / level of consumption[120]. The same schizophrenia governs the behaviour of the political

[117] This collective schizophrenia has today reached the point of parroting ***anything*** Jews tell the KOPROS / EXCREMENT in "Greece" to parrot.
[118] I.e. circa 1990, when Greeks, who were immeasurably much more than today at least partly like Greeks, still existed, albeit in a small minority.
[119] I.e. labour productivity.
[120] Nationalism as it is used scientifically is neither "good" nor "bad", and it does not necessarily mean an imperialistic-racialistic-hierarchical nationalism (that depends on situational-contextual use). Nationalism simply means putting national concerns of a nation first and definitely not e.g. in subservience to hyper-nationalistic, hyper-imperialistic Jews.

parties too, which outbid one another in nationalistic rhetoric at the same time (moment) they sell off the state mechanism and the state more generally in order to satisfy the consumer demands of their voters.

The above does not constitute either satire or an accusation, but the description of the historical, social and psychological tailpiece, ending, conclusion, last word of the processes which the function(ing) of the parliamentary game and of patron-client politics[121] *inside of the specific, concrete conditions, circumstances of the modern Greek state and nation set in motion. Today's crystal-clear crisis is not located only in the fact that the political-party selling off and divestiture of the state mechanism, although it has passed to the stage of the permanent selling off and divestiture of the country, has gone past / surpassed / exceeded the limits of economic endurance, durability, that is to say that patron-client politics proceeded as its [[own]] self-destruction and is obliged itself to put limits on itself so that it can have the possibility of continuing in the future. Moreover, the crisis embraces the fundamental ideologemes upon which the nation rested and supported and propped up its self-consciousness, and especially the ideologeme of Helleno-centrism. The Helleno-Christian version of Helleno-centrism found its final systematic political use/usage as the ideological weapon of the anti-communist(ic) camp in the epoch/times of the civil war [[(1942-)1944-1949]]*[122]*, but also thereafter, when namely the country lived under the consequences of the civil war, one of which – in the final analysis – was the dictatorship*[123] *as well. Its (i.e. The Helleno-Christian version of Helleno-*

[121] The Jews and their Zombies like to call the parliamentary game and patron-client politics "dimokrasi", for obvious ideological reasons pertaining to their total ***ZIO-JOO***-ANTI-CHRIST-***GREAT SATAN***-IMPERIALISTIC RULE.

[122] The Greek communist camp of the time was generally (not always) national-liberationist and ethno-patriotic as was the communist movement in general, and had nothing to do with the "Left" ***KOPROS*** / EXCREMENT of HOMO-POOFTA-LEZZO-TRANZ-ABORT-STERILE-FUCK-SLUT-MONKEY-APE-SELF-RACIST-EXTOCISM-DRUGS-PORN-***ZIO***-TOTAL FILTH-SHIT-SKATA-EXCREMENT-KOST-WORSHIP of today.

[123] The ***ZIO-JOO***(-SATAN STATE-***ZIO-JOO***-SSINGER)-controlled military junta of 1967-1974, which ***ZIO-JOO***-gave northern Cyprus to Turkey in the ***JOOZ*** dealings with Turkey.

centrism's) such political use brought about its serious weakening, when, on the one hand, a generation essentially alien to the civil war cast of mind was nourished and nurtured, grew up (even if it went over to and joined one of the two civil war factions[124]) and when, on the other hand, the entry [[into Greece]] and the spreading of consumerism and related emancipatory and hedonistic ideologemes / ideologems (see ch. IV, 2-4) took away / removed social precedence from the given, handed-down / surrendered patriarchal perceptions and stances. The gap, void on the front of Helleno-centrism was covered in part by other versions of it (i.e. Helleno-centrism), which tried to combine motives both of ancient as well as the Helleno-orthodox tradition with the anti-alienating proclamations of the cultural revolution of the 1960s and 1970s. These versions exercised some influence, particularly on young people, youth, because the rapid consumerist de-Hellenisation, but also external threats[125], pressingly, compellingly posed the problem of national identity[126]. Despite all that, the main current of development pulled (itself) towards the direction of the blunting or relaxing of all ideological contours. Of course, Helleno-centrism survived, and it will survive for a lot longer[127], since psychologically it constitutes a fundamental defensive and hyper-substitutionary / surrogate / vicarious mechanism of a nation which produces a bear minimum of its own things / stuff / goods in the sector of intellectual-spiritual and material production, so as to offset and counterbalance without wounds everything that invades [[Greece]] daily from the outside, conquering its (i.e. Helleno-centrism's) own space / area / realm. But it will survive without, constituted in

---

[124] Non-communist or communist.

[125] Not just from Turkey !!! ***HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA !!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!***

[126] E.g. albums were released circa 1970 by the "Greek Left", incl. by Theodorakis and one still alive and active stupid-fucking bitch ***ZIO-JOO***-GREAT WHORE-woe-man composer and another still alive and active stupid-fucking bitch ***ZIO-JOO***-GREAT WHORE-woe-man singer, amongst others, whose lyrics and stances today are considered by the excrement / **KOPROS** that has remained in "Greece", including the two said stupid-fucking bitch ***ZIO-JOO***-GREAT WHORE-woe-men, as "fascistic".

[127] About 13% of the parties in the "Greek" parliament today (2024) have at least some Helleno-centric rhetoric, notwithstanding more than three decades of non-stop ***ZIO-JOO***-HYPER NATIONALIST / ***ZIO-JOO***-HYPER-IMPERIALIST ***ZIO***-USA-***ZIO***-EU-PROPAGANDA AND FULL-SPECTRUM-***ZIO***-LOBOTOMISATION-***ZIO-JOO-ZIO***-SATANIC CIRCUS MONKEY-***ZIO-JOO***-BRAIN-WASHING.

terms of a world view, and more generally acceptable, forms — either as a stance of national "good-looking / attractive and high-spirited bravery and valiance" and "pride", either as a folk-lore spice of (the) touristic selling-off [[of the country]][128].

The adoption and the spreading, dissemination, diffusion of central ideas and values of the cultural revolution [[of the 1960s and 1970s]] accompanied also in Greece even from before 1974, but especially after the dictatorship, the formation of a domestic, internal-to-Greece (monstrous, freakish, odious, horrendous, abortive) mass democracy, influencing to a significant extent everyday mores, morals, ways of living (cf. ch. IV, 4). Simultaneously, with the turn towards the domestic, internal variation of mass democracy, a turn, then, was carried out as well to a corresponding form of post-modernism in the sense that the relaxing, loosening and the dissolution of local ideologemes, together with the international making fluid of the clear Cold War ideological limits, bound(arie)s, borders, frontiers, provoked and brought about not only an indifference for Greek ideology more generally, but also a chaotic mixing of intellectual-spiritual products which came [[into Greece]] in greater and greater masses from the outside – in precise correspondence, after all, with the rapid increase in the importation of material consumer goods. The combination of everything with everything, which, as we shall see in this book, constitutes an essential feature of the mass-democratic way of thinking, as well as the

---

[128] Since circa 1990, the ***JOOZ*** with their ***ZIO-JOO***-ZOMBEE allies managed to combine "pride" and tourism in a mix – not of superficially ethno-centric folk-lore Kitsch which "went around" from the 1950s to the 1980s – but of ***ZIO-JOO***-TRANZ-LESBIO-HOMO-POOFTA-SOOPA-ABORT-FUCK-SLUT-GREAT WHORE-APE-MONKEY WORSHIP (with a bit of Ancient Greek museum / archaeological site tourism) which matches perfectly the EXCREMENT / KOPROS which has lived in "Greece" in recent decades. It seems as if P.K. circa 1990 underestimated how quickly and how broadly all the ***ZIO-JOO***-HOMO-LEZZO-TRANZ-EMFYLO-POOFTA-POUSTO-STERILE-FUCK-ABORT-FUCK-SLUT-BOING-BOING-BOING-MONKEY-APE-***ZIO-JOO***-DAS-TOTAL FILTH-SHIT-SKATA-EXCREMENT-KOST-WORSHIP GARBAGE would have a wholesale and overwhelming **SELF-ETHNIC CLEANSING** AND **SELF-GENOCIDAL** effect under the ***ZIO-JOO***-DAS-PROGRAMME OF A "CARTHIGINIAN PEACE" (I.E. WE GET YOOZ TO WIPE YOOZ-SELVEZ OUT OV EXISTENCE, AND DEN WE NO HAVE A "PROBLEM" WITH YOOZ ANYMORE (cf. *The Stranger*, 1946)). On the other hand, P.K.'s phrasing is so brilliant, as always, that it does not exclude at all the possibility of a rapid descent into general de-Hellenisation and ***ZIO-JOO***-MONKEY-APE-IFICATION.

hedonistic values of spontaneity and self-realisation, self-actualisation, as the cultural revolution declared them[129]*, in Greece came together in a great mix with the age-old and known-to-all domestic (internal-to-Greece) habits of intellectual-spiritual sluggishness, listlessness, being a smart-arse and sciolism, semi-education, "half-learning" ignorance; this hodgepodge, mishmash, jumble, muddle, tangle, assemblage, medley, consequently, was the natural and convenient entry of post-modernism into a place, locus, country where the bourgeois work ethic is essentially unknown, not only in the sector of material production, but also in the sector of the spirit-intellect, where scientific traditions were not formed with consistency and (with regard to) long-lived, viable bearers, and where the mimes (i.e. mime artists), mimics and the clowns are represented in numbers / percentages particularly high in the circles of intellectuals, in universities and in the mass means of information and updating (i.e. the mass media). Whatever the case may be, such an entry of post-modernism into Greek conditions and circumstances constitutes the completing, and in part the climax of the crisis of all the fundamental data of Greek national life. The selling off and divestiture of the nation in the material sense will be accompanied by its full, complete intellectual-spiritual sterility too if the post-modern hodgepodge, mishmash, jumble, muddle, tangle, assemblage, medley of everything with everything is realised exclusively as a hodgepodge, mishmash, jumble, muddle, tangle, assemblage, medley between badly digested loan(-like) elements, and if the wear and tear, decay of the Greek, or in any case, Hellenised, ideologemes end(s) up, furthermore, in the shrinkage or instrumentalisation of the [[Greek]] language such that the only product which —precisely because of the unique dynamic/potential of a many-layered and age-old, ancient, old-as-the-hills language— cannot be produced in the modern Greek realm, space, area anymore, which has been produced until now in high*

[129] All under FULL-SPECTRUM ***ZIO-JOO***-LOBOTOMISATION-***ZIO-JOO***-BRAIN-WASHING-***ZIO-JOO***-PSYCHO-OP-***ZIO-JOO***-STIMULUS-REACTION-CONTROL (**KONTROL**).

quality: poetry[130]*. Opposite / Across from all of these phenomena, one could try, taste, sample and feel pain, anguish, affliction, feeling oneself to be suspended and hovering and without national roots, or one can consider it all as unimportant, insignificant, believing that the fatherland/motherland of man / humans, especially today, is the world, and that the food, feed, nourishment, sustenance which one place cannot give him, another place will supply him with*[131]*. Whichever personal stance one may choose, the fact is that modern Greek history, as we came to know it for the last two hundred years*[132]*, has closed its circle, i.e. has come full circle. Certainly, its tragic and comical episodes have not ended yet, however the unity of the examination of the problem is lost, as well as its (i.e. Greek history's) distinctive, specific, distinguishing character. Greece is being incorporated, included, integrated in a very low position in the system of the international division, apportionment of material and intellectual-spiritual labour. Her (i.e. Greece's) post-modernism consists in (the fact) that it constitutes a narrow and seclusive, sidelined, on-the-sidelines strip on the broad spectrum of the post-modernism of others*[133]*.*

[130] That's already happened.

[131] As lizzard-***ZIO-JOOZ*** do, legally and on-the-surface "belonging to all nationalities", but as ORGANISED CRIMINAL-ULTRA-CONSPIRATORIAL-PRIMITIVE SECRET SOCIETY-SAVAGE TRIBE-RAT-TUNNEL-INCESTUAL-IN-BRED-SICK-FUCKING-CRAZY-PSYCHO-PATH-BLOOD-SUCKING-LIZZARD-RODENT-PARASITE VERMIN are only really ever "MASTER RACE, CHOSEN, SPECIAL, EXCEPTIONAL, ROOL-DA-WORLD" VOMIT-EXCREMENT-MONKEY-***ZIO-JOO***-DAS-ANTI-CHRIST-***GREAT SATAN-ZIO-JOOZ***.

[132] Since the second half of the 18th century until c. 1990.

[133] P.K. does not even discuss the thought of Greece radicalising its tradition outside of ***ZIO***-"Western" power structures, i.e. of "doing a Greek-version of Persia-Iran (or of North Korea / Vietnam / Cuba)", because we were never demographically and in terms of state organisation, militarily, economically and culturally in a position to do so, and within ***ZIO***-"Western" power structures, we are nothing more than already expendable **KOPROS** / EXCREMENT, i.e. OVER. DEAD. ***ZIO.***

I. Fundamental concepts and thought figures / basic schemata of thought (Grundlegende Begriffe und Denkfiguren / ΘΕΜΕΛΙΩΔΕΙΣ ΕΝΝΟΙΕΣ ΚΑΙ ΒΑΣΙΚΑ ΣΧΗΜΑΤΑ ΣΚΕΨΗΣ)

The concepts of the modern (modernity) and of the post-modern (post-modernity) have for two decades [[until 1991]] been (found) at the centre / focal point / middle of an international debate/discussion, which began in regard to questions and problems of the history of literature[134] and aesthetic questions and problems, in order to then go/pass over into the philosophical (realm, sphere) / to philosophical matters and raise more fundamental problems. Philosophers as a rule feel / sense / are conscious of / apprehend atmospheric changes and new question formulations with some delay, but as soon as they step into and intervene in an already running, on-going debate/discussion, they make the claim connected with the dignity and grandeur (and high vocation) of their (high) office / post / position of putting in order and classifying the matter about which there is much talk (ado) / at hand / under discussion/debate in their categories, and of retaining the final word with the invocation of / by invoking the supposed higher status of the(se) same (categories)[135]; in any case, their participation in originally non-philosophical debates/discussions bear witness to the symptomatic character / central importance/significance of these latter (non-philosophical debates) – also (then) or even above all (then) when the main motive for this participation is the all-too-human, yet in the age of mass media, almost irresistible wish to remain active in the great business / deal / transaction / affair[136] of the intellect(-spirit). Now the debates/discussions from the point of view of the observer standing on the outside / external observer often say something less about the on each and every respective occasion controversial, contentious matter than about the debaters themselves, and indeed not merely about their sympathies and antipathies, but – over and above that – the world-theoretical (i.e. pertaining to a world view or world views) and social-political

[134] Krazy man recalls that circa 1990 in a ***ZIO***-ANGLO-***JOO*** "university" it was said dat da tork about "post-modernism" started in ***ZIO-JOO***-DAS-YALE circa 1974 in relation to "literature" …

[135] ***AAAA-HAHAHAHAHAHAHA !!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!*** P.K. had no time whatsoever for his contemporary, living "philosophers".

[136] I.e. totally and absolutely ***ZIO-JOO***-controlled (**KONTROL**).

currents stuck, lodged, embedded behind them (i.e. the said sympathies and antipathies)[137]. What in the debate/discussion passes off / poses as / appears as the conscious knowledge of a reality turns out / reveals itself to be, then, (as) an unconscious or half-conscious aspect of the reality concerned, whose meaning can be inferred / detected / opened up / revealed through its translation into another language[138]. This translation can, of course, for its part only (then) succeed when the reality coming into question / of interest in every case is seen inside of a broader perspective and is interpreted with the help of a more subtle conceptual set of instruments so that in the image / picture of the reality coming into being from that (process), that reality of interest / reality coming into question can be included/incorporated/integrated and made understandable / be explained; [[i.e. it is / becomes]] what it otherwise wants to be the interpretation of reality / and whatever it wants, be presented as the explanation of reality[139].

One would not go wrong / make an error if one, with the use of / using Marxist terminology, wanted to assert/claim that the debate/discussion regarding / over the modern / modernity and the post-modern / post-modernity was / became / has been – unavoidably / inevitably – ideological. With that, not least of all (what) is meant (is) that the, in the course of this, descriptions undertaken (of the state of things/affairs) were moulded, shaped, formed by the blows of / were marked in a telling manner by statements which directly or indirectly refer to the manner (as to) how their creators / originators participate or would like to participate in the state of affairs described by them[140]; certainly / admittedly, this (ideational) participation takes place / occurs not through the naming of one's

[137] I.e. the whole lot of them are full-spectrum ***ZIO***-LOBOTOMISED ZOMBEEZ or ***ZIO-JOO***-STOOGEZ, without exception.
[138] I.e. all ***ZIO-JOO***-CLAP-TRAP-BULLSHIT IDEOLOGIES need to be "unpacked" and exposed for what they really are : ***ZIO-JOO***-ANTI-CHRIST-***GREAT SATAN*** PROPAGANDA.
[139] Even scientific observation is a form of perspective-based interpretation / description and or explanation, which engages in polemics against other perspective-based interpretations, descriptions and or explanations.
[140] I.e. Jews talking to Jews about Jews, along with some non-Jew ***ZIO-JOO***-ZOMBEEZ.

own name[141], but through the setting up and establishment of normative positions, whose defence each and every respective person concerned has undertaken. The(se) normative positions in which the perceptions and views and wishes of each and every respective subject are reflected and find expression and manifest themselves via its own value, importance and its own role, that is, in the final analysis, its own power claims, soak, saturate, steep, impregnate, fill, imbue, understandably, the apprehension and the presentation of the state of affairs itself. Thus, one counterposed the modern / modernity and the post-modern / post-modernity as concepts of epochs, each of which was connected with specific values and un-values, i.e. disvalues, non-values, anti-values (Werten und Unwerten): what for the defenders and the proponents of the modern / modernity was the universal claim of Reason for the conduct of human kinds of acting, actions and acts and matters of concern, meant for the advocate, champion of the post-modern / post-modernity, open and latent totalitarianism; and what for these latter (advocates of the post-modern) was the welcome ascertainment of the relativity of standpoints as the foundation of tolerance and humanity[142], stood, for the former (defenders of the modern), under the suspicion of nihilism or anarchy[143]. The dispute, quarrel as to whether the modern / modernity has come to its end or not had to, hence, revolve around the question and problem of the liveliness or capacity/capability for survival of the assigned, attributed to it values (or un-values, disvalues, non-values, anti-

[141] ***AAAAA-HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA !!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!*** ***ZIO-JOO***-LIZZARD TIME !!! ***AAAAA-HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA !!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!***

[142] A relativity of standpoints and values has absolutely nothing to do with tolerance per se. Tolerance is never absolute in any society and is always subject to the constraints imposed by the correlation of forces, whereas humanity has no concrete existence whatsoever as a political collective, but only notionally as a rhetorical device.

[143] In other words, Jews controlled and control (**KONTROL**) both sides of the "debate" and had / have the "debate" running simultaneously in favour of ***ZIO***-USA-***GREAT SATAN*** IMPERIALISM, using either side or both sides whenever it suited / suits them, e.g. "Human Rights" in conjunction with "Multi-Culturalism", when, strictly speaking (and not in terms of their ideological ***JOO***-BALL ***ZIO-JOO***-BULLSHIT use), both are in absolute opposition to each other. Multi-culturalism, stricto sensu, means every culture has its own autonomy and sovereignty, which ***per definitionem*** precludes the "universality" of "Human Rights". Nihilism cannot be a practical programme of action because all human-societal-political action is normative, nor can there be a society where there is no Social Order, Social Coherence or Social Discipline whatsoever.

values). The epochal perception of values constituted, with that, the reverse side of the value-related perception of the epochs – and the schematisation or even the high/elaborate-stylisation of the epochal / the dithyrambic projection of an epoch served in its value-related nature or axiological texture / nature as a bearer of values (Werthaftigkeit), –as it is normal in the new-times history of ideas already since the first demarcation and delimitation of the "dark times" of the Middle Ages against, on the one hand, antiquity, and on the other hand, the Renaissance[144]–, for the underpinning, corroboration and support of the (double, dual) wish of normatively-minded theoreticians; to know and be certain of [[things]] in agreement with the moving / motive forces of history, and consequently, to make out of their own (subjective) power claim(s) an objective command / objective commands.

Certainly, the references to the historical course [[of human affairs]] / course of history do not, in the process, go any further than this appears to be necessary in order to, after a fashion / more or less, give satisfaction to / satisfy the above-mentioned wish; however, historical, sociological and world-theoretical or ideological-critical (i.e. critique of ideology) analysis never penetrates so deeply that, through that / accordingly, its own normative preferences could be relativised or even shaken[145]. The followers, supporters, adherents, devotees of the modern / modernity do not pursue in all / with every/complete consistency the historical roots and preconditions/prerequisites of belief/faith in Reason, and hence, they do not even pose the question as to what value such a belief/faith can have after the end of the bourgeois age/era[146]; they seem to hold / nurture the conviction that Reason in the specific new-times-universalistic sense of the word could sooner or later obtain / gain / attain the status of a quasi-

[144] To the scientific historian of history as science there is absolutely no reason whatsoever to view "the Middle Ages" as "bad" and antiquity and the Renaissance, for instance, as "good", and vice versa.
[145] As such analysis should, if it wanted to be consistently scientific.
[146] In 2024 "these kind of people" hardly exist at all, but did have their "Last Hurrah" until circa 1990, notwithstanding that ***ZIO***-USA still advocates universalistic Human Rights today, albeit connecting it with content deemed unspeakable even circa 1945, let alone circa 1776 / 1789.

anthropological constant and generate, constitute, make up a fixed, firm, stable, unambiguous (with only one meaning) interpretable authority for the arbitration and settlement, reconciliation of all conflicts, through which it (i.e. Reason) would survive the decline (downfall, ruin, extinction) of all those social strata whose historical rise and victory it – as a slogan / watchword – had demonstrably accompanied. The difficulties increase when the defenders, advocates, upholders of the concept of Reason (in respect) of the modern / modernity want to behave and act like / appear as "progressives" in the post-bourgeois sense, and are not ready, prepared, willing to identify socially with the bourgeoisie and politically with the classical teaching, doctrine, theory of liberalism, but on the contrary attempt to re-interpret liberalism in the mass-democratic sense. Such a frail / fragile undertaking must constantly entail ambiguities, thus e.g. when that which one in the bourgeois-liberal context called discussion or discourse, is (now) transformed and converted into "communication" – a word / term which inside of mass-democratic culture does not have to necessarily be understood in the sense of an act of "Reason", but is connected with all kinds of exoticisms and mysticisms. But also the heralds, harbingers of post-modern values, who suspect Reason of totalitarian universalisms, do not want to rightly see that their supposedly playful-humane scepticism cannot constitute any foundation for the regulation of human living together, co-habitation, co-existence in general and as such, but represents and constitutes an ideologically sublimated / idealised projection of positionings and mentalities which for mass-consuming and permissive mass democracy are characteristic – from apolitical hedonism up to resigned indifference and to an intellectual carnival license / fool's licence (i.e. getting off scot-free or being soft and easy with regard to every discourse and thought). It is / ought to be assumed that most "post-modernists", who want to pass off / present their positions as a socially desirable ideal and as an ideal befitting humans / in accordance with human dignity, neither recognise these interrelations up to their

ultimate/final consequence(s), nor would they want to identify in toto with that society whose unhindered, unobstructed, albeit in much / many things contradictory functioning, generates, causes, brings about, gives rise, spreads, disseminates – and needs such outlooks and points of view[147]. The question is not whether in abstracto "anything goes" and whether the plurality of opinions and modes of behaviour / ways of acting, action and the act have a pleasant / soothing effect for "society" and for "men, humans"[148], but under which concrete circumstances/conditions such a belief/faith flourishes/thrives and with/to which thought style / style or way of thought it corresponds. Because it applies only under certain circumstances, conditions – something which, by the way, "post-modernists" themselves silently, tacitly concede, admit, confess in so far as they take as the basis of their thoughts and considerations precisely the ruling, dominant relations, circumstances, situation in (today's) Western societies without keeping in mind / thinking about times of crisis, historical upheavals / turning points, deep-rooted and radical changes and emergencies (cases/states of emergency)[149]. This political simple-mindedness, naivety, they share, despite all of the other/remaining differences, variety/varieties of opinion, with the liberal or democratic[150] advocates, champions of the modern / modernity / the modern epoch. They do indeed see through the possible, potential aggressivity of the claims of Reason; yet in their endeavours, efforts, aims, desires to eradicate, uproot, root/stamp out (along) with the universality of demanding Reason / universal claims of Reason, aggressivity too, they cannot bring themselves to understand / have insight (into the fact) that aggressivity

[147] In practice, there is no such thing as "we tolerate everything", because that would mean a potential at least threat to those in power.
[148] Jews and their ***ZIO***-ANGLO-GALLO-GERMANO-***JOO***-ALLIES want everyone on drugs, on porn, on sterile abort-contraceptive fuck-slut and or homo-poofta-lezzo-tranz-fucking, TOTALLY ***ZIO-JOO***-BRAIN-WASHED and on orgies of self-racist ape-monkey-worship exoticisms and ***ZIO-JOO***-DAS-TOTAL FILTH-SHIT-SKATA-EXCREMENT-KOST-WORSHIP-autistic mysticisms.
[149] This is so typical of the short-sightedness of sick-fucking-crazy-psycho-path-autistic-incestual-in-bred-organised criminal-hyper-conspiratorial-rat-tunnel-primitive secret society-savage-tribe Jews, drunkard Anglo-Saxons, German Pigs and Silly, Stupid Frogs.
[150] As actors understand themselves as "liberals" or "democrats", and not in the scientific sense.

preceded Reason in human history; that is why Reason does not constitute the source of aggressivity, but only one of its possible weapons.

The ideological character of the constructions of the modern / modernity and the post-modern / post-modernity becomes / is visible / apparent in the light of the elementary ascertainment pertaining to the history of ideas that the holistic and atomistic way of looking at things, “identity” and “difference”, the dreams of the unity of Reason and relativising / relativistic scepticism have existed from the beginning [[of the history of ideas]], and were reciprocally / mutually determined in the womb of new-times rationalism (next to one another); precisely because of that, can both constructions be projected almost at will upon the past (pertaining to the history of ideas), something which is also done when this appears to be expedient for reasons of legitimation (of a thesis / position). That is why in this fictivity i.e. fictionality, fictiveness and arbitrariness, randomness of theirs, the words, statements, paroles about the modern / modernity and the post-modern / post-modernity may / should not be taken at their nominal, i.e. face value. They are the symptoms of certain developments rather than their diagnoses – and the aim, objective of this work [[i.e. P.K.’s book]] is to demonstrate, point out and analyse exactly the developments whose symptoms they are. In the symptom of a development, nonetheless, an aspect and or (possibly/potentially) a decisive feature of the development itself in question hides / is (lodged, embedded) in a rudimentary or distorted, contorted form. In this respect/sense, it is advisable to start with the / certain symptoms of a development or else talk about it / like statements about it (i.e. the said development), in order to then remove / takes off its/their ideological makeup/paint to venture/penetrate into the real form of the development, namely, the objective sense / meaning of the talk (on that

development)[151]. The fact that today's familiar/common and (melodramatic) epochal high/elaborate-stylisation of the modern / modernity and of the post-modern / post-modernity are not correct/valid in terms of social history and in terms of the history of ideas, does not yet/necessarily mean that the with it connected feeling of an epochal (great) upheaval, deep-rooted/radical change (which took us from one epoch to another) as such is deceiving, fooling, deluding [[us]]. The question/problem is only where this (great) upheaval, deep-rooted/radical change began/(ought to have begun/be placed), what it consists in and what it (has) brought about. Periodisations with ideological-normative intent are not accordingly false/wrong because every periodisation must be/is necessarily false/wrong, but because of the fact that they are conceived and designed in such a manner that they can legitimise the power claims of their authors, originators, creators in the aforementioned sense. Appropriate, valid, well-founded, well-grounded periodisations must, for their part, take as their basis not normative-content-related (criteria), but form-related/formal-structural criteria; not thought content(s), but thought figures should be compared with one another and be looked at and regarded/considered in their succession. From this standpoint, the of necessity normatively loaded / charged concept of Reason e.g. has no central meaning, whereas conversely, forms of the ideational move / come to the fore / into the foreground, which are comprehensive, overlapping, overarching (and straddle / bestride the boundaries of the in part / individual sectors); they are, therefore, able to be recognised again in completely different content(s) and branches of intellectual(-spiritual) creation, but also of the rest of social life. In this way, research does not orientate itself anymore towards the self-understanding of the intellectuals, which is the inspiration for the setting up, erection, formation, creation of their epochal constructions, but has before

[151] As much as the ***ZIO-JOO-***RODENT-PARASITE-LIZZARDS try to "lizzard their way" around us and everything, they'll never do it to P.K. or me. We are not their ***ZIO-JOO***-ZOMBEEZ, even though our Tribe is dead.

its eyes (i.e. keeps in mind) a much broader spectrum in which the self-understanding of the intellectuals is included as the object, not as the organ of knowledge[152]. The fertility / fruitfulness of this mode of proceeding is confirmed by means of the proof/evidence/ascertainment that there is an accurate/exact structural correspondence between the central thought figure, which encompasses, in diverse variations, all the areas/sectors of the ideational, and the determinative, fundamental phenomena and tendencies in the economy and society[153]. Only the proof/evidence/verification/ascertainment of such a correspondence enables / makes possible a valid, well-grounded, well-founded, cogent, sound periodisation; if it (the said ascertainment) is not sought and not produced/furnished/adduced, then the periodisations remain empty (blank, void, vacant, bare), at least to the extent that they are supposed to comprehend the character of whole/entire historical epochs, and not merely the development in partial areas/sectors.

We want to here support and found the perception and view, opinion that the examination of the problem of the modern / modernity and the post-modern / post-modernity – both in their social and political, as well as in their cultural aspect – can be best illuminated against the background of the decline of the bourgeois thought form and life form, as well as the transition from liberalism to mass democracy[154]. A double mistake/error, namely the misjudgement, underestimation, misapprehension of the specifically bourgeois roots and

[152] What have we been saying all along about ideal types including actors' own self-understanding and ideological views of the world, without those kinds of self-understanding and ideological views of the actors being the way to scientifically understand the world?

[153] Society, i.e. the social, encompasses the economy, i.e. the economic, as well as the political and the cultural / ideological. The Marxist economic basis-ideological superstructure model is not totally wrong everywhere and on all points (and especially macro-historically is of definite at least in part scientific use), but is clearly insufficient as the fundamental starting point and modus procedendi for the scientific understanding of societies and human affairs.

[154] Scientifically, liberalism has absolutely nothing to do with ***ZIO-JOO***-mass democratic ANTI-CHRIST-***ZIO-JOO***-DAS-***GREAT SATAN*** mass degeneracy. Liberalism refers *grosso modo* to the ideal type of the European bourgeois liberal from circa the (post-)Renaissance until circa 1900, who as a type had by no means totally shed his patriarchal, oikos-based, Christian and ascetic, economising characteristics, even though dandy-like and other hedonistic degeneracy was definitely within the margins of his behaviour, especially in the nineteenth century.

features, traits of the concept of Reason and the lack of insight into the meaning and significance of the decline of the bourgeois life form and of classical liberalism for the future of this same concept, led the advocates and champions of the modern / modernity to the paradox of recommending bourgeois-liberal ideals and procedures, methods, processes, but without the bourgeoisie and (classical) liberalism, as the panacea for the problems of mass democracy. The reverse(d) double mistake, namely the misjudgement, underestimation, misapprehension of the concrete mass-democratic origin(s) and character of pluralism, as well as the lack of insight into the unsolvable, inextricable interweaving of the "good" and "bad" aspects of the consuming and permissive mass society[155], enticed, tempted, misled, again, the heralds and preachers of the post-modern / post-modernity (to lapse) into a contradiction, precisely in the name of relativising scepticism, of launching into a highly unhistorical song of praise and pean for (obviously, patently "rational / reasonable") values like tolerance and humanity. Only a consistent, that is, a putting into order and classification (integration, incorporation, inclusion) free of normative prejudices and power claims in respect of the examination of the problem of the modern / modernity and post-modern / post-modernity (with)in the great social-political and cultural context (correlation, function) which consists in the replacement of the bourgeois thought figure by a new thought figure and (in the replacement) of (classical) liberalism by mass democracy, can put (set) aside and eliminate similar paradoxes and contradictions. On this same path, moreover, the possibility is offered (/ This approach offers, moreover, the possibility) of bringing the literary-artistic and the historical-sociological component, side of these problems, whose organic belonging together and relevance, pertinence, to its entire extent and course, has hitherto hardly been worked (carved) out / demonstrated, to a common interpre(ta)tive denominator. In order to achieve

[155] Inter alia, over the long run, heightened anomy and all-round economic, and not just moral, degeneracy.

this, we must first of all clarify some basic / fundamental concepts.

As is known, the term "modern"(, "modernism", "modern epoch / modernity") is (are) used in a double/dual/twin sense. On the one hand, it means (describes, refers to) a certain phase or direction/tendency in the history of literature and art, which commenced/began (somewhere/sometime) in the second half of the 19th century[156], and in the first three or four decades of the 20th century took, despite all (its) internal/inner (great) diversity, firmer/more solid outlines / contours; on the other hand, it means (just as much as) the "New Times" or "Enlightenment"; and indeed in its demarcation/delimitation from (/ as the anti-thesis) of the theological world image and (theological) image of man/humans, as well as in its claim to/on the autonomous shaping, moulding, forming of human co-existence / living together / co-habitation on the basis of immanent, but not any criteria and values whatsoever (/ but not arbitrary criteria and values), which can be detected and ascertained and discovered by Reason. A corresponding double meaning has to / must be bestowed upon and granted to the concept of the "post-modern" (of "post-modernity") (/ The concept of the "post-modern" has a corresponding dual meaning). Literary-artistic currents, which arose and appeared sooner or later (at a period of time) after the Second World War and harboured the ambition, or at least gave the impression, that they were leaving behind (themselves) and going beyond the forms, content(s) and

[156] Most famous of all are Baudelaire and the impressionists, though, the list of people who represent what is being talked about here, and moving into the 20th century, is endless and includes not a few ***JOOZ***, from "high-art" parody to noise "music" (Bruckner, Mahler, Schoenberg), to increasingly nonsense and or asymmetrical ***ZIO-JOO***-ugliness as in the cases of Modigliani, Chagall, Proust, Bug-Worm Kafka, Uglier-than-Satan's-Arse-Hole-G. Stein, Homo-Faggot-Eisenstein, Incest-obsessed-Homo-Lezzo-Tranz-Freak-von Sternberg, and all the rest of the sick-fucking-crazy-psycho-path ***ZIO-JOO-GREAT SATAN***-ANTI-CHRIST KABAL and all of their ***ZIO-JOO***-ZOMBEE STOOGEZ (Homo-Faggots Rimbaud/Verlaine/Cavafy, Mallarmé, Satanist-Kabalist Pessoa, Stravinsky, Berg, Picasso, Matisse, Wright, Joyce, Pollock, Beckett, et al.). The list is endless, so do as much research as yooz want, but what "gives the game away" is not the number of ***JOO*** "artists" as such, but the number of ***JOOZ*** controlling (**KONTROL**) the publication / production and distribution (and funding where applicable) and the "I'll make you famous" mass-media/mass-entertainment/university "appreciation" etc. aspect of all these "artists" and their "works". Oh, and just to be clear, some, up to a lot, of the "shit" I'm referring to here is obviously artistically and or historically of up to very great interest (and can include extremely commendable ethno-patriotism as in the case of Cavafy), but from the point of view of a Christian, it is mostly, up to all, TOTAL AND ABSOLUTE ***ZIO-JOO***-ANTI-CHRIST-***GREAT SATAN*** TONNES AND TONNES AND TONNES OF ***ZIO-JOO(-ED)***-SHIT AND ***ZIO-JOO(-ED)***-BULL-SHIT.

positionings, stances of (the) literary-artistic modern / modernity, were first of all called post-modern; shortly thereafter, that epoch was apostrophised and mentioned and referred to / characterised as post-modern / post-modernity, which follows the modern / modernity in the sense of the New Times or else the Enlightenment[157], and is grounded and founded in the knowledge that the project of the modern / modernity failed and that towards/for the avoidance of the universalisms and the totalitarianisms of Reason, it would be best to go down / pursue / follow the – today finally, at last viable, passable, doable, in fact solely/alone open – path / road of the free game of intellectual(-spiritual) forces and the many centres of power and of opinion of a pluralistic society[158]. These double/dual concepts of the modern / modernity and of the post-modern / post-modernity unfolded / developed / formed with – on each and every respective occasion – a different precision and weighting, emphasis in two debates, in respect of which the one debate was conducted/led mainly by historians of literature and of art, but the (other and) later debate mainly by philosophers. Both of these debates intersected with each other only in part, and remained asymmetrical. Because the first debate, which primarily revolved around

[157] There is no "set starting date" for the "New Times" or the "Enlightenment", but for argument's sake, let's say that the "New Times" begin with the Renaissance (P.K. never wrote that, but I'm saying it), which at an "elite artistic level" has at least in part started using poly-theistic antiquity to relatively downgrade or "push aside" Christianity from circa (1400-)1500 onwards, in conjunction with the first flourishing of Italian and or ***ZIO-JOO*** capitalism(s) on the European continent (see, inter alia, the relevant Roberto Rossellini films), along with ***ZIO***-ANTI-CHRIST-***GREAT SATAN***-Protestantism, whereas the "Enlightenment" had its "apotheosis" in the 18th century (G. Vico, Voltaire, Hume, Rousseau, Diderot, Kant, et al. up to the marginalised but expressly more consistent "nut-jobs": de Sade and La Mettrie), even though Galilei, Descartes, Locke, Newton, et al. where mostly, or up to exclusively, of the 17th century. Francis Bacon lived between 22 January 1561 and 9 April 1626, whilst Hobbes (5 April 1588 – 20 December 1679) was of the 17th century, as was Spinoza (24 November 1632 – 21 February 1677). Montaigne (28 February 1533 – 13 September 1592) was of the 16th century.

[158] Which is total ***ZIO-JOO***-ideological BULL-SHIT, of course, since "post-modernism's" only purpose was to have the ***ZIO-JOO***-ANTI-CHRIST-SATANISTS ***GROSSLY DISPROPORTIONATELY AND VASTLY ASYMMETRICALLY*** CONTROLLING UP TO EVERYTHING IN THE ECONOMY, THE STATE AND CULTURE / IDEOLOGY, as happened, especially from ***ZIO***-WW2-1960 and thereafter in "Western" societies increasingly ***ZIO-JOO***-DIVIDE AND RULE, ***ZIO-JOO***-DAS-DIVIDE AND CONQUER ***ZIO-JOO***-"LEFT" / ***ZIO-JOO***-"RIGHT", ***ZIO-JOO***-"BLACK" / ***ZIO-JOO***-"WHITE" ***ZIO-JOO***-MASSIFIED-ATOMISED-***DIE***-VERSIFIED (WITH ORGIES UPON ORGIES OF ***ZIO-JOO*** "DE-CONSTRUCTION" OF "EVERYTHING", EXCEPT FOR, ***SURPRISE, OH FUCKING ZIO-JOO-DAS SURPRISE***, ***JOO***-DAS AND THE JOOZ !!!), whilst the SICK-FUCKING-CRAZY-PSYCHO-PATH INCESTUAL-IN-BRED, PRIMITIVE SECRET SOCIETY, SAVAGE TRIBE, ORGANISED-HYPER-CRIMINAL, HYPER-CONSPIRATORIAL, RAT-TUNNEL ***ZIO-JOOZ*** KEEP THEIR VOMIT-INCEST-SCUM-BAG RACIAL AND GROUP-IDENTITARIAN BASIC HOMOGENEITY. ***THAT'S FAIR, ISN'T IT JOO-DAS*** ? !!!

literary-artistic and cultural phenomena, necessarily little / slightly cared about and dealt with (/ was only slightly interested in) the project of the New Times or else of the Enlightenment and the concept of Reason, and indeed for the simple reason that because both the literary-artistic modern / modernity, as well as the literary-artistic post-modern / post-modernity (let us temporarily take the latter (post-modernity) as in actual fact existing as a self-sufficient, self-reliant/ standing, independent/autonomous current) pre-supposed or even brought about exactly the downfall, ruin, demise, collapse of that [[new-times or Enlightenment]] (aforementioned) project. Against the background of this decisive commonality of the modern / modernity and of the post-modern / post-modernity in the literary-artistic sense, on many occasions could their belonging together, togetherness, mutual/shared relevance or continuity be asserted, and in fact, the independence and self-efficiency, reliance on itself of the latter (post-modernity) could be doubted, regardless of how this thesis was justified and substantiated on each and every respective occasion. However, as soon as the talk about the modern / modernity and the post-modern / post-modernity went over and passed into the epochal and philosophical [[spheres, dimensions, realms]], the contrast and opposition between both concepts unambiguously and inevitably gained the upper hand.

The asymmetry between both of the aforementioned debates and conceptual pairs has a further instructive, didactic aspect, namely the chronological aspect. The literary-artistic modern (/ Literary-artistic modernity) is (only, just) about one-hundred years old [[up to circa 1990]]; the modern / modernity as an epoch, which is supposed to be under the sign and aegis of the postulates and desiderata of secular Reason, goes/reaches/stretches back, however, to the beginnings of the New Times[159]; if one is not prepared, ready, willing to go back

[159] See footnote 157, above. In terms of the history of ideas, the New Times begins, inter alia, with reference to and after the Titans of "advanced" Catholic rationalism : Bonaventura (1221 – 15 July 1274), Tommaso d'Aquino (c. 1225 – 7 March 1274), John Duns Scotus (c. 1265/66 – 8 November 1308) and William of Ockham

so far (into the past), thus/then one must at least jointly think about and connect their (i.e. the New Times') beginnings with the beginnings of the Enlightenment[160]. Now the advocates and champions of (the) modern / modernity in this latter sense [[of secular Reason, not of letters and arts]] opine / think that this would have / has lasted until today [[i.e. circa 1990]], and as a (still incomplete, unfinished) project, retains (preserves) its normative validity. Paradoxically, this perception of the longevity and durability of (the) (Enlightenment) modern / modernity (/ of the modern epoch as the epoch of the Enlightenment) is also shared by those who talk of (the) post-modern / post-modernity in the epochal and philosophical sense since they assert and claim that only the developments of the last two or three decades [[up to circa 1990]] have / had made possible, in fact, unavoidable its (i.e. modernity's) overcoming. The philosophers of (the) post-modern / post-modernity agree in this dating, chronology of the great caesura, break, turning point with literary-artistic post-modernism, in relation to which / whereby they, accordingly, lead the connected perception of the independence, self-efficiency, reliance on itself of the post-modern to a direct or indirect misjudgement, underestimation, misapprehension of the decisive – in the history of ideas – function of (the) literary-artistic modern / modernity [[from (not long before) circa 1900]]. From this perspective, this latter (modern(ity)) appears less as the workshop / laboratory of a new thought figure which would have / was interrelated with promising and pioneering social tendencies, and more as an uprising, rebellion, revolt against traditional bourgeois culture, which was (supposedly) expressed by the

---

or Occam (c. 1285 – 10 April 1347), with Averroes (14 April 1126 – 11 December 1198) another earlier pre-New Times and important reference point. I see a dearth of "thinkers" in the 14th and 15th centuries, but I'm sure that if one does one's research, one will find them, including Italians (e.g. Neo-Platonist Ficino (19 October 1433–1 October 1499)) et al. !!! Erasmus lived from 28 October c.1466 to 12 July 1536, and is the most likely candidate in the history of ideas for being known (erroneously) as "the start of the New Times", whatever that means (cf. Bernardino Telesio (Cosenza, 7 novembre 1509 – Cosenza, 2 ottobre 1588); Giordano Bruno (Nola, 1548 – Roma, 17 febbraio 1600); Tommaso Campanella (Stilo, 5 settembre 1568 – Parigi, 21 maggio 1639)). The point is that reality is "flowing" and "overlapping" (with its own dynamic of polemics and constellations, convergences and anti-theses etc.) and periodisations, like types, can be very useful, but have their limits.

[160] See footnote 157, above.

catalysis, abolition, dissolution, disintegration of its forms, but without being able to overturn from the ground up (/ to radically overturn) its content(s) and values, since it remained connected to the same (content(s) and values) as its negative counterpart, complement. Despite all the shifts in emphasis, in the main focus / centre of gravity and in sympathies, (the) literary-artistic modern / modernity is similarly judged from the point of view of the advocates and champions of (the) Enlightenment modern / modernity (i.e. of those [[so-called post-modernists]] who advocate and champion (the) modern / modernity / the modern epoch as the epoch of the Enlightenment [[and not of commencing in the few decades before circa 1900]]): it is a matter here [[for the so-called post-modernists[161]]], in the worst case, of reactionary thought (intellectual) products, and at best of differently motivated protests (/ of protests with different motives on each and every respective occasion) – in any case, not of the crystallisation(s) of a new and self-sufficient, self-reliant/standing, independent/autonomous thought figure which articulates (the) central tendencies of movement / motion (motive tendencies) of (a) society.

It can be easily seen (/ We thus easily understand) why (the) literary-artistic modern / modernity in the present (i.e. preceding) / these cases was judged in this manner: today's champions, pioneers of a self-sufficient, self-reliant / standing, independent/autonomous post-modern / post-modernity would have had to strongly / intensively relativise their epochal claim and appear in their own eyes as epigones rather than as demiurges / creators / world-moulders if they had traced back their attempt, venture, beginning to their remote, out-of-the-way, way-out, furthest and in part covered-up, hidden, concealed roots pertaining to / inside of the history of ideas; and the advocates, champions, proponents of (the) new-times-Enlightenment modern / modernity (/ of the modern epoch as the epoch of the Enlightenment) would have known / seen that

[161] I.e. ***grossly disproportionately and vastly asymmetrically***, Jews, who were also ***grossly disproportionately and vastly asymmetrically*** part of the "modern(ist)" side of things too !!!

they had already lost the battle (game) / they were already in a losing battle if they had ascertained that their struggle against (the) post-modern / post-modernity is only the rearguard action of an army, which from now on only consists of its rearguard, since its gross, bulk, main body was already decimated from the time of the formation and development of (the) literary-artistic modern / modernity / modernism – and not least of all by it (i.e. the said literary-artistic modernism). Against both (of these) positions, accordingly, the key (main) character pertaining to the history of ideas of (the) literary-artistic modern / modernity / modernism as the creator of a new, self-sufficient, self-reliant / standing, independent/autonomous and future-oriented, trend-setting, pioneering, forward-looking, determinative-as-to-the-future thought figure, must be brought to light / demonstrated. In the course of this, it is not a matter of only / simply working / carving / bringing out and elaborating and shedding light in detail, –as to content and stylistically–, upon the origin and source of (the) literary-artistic post-modern / post-modernity / post-modernism from (the) literary-artistic modern / modernity / modernism. The unity and the continuity of both of these directions / tendencies were already / hitherto asserted / accepted, in fact / indeed, proven / demonstrated repeatedly / on many / several occasions; but the argumentation remained, in the course of this, (with)in the framework of the history of literature and of art or (in the context) of aesthetics. In comparison / In contrast / However / On the other hand, what is needed is to widen and expand the hermeneutic horizon through and by means of historical, sociological and world-theoretical (i.e. pertaining to a world view or world views) analysis, in order to point out and make crystal-clear that the united development / unfolding, which encompasses (both) (the) literary-artistic modern / modernity / modernism and / as much (well) as (the) literary-artistic post-modern / post-modernity / post-modernism, starts simultaneously / in parallel with a profound/deep social change and accompanies the great phases of this change until today. The ascertainment of this parallelism, which in reality

is / constitutes an organic belonging together / (joint) function / togetherness, becomes less banal if it is emphasised / underlined / verified that between the thought figure coming into question / being examined and the social formation / construct coming into question / being examined, a precise / exact structural correspondence is existent / exists, or else, that the thought figure and the mode of function(ing) of society in its various activities and areas, sectors can be reduced to the same form-related / formal structure without consideration / irrespective of / without regard to / notwithstanding the almost vast, immense, unmeasurable, unclear, confusing (great) variety of the content(s). For its part, the thought figure stretches and extends not only to literary-artistic phenomena, but just as much to the areas and sectors of the sciences of nature and of man (/ the intellect(-spirit)) (i.e. the natural sciences and Humanities), as well as to philosophy. Because the forms of the ideational in their totality / entirety constitute, indeed, if they are looked at as such / in themselves, the pendant (i.e. counterpart, complement, analogue, cognate, correlate, correlative, correspondent, equivalent, matched pair, companion piece) of the material mode of the function(ing) of society; simultaneously, however, they (i.e. the said ideational forms) represent and constitute one aspect or one part of the same mode of the function(ing)[162].

Which / What social change and which/what phases of the same (social change) now come into consideration / have to occupy us when it is a matter of making understandable, against a comprehensive background / on a broad basis, the formation and development of (the) literary-artistic modern / modernity /

[162] What has Krazy Man being telling yooz all dis time ? The Base-Superstructure model is by no means perfect (especially within social formations as to its mechanical cause-effect character, but not so much macro-historically across social formations (i.e. ***grosso modo***, the more macro-historical the consideration, the relatively better the Base-Superstructure model looks)), but it is also definitely not total ***ZIO-JOO***-GARBAGE. Notice how my little dead friend (murdered by ***ZIO-JOO*** "medical error") Takis does not mention the "base-superstructure" model at all. That's because he was a very smart cookie, and knew he'd be killed by ***JOOZ*** so he didn't e.g. seek refuge in Russia (the ***JOOZ*** there would have got him) or China (way too "CHING-CHONG" foreign for him) or Persia (as not a few notable ancient Greeks once did).

modernism and its further development and unfolding (meta-evolution) into (the) literary-artistic post-modern / post-modernity / post-modernism? A schematising / schematic answer can read / be as follows. (The) literary-artistic (/ Literary-artistic) modern / modernity / modernism takes shape / form at the point in time / in the epoch when industrial mass society is formed / constituted / moulded / shaped / framed, and in the course of this (in parallel), begins to drive / force / push back the dominance / dominant authority and the social preconditions of liberalism. Because liberalism in its concrete historical sense, i.e. in the sense of the social and political dominance of the bourgeoisie, lost (its) substance and assertiveness / (cap)ability at pushing/carrying things through and asserting itself to the extent/degree as the emergence / advent of a mass society, which sought to be politically articulated through and by means of mass organisations and mass action(s), which made more and more difficult the closed political game of the bourgeois oligarchy[163]. Objective factors, as well as the resistance of the bourgeoisie, hindered and obstructed for some, overall / by historical measure, short (period of) time, the openness / opening of liberalism in a democratic[164] direction; in this first phase of its development, mass society was not yet a mass democracy, whereby the lack/absence in democracy was interrelated and (inter)connected with the fact that the process of massification, and (at the same time) of atomisation (i.e. the segmentation of society into individuals/atoms), had not been completed[165]. The contradiction coming into being from that was put/set aside and eliminated / solved only through the

[163] Depending on the country / region in Western Europe, ***grosso modo***, the bourgeoisie began its rule in cahoots with the Church circa 1400-1600, kept the Church "in its place" circa 1600-1800, and started itself to lose its pre-eminence during the course of the 19th century, especially in the second half thereof, when mass society, which accompanied the Industrial Revolution from circa 1800, was becoming not only economically, but also politically, and then culturally, ***ZIO-JOO***-BALL-ANTI-CHRIST-***GREAT SATAN-ZIO***-ED.

[164] I.e. in terms of mass democracy, including in terms of its own ideological self-understanding. Also, see the next footnote !!!

[165] This is the "Tocqueville period" starting in the first half of the 19th century extending in part, though greatly diminished in terms of mass pre-mass-democratic features, all the way up to ***ZIO***-WW2, but with the great FROG noticing that the USA, with its lack of not only "feudal", but also classical liberal-bourgeois traditions / roots, was taking a lead on important societal-political-cultural matters. P.K. did not take long to explain what he's talking about, did he?

breaking up, dispersal, loosening, slackening or dissolution, elimination of the oligarchic features belonging to the essence of / of their nature to classical liberalism, and through the diminution, reduction of the social role of the – itself in transition / changing – bourgeoisie, but also through the always increasing, growing participation of the broad masses in the consuming/consumption of an always increasing, growing mass production; (mass society, mass democracy,) mass production and mass consumption made up, from now on, the inseparable from each other (one another) sides of a single / united social construct, which in the first decades after the Second World War, above all, was realised in the Western industrial countries. An intellectual(-spiritual) product of this second great phase[166] in the history of industrial mass society is (the) literary-artistic post-modern / post-modernity / post-modernism, as well as the theory of (the) post-modern / post-modernity as an epoch (/ the theory of the post-modern epoch), which (allegedly) follows (the) new-times modern / modernity (/ the modern epoch (as the epoch of the New Times or of the Enlightenment)). Sociologically seen, (the) literary-artistic modern / modernity / modernism and (the) literary-artistic post-modern / post-modernity / post-modernism, therefore, belong together and are connected with each other to the same degree/extent and in the same sense as both of the great phases in the history of mass society: the former [[such great phase of mass society]], which developed and unfolded and was formed under/in the circumstances and relations/conditions of early mass society passed/went over to the latter when (the) mass society was transformed and converted into a mass-producing and mass-consuming mass democracy[167]. The general sociological difference/distinction concretised itself

[166] The first great phase was accompanied by the **novum** of the Industrial Revolution from circa 1800, and the second great phase has been accompanied by the **novum** of mass democracy from circa 1900, but "maturing" only after ***ZIO***-WW2. Whether a third in relatively quick succession **novum** from circa 2000 is underway, whereby only ***JOOZ*** and their ZOMBEEZ will "master race, rule the world" along with their TECH, can only be judged in the future, say by circa 2100, but I doubt very much anyone is going to get "there".
[167] I.e., ***grosso modo***, from the 19th century to the 20th century, but with the second phase only "maturing" and "displaying its real self as a whole" only after ***ZIO***-WW2.

in several / many stylistic, content-related and atmospheric differences between the modern and the post-modern artistic-literary direction/tendency, in respect of which we shall speak/talk below (ch. IV, sec. 5). More important, however, appears to be / is the aspect of the continuation (between them), and indeed in regard to conceptual and terminological questions, issues and problems with which we have occupied ourselves in this section.

The double/dual/twin ascertainment of the continuity between (the) literary-artistic modern / modernity / modernism and (the) literary-artistic post-modern / post-modernity / post-modernism, as well as the interrelation / interconnection of this continuity with the development and unfolding of mass society, first of all, excludes the epochal caesura of being set/fixed/put (/being allowed to be set /fixed/put) at a (relatively) recent point in time, in which it is set/fixed/put by the advocates, champions of (the) Enlightenment modern / modernity (/of the modern epoch (as the epoch of the Enlightenment)), and of those (advocates, champions) of (the)[168] philosophically and social-politically understood post-modern / post-modernity / post-modern epoch, in a negative agreement (correspondence) (between them)[169]. This, again, suggests the notion / idea of seeking a terminological convention (/ This fact makes the search for a terminological convention tenable / well-founded), which takes current language use into account, but clears out, removes, dispels the in it implied misunderstandings by means of some targeted and well-aimed modification (/ but sets/puts aside with studied modifications all the misunderstandings born / begot by this current language use). Self-evidently, (/ It is self-evident that) we must clearly distinguish from one other the modern / modernity / modern epoch in the epochal-Enlightenment sense / as the epoch of the Enlightenment from the literary-artistic (sense), as well as both corresponding concepts from the

[168] I can't be bothered just like at the beginning of this translation, continuing putting brackets around (the). If yooz know the Barbarian Idiom, then yooz know when yooz read the "the" or not.
[169] These historically illiterate ***ZIO-JOO*** and other ***ZIO***-ANGLO-GERMANO-GALLO-ET AL.-***JOO***-BALL imbeciles think that "it was all happening" in terms of "cultural wars" only after ***ZIO***-WW2 !!!

post-modern / post-modernity. However, if we put / set / place the epochal caesura in the foreground / to the fore / at the epicentre of our attention and want to otherwise date it differently than as it happens today, then the paradox comes into being that the post-modern (epoch) as the epoch which follows the epoch of the Enlightenment, also encompasses that which was called the modern / modernism in the literary-artistic sense. Said otherwise / In other words: the post-modern (epoch) in the epochal sense starts/begins temporally / chronologically / in terms of time in parallel with the literary-artistic modern / modernism[170], and not first(ly) with the literary-artistic post-modern / post-modernism, as is (often) thought / assumed today. The paradox, however, is limited / restricted here only at the terminological (level) (/in terminology), if in (regard to) the matter [[at hand]] it remains clear at all times that the talk about the post-modern at one time means the philosophical or social-historical in the epochal sense, at another time reference is being made to the literary-artistic level. The terminological paradox must, in any case, be accepted / conceded (/In any case, we are obliged to run the risk of the terminological paradox), since we want to underline / emphasise through the drastic concept of the post-modern the decisive turn from liberalism – as politics / political practice and world view of the bourgeois modern (epoch) – to mass society and mass-democracy[171]. Indeed, the theory of the post-modern was first(ly) presented, set up, established, put forward, laid out in a mature phase of the post-bourgeois time(s)[172], nonetheless, the analysis of the literary-artistic modern / modernism

[170] Circa 1900, starting in the (latter-part of the) second half of the 19th century, along with the **novum** of mass democracy.
[171] Ditto.
[172] P.K. oversaw in Greek (in the 1990s) the publishing of, inter alia, ***ZIO-JOO***-DAS-***GREAT SATAN***-Daniel Bell, *The cultural contradictions of capitalism* (1978), whose Greek title translates as : *The culture of the post-industrial West*, and all of that, and other "stuff", is not unrelated to the post-modernism being discussed here, including in relation to the crisis-making/inducing contradiction between the streamlining and rationalisation of production on the most advanced technical/technological basis and the life stances of Hedonism and Consumption which lead to the most vulgar forms of the body as a piece of meat "pleasure" and degeneracy up to **self-ethnic cleansing** and **self-genocide**. A ding-dong ***ZIO-JOO***-DAS-BELL would obviously go into all of this up to the point, but not to the point of giving FACTS about the ***GROSSLY DISPROPORTIONATE AND VASTLY ASYMMETRICAL*** role played by his ***ZIO-JOO***-ANTI-CHRIST-***GREAT-SATAN*** tribe of incestual, conspiratorial, rat-tunnel, organised-criminal, rat-rodent-parasites who monopolise up to all of the economy,

will show us that the/its essential thought/intellectual material(s) (in relation to that), just like its/the social-political preconditions (for it) had existed long ago. This gives us the right to apply the concept of the post-modern quasi with retroactive / retrospective force, and in the course of this to give it its concrete social-historical, that is, anti-bourgeois and anti-liberal or mass-democratic sense.

We have already said that the transition from the liberal-Enlightenment modern / the modern epoch of liberalism and of the Enlightenment[173] to the mass-democratic post-modern (epoch) / the post-modern epoch of mass democracy brought about a change of the socially predominant thought figure. The manner with which that transition was carried out has already to a large extent been researched[174], and it does not have to occupy us here in detail / at length / extensively, although we must stress or shed light and work upon some aspect(s) of it anew (ch. IV, sec. 1 and 2); also, in terms of theory, it can be dealt with and made understandable without particular difficulties if one only does not lapse/fall into the widespread error of confusing liberalism and democracy[175] with each other by using the concepts not in their concrete historical sense, but thus as they are used as catchwords/slogans in (the) topical and present-day political confrontation(s). Much less was the question as to what the bourgeois thought figure consisted in, researched and understood – and still less, which thought figure replaced the bourgeois thought figure. In the attempt to outline and the latter (thought figure replacing the bourgeois thought figure), the literary-artistic modern / modernism (and post-modern / post-

---

state and culture in "free-market" !!! capitalism, under up to total and absolute ***ZIO-JOO***-CONTROL (**KONTROL**), whilst propagandising that all of that has something to do with "freedom, liberty, dimo-krasi, civil society, non-corruption rule of law" and all the other **TOTAL AND ABSOLUTE *ZIO-JOO***-BULL-SHIT spun by the ***ZIO-JOO***-MASS MEDIA-UNIVERSITIES-ET AL. !!!

[173] P.K. is obviously considering the Enlightenment as a (16th-)17th and not just 18th century phenomenon, as evidenced by his history of the Enlightenment.

[174] Especially in relation to the Industrial Revolution.

[175] As to the social whole in mass democracy and not as to polity in its historical and scientific, non-ideological, non-rhetorical sense.

modernism), as well as some scientific and philosophical theories of our [[20th]] century, must appear (compared to beforehand) in a new light and context / in new interrelations. It will be proven, namely, that all these products of the intellect-spirit take as their basis a common thought style and a common perception of the world, from which – with a regularity which cannot be coincidental / chance – a certain thought figure results. In what follows / In what is below, we shall call this [[mass-democratic]] thought figure the *analytical-combinatory* thought figure, in order to contrast it with the *synthetic-harmonising* thought figure, which characterises the bourgeois spirit/intellect / the bourgeois attitude, mentality, mindset. Bourgeois thought in principle strove (/ had as its programmatic main concern to strive to) construct a world image out of a great variety of different things and forces, which, indeed, looked at in isolation (can be [[or]]) are found in contrast and opposition to one another, yet in their entirety constitute a harmonic and law-bound (deterministic, law(rule)-based) Whole, inside of which friction(s) and conflict(s) are lifted, i.e. abolished and cancelled in the sense of superordinate / superior rational/reason-related ends/goals. The part exists inside of the Whole, and it finds its determination (destiny, fate, calling) by contributing to the harmonic completeness and perfectness of the Whole, but not by the denial, disavowal of, but / however by the development and unfolding of its own individuality. In this respect, things are thought about and contemplated on the basis of their function, however, their substance (essence) in the process is not lost, even if it cannot be or cannot entirely be known/recognised / cannot be (completely) known; and exactly / precisely the assumption or conviction of the substantiality of things (i.e. that things have (a) substance) allows / permits their objective evaluation and their proper, correct putting into order / incorporation at this or that tier of the harmonic Whole. Things are / act/behave very / essentially different(ly) in the analytical-combinatory thought figure. Here there are no substances and no fixed things, only ultimate components / constituent parts/elements which are

detected through / by means of consistent analysis; points or atoms, whose essence, texture and existence consists simply/actually only in their function, i.e. in their (cap)ability and capacity to enter together with the other points or atoms into always (/ to form and mould perpetually/continually) new combinations. That is why there can be no talk here of harmony, which rests and is based / founded on more or less stable relations between (the) parts and (the) Whole; there are only combinations / combinations only exist/happen, which are constantly replaced by new and in principle equivalent combinations. Everything can and may in principle be combined with everything, because everything is found at/on the same level, and there is no ontological background / there are no ontological preconditions which would secure the precedence of certain combinations vis-à-vis other combinations[176].

Both of these fundamental thought figures are the condensed (compressed) ideational form or else / and at the same time side of certain constitutive features, whose material correlate/correlative is to be found in the composition, constitution, texture and (mode of) function(ing) (i.e. in the concrete arrangement / set-up or movement/motion of the individuals and the groups inside of) the corresponding social constructs. Thus, the synthetic-harmonising thought figure interrelates with a social construct in which indeed social differences are substantial (i.e. pertaining to substance(s)) and are perceived substantially (i.e. in terms of (various) substance(s)), simultaneously, however, they do not become or are not fixed (solidified, hardened) (as this for instance

[176] All of this pertains to the ideal type of mass democracy and relatively / highly advanced massification and atomisation. The ultimate goal of the ***ZIO-JOO***-ANTI-CHRIST-SATANISTS is for everyone to be totally mixed up and confused and abnormalised and atomised except for themselves, so that there can be no crystallised ethnic group resistance to ***ZIO-JOO***-HYPER-NATIONALIST-HYPER-IMPERIALIST-ANTI-CHRIST-***GREAT SATAN***-RULE. Of course, all of that may have happened in the former West, which is now totally destroyed under **THE SYNAGOGUE OF SATAN**, but if China and Russia are worthy of their ancestors and histories, the SICK-FUCKING-CRAZY-PSYCHO-PATH ***ZIO-JOOZ*** (AND ALL THEIR ***ZIO***-ANGLO-GERMANO-GALLO-ET AL.-***JOO*** ZOMBEE-ALLIES) will have nowhere else "to go", and will provoke the end of everyone.

was the case in the hierarchy of societas civilis[177]), but is formed in the framework/context of a competition, which, for its part, does not flow into and end up in, or is not supposed to flow into and end up in, the struggle or war of all / everyone against all / everyone, but in a dynamic equilibrium. The analytical-combinatory thought figure accompanies, again/contrariwise, a constitution of society in which social differences are no longer regarded as substantial (i.e pertaining to differences of substance), but (the) social mobility in principle knows no limits/restrictions, and permits the constantly / ceaselessly new allocation (lineup, occupation, distribution) of socially available roles; the mass(-like) character of this society enables – in view of the in principle participation of all atoms/individuals, which/who constitute the mass, in (the) social processes at all levels – an unending/infinite number of combinations, whose great variety and at the same time transience/transitoriness disappears, puts aside or eliminates every / any thought / the idea of substance, and in its place merely/only accepts/allows functional points of view (/ puts functional points of view only)[178]. Now in socially prevailing, determinative, decisive, widely-significant thought figures, not merely those aspects of socially reality, which in the perception of socially living individuals more or less attract attention and are noticed, are expressed and reflected and manifest themselves, but also that which we can/could call perception or sense of the world in its totality / entirety, i.e. said in Kantian terms / in Kantian language, the forms of the appearance (supervision, monitoring, watching over, outlook, contemplation, perception, view, intuition) and the categories of understanding,

[177] The ideal-type of "late feudalism" (preceding (and overlapping with) bourgeois oligarchic liberalism and the synthetic-harmonising thought figure), which, in turn, precedes (and overlaps with) mass democracy and the analytical-combinatory thought figure), based on Western/Northern European society before the centralising state came to dominance, especially before the 17th (/18th) century (but after circa 700-1000-1200 A.D.), and whose Christianity was not under significant bourgeois and or ***ZIO-JOO***-ANTI-CHRIST attack, and where agricultural life still dominated, setting the tone for relatively de-centralised political and cultural life as well, with the Church, in whatever of its forms, still in control (**CONTROL**), and not only culturally, but up to a large extent in the economy and the political too. P.K. does not name the thought figure of societas civilis anywhere, but I would suggest something like : the fixed-Christian-eternity-aspiring and pyramidal-tradition-based thought-figure.

[178] See footnote 176, above.

cognition, is articulated. Already the adequate articulation of the immediately-directly social dimension of a comprehensive thought figure needs the formation of a specific perception of the world – besides/apart from that (/and moreover), the quarrel, dispute, argument about the manner how the world is supposed to / should/ought to be perceived necessarily constitutes / must constitute an essential aspect of the profound / deeper / every intense/intensive social-ideological struggle. From / Out of the having an effect together, collaboration, working together, synergy of both of these necessities under the concrete circumstances of the turn from bourgeois liberalism to mass democracy, it so happened / turned out that the precedence of the magnitude "space" inside of the analytical-combinatory thought figure [[of mass democracy]] followed the precedence of the magnitude "time" inside of the synthetic-harmonising thought figure [[of bourgeois liberalism]], whilst simultaneously central categories like that / the category of (e.g.) causality [[of bourgeois liberalism]] was relativised or even scrapped and rejected. How it / things came to that and which forms the change/changing of the perception of the world took in the framework of the replacement of one thought figure by another thought figure, we shall see in detail (later). (Speaking) In advance, we (only) need make the observation that in the discussion and examination of this issue / matter / question / problem, the level of the philosophical, artistic or scientific perception of the world may / ought / should not be confused with the level of daily (world) experience / the everyday experience of the world. This latter (daily world experience) is indeed/certainly also modified in the course of history too, yet here those breaks, fractures, ruptures do not happen/appear which happened and appeared a few times at the former (level of philosophical, artistic or scientific perception of the world), especially since the early New Times / the very beginning(s) of the New Times[179]. In other words, every

[179] See footnotes 157 and 159, above.

revolution in the perception of the world through and by means of philosophy, art or science must not / does not necessarily entail an anthropological revolution[180], even though it, as a rule, has certain long-term repercussions, consequences, effects, consequences in regard to the mode/way/manner of perception of certain social groups. The reason for this discrepancy / difference lies in the fact that revolutions in the perception of the world do not come into being / are not born out of / from the mature need of broad masses to see the (objects in the) world with other eyes, but rather out of / from the polemics of a rather small social minority[181] against the dominant, ruling world image. That is why the change / changing of the world image represents and constitutes a symbolic act which confirms the victory of that minority against the official representatives of the old world image, rather than an upheaval and radical change of the banalities of daily/everyday experience, against whose background the life of most men/people/humans or the greatest, largest part of the life of all men / humans takes place and unfolds[182].

A further observation, remark, comment of a methodical / methodological character is here called for / appropriate. In our investigation / research, which makes use of the contrast and opposition between the synthetic-harmonising and analytical-combinatory thought figure as well as between the time-oriented and the space-oriented perception of the world as a guiding thread / guideline /

---

[180] An anthropological revolution pertains to a fundamental paradigm shift in the way people view the world at the sociological-historical level, but does not affect the anthropological constant of man in relation to social-ontological factors and forces and nature and culture unless it goes beyond a human born of humans. If, for example, the world existed after circa 2100, and ***JOOZ*** "got what they wanted", then robotised-***ZIO-JOO***-ZOMBEE-SLAVES with brain implants etc. would not be humans anymore as understood by P.K. and the scientific observation of human affairs until P.K.'s death in 1998. It could well be that P.K. here means by "anthropological revolution" at the mass-level, another **novum** say of circa 2000 / 2100 which has gone beyond man, in the re-production of beings by man, which are not human in the old sense anymore of not being mechanically (with brain implants, microchips etc.) controlled by ***JOOZ*** et al from within their human bodies.
[181] ***JOOZ*** and their ***ZIO-JOO***-ANGLO-GERMANO-GALLO-ET AL.-***JOO***-DAS-ANTI-CHRIST-STOOGEZ.
[182] This applies especially from circa 1900 (but also from the beginning of the New Times) until today, though today, the number of people in "the West" "crossing over to the other way of looking at the world" has certainly increased, but has by no means yet "crossed over" completely as regards everyone and all aspects of life, e.g. children are still being born to a man and a woman, and most people, or a large number of people, still have to work for a living, the major "ball sports" are still dominated by men born with balls, as are construction, infrastructure, transport and other such sectors and industries, the army, the navy, the air-force, etc. etc. etc..

leitmotif, we shall keep/stick primarily to intellectual-spiritual products and social realities in which decisive, determinative structures and tendencies are most clearly / perspicuously condensed. This (methodical) procedure / proceeding / method / method(olog)ical approach is not founded in a scientifically suspicious, dubious eclecticism, in which the premises behave tautologically in relation to the conclusions, but its necessity results / arises from the fact that propulsive factors in the history of ideas and in society in the beginning – and also for a more or less long time – by no means make up the broader side of the spectrum concerned (on each and every respective occasion). Rather they have to be compared with locomotives which gradually succeed in setting in motion a mass which in itself for the most part remains inert (sluggish, lethargic, languid). Even after the pushing/carrying through and imposition, prevailing of a new thought figure or structure of society / social/societal structure, it is possible that phenomena which take root in the old (thought figure or structure of society) find themselves quantitatively still in the majority. The decisive question is, however, on each and every respective occasion, to whom befits (/ who and what takes on / over, assumes, undertakes) the function of the locomotive, who (and what) constitute(s) the axis around which the central confrontation (conflict, dispute, debate, argument, discussion) revolves on each and every respective occasion. Because the permanent (lasting, enduring) heterogeneity of the spectrum, which goes back and is due partly to the persistence (perseverance, insistence, tenacity, steadfastness) of the old and partly to the rapid, quick, swift differentiation or even splitting of the new, constantly brings about, begets, engenders, generates conflict(s), which weaken and debilitate the tractive (pulling) force/power, traction of the locomotive. This must be stressed against structuralist(ic) simplifications, simplifications pertaining to the history of ideas and sociologically untenable simplifications which suggest the impression as if / that a thought figure or a formation of society (soci(et)al formation) completely replaces another (thought figure or

social formation) quasi through and by means of a direct and immediate magic strike (or wave of a magic wand). Only the great variety and the constant polemical confrontation inside of one and the same formation pertaining to the history of ideas or inside of one and the same social formation can explain differentiations and breaks, ruptures, which inaugurate the transition to other formations; also, the forces which the burst open, blow / break up, blast, disperse the existing formation or existing structure are as a rule in themselves fissured, split, cleft and contradictory. Thus, even in the time(s) of the predominance of the bourgeois thought figure, there were powerful parallel / side currents and counter currents; and the replacement of this (bourgeois) thought figure was brought about and effect(uat)ed, again, simultaneously, by a number of currents, which very often and fiercely fought and battled against one another. This was, though, neither a coincidence, nor a misunderstanding; because the mass society and the mass democracy coming into being represented and constituted, for its part, a compound, composite and heterogeneous, or even contradictory, construct, whose individual / in part aspects or tendencies had to be articulated ideationally in its own each and every respective manner[183].

[183] And yet, it most certainly seems that "Western" mass democracies are still around and are preparing themselves for the end of all things human under ***ZIO***-USA, rather than allowing descent into internal decomposition and up to complete subjugation to, and dependence on, non-Western powers, especially China.

II. Formation and structure of the bourgeois thought form and life form (form of thought and form of life)

(CHAPTER TWO

FORMATION AND STRUCTURE OF THE BOURGEOIS MODE (WAY, MANNER, MODUS) OF THOUGHT AND OF LIFE)

1. The world-theoretical framework (context) (The framework pertaining to a world view / world views)

The ascertainment that the bourgeois thought figure would be inspired and sustained by a synthetic-harmonising matter of concern, disposition and intent does not help the understanding of things / the facts, circumstances for as long as it remains undetermined / unclear which different or even opposing elements were supposed to have been / had to be connected with one another in the framework of the harmonic Whole to be constructed. Because there is no harmony in itself / in the absolute sense and in general already because no standpoint can be detected and found from which all really or ideationally existing elements could be apprehended in one fell swoop / all at once / all at one go and put into order, integrated, included in one single/sole harmonic construction; that is why the endeavour at / venture of harmonisation must always start from certain elements, and the decision(, in the course of this,) of giving precedence to other elements, (also) brings into being another perception, idea, notion of harmony. This implies again that an abstract, already existing in advance, (psychological) need for harmony does not determine the choice of the elements which is supposed to construct the harmonic Whole, but things are the other way around: the already fixed, set(tled), definite, established, formed option of / preference for certain elements sets in motion the endeavour at / venture of harmonisation when/if these latter (certain elements) appear to be logically or ontologically more or less heterogeneous. At the same time, the need for and the endeavour, venture at harmony, as well as the decision of holding / regarding harmony as such to be / as a paramount, supreme value, are connected and interrelate with the wish of making opposed positions (/ the positions of the opponent) out to be chaotic, and consequently of stressing / emphasising their in(cap)ability at offering stable, steady orientation in respect

of life; because harmony means not least of all ponderability and calculability on the basis of the steady, stable position of the parts inside of the Whole. In actual fact, the thought, idea of harmony as the normative axis of the bourgeois world view was crystallised in the demarcation from, and opposition to, that which was called at the social-political level, feudal disorder or feudal chaos and (that which) was projected into/onto the universe (space, cosmos) through and by means of the theological and magical perception and interpretation of nature. The individual / in part elements of that harmony, which was supposed to put / set aside, discard and eliminate the disorder in nature and society, arose likewise in / during the (simultaneous) demarcation from and opposition to several / many foes at a number of / many fronts, in relation to which the different character of the foes brought about the inner/internal heterogeneity of the spectrum of the related positions against them, which now, for their part, desired, required harmonisation (/ had to be harmonised) amongst themselves. In other words, the bourgeois world view was formed under contradictory circumstances and under the influence, impact, having an effect of contradictory factors; furthermore, it never prevailed socially to such an extent that the discontinuation, ending, cessation, eclipse of polemical considerations and needs could have stopped, halted its internal differentiation. It could not in fact claim, pursue, seek for itself an ideological monopoly like for instance that which theology had enjoyed (/ in its possession) for a long time, already because of the fact that it (i.e. the bourgeois world view) had appeared from the beginning under the banner of the individual freedom of opinion and of tolerance[184].

The bourgeoisie / bourgeois class possessed social (above all economic)

[184] The ideological posturing of freedom of speech/opinion and tolerance continued in the much more ***ZIO***-ed mass-democratic era, though ***ZIO***-USA dominance of the former West is so great that it seems that there is no way out apart from the end of everyone, which will come about because of the sick-fucking-crazy-psycho-path-***ZIO-JOO'***z desire to "master race, rule the world".

power much earlier[185] than it could reach, attain, acquire, obtain up to exclusive or (very often) shared political dominance / dominant authority. The contradiction between the possession of (limited, restricted) power and the (far-reaching, broad) lack of dominance compelled and forced ideological compromises which, psychologically seen, reflected the ambivalent state (of affairs) of a class which defied, challenged, called out, provoked (/ was forced to come into opposition to) the traditional world view of societas civilis, but simultaneously necessarily ascertained that the instruments of dominance were (located, found) in alien/foreign/others' hands, and hence (gladly or reluctantly, grudgingly / wanting to or not (wanting to)) tended in relation to that to moderate its challenge / opposition / provocation / act of defiance, partially in terms of content, partially by translating it into the language of the opponent, that is, to weaken, attenuate, lessen, soften it (/ tone/water it down) formally (i.e. in terms of form)[186]. But even after the total or partial political victory of the bourgeoisie, the main current of bourgeois ideology was characterised by the search for the juste milieu (i.e. happy medium, middle way, golden mean or middle ground) – this time not on account of the violence of those ruling (and dominant), but with regard to the danger of those (coming from) under / below (i.e. the lower classes), especially since the ideology of social democracy[187] originally / initially appropriated (/made) bourgeois paroles, words, slogans (their own), giving them a new content. Accordingly, the bourgeoisie was put in a tight spot / corner, and it (more and more) felt forced, compelled to distance itself from the radical reinterpretation of its own catchphrases / slogans / catchwords; exactly that which earlier was a tactically expedient attempt at approaching the dominant, ruling traditional world view, was now transformed /

[185] What has Krazy Man been telling YOOZ all this time !!! First comes relative economic power, in the case of the transition from "feudalism" to "bourgeois liberalism-capitalism", taking up to centuries, before that relative economic power translated into political, and then later mass cultural, power as well.
[186] These kinds of compromises did not start to constitute up to total ***ZIO-JOO***-bourgeois victory at the political (and in part cultural) level until the 19th century, albeit in ***ZIO***-GREAT BRITAIN "things got moving" from the 17th century, and from 1789 in ***ZIO***-France.
[187] We're firmly in the 19th century here.

converted into the means of demarcation and delimitation from the threat, menace and danger (coming) from below. To this circumstance and fact, the bourgeois thought figure owes its continuity in the history of ideas, despite the in part essential / significant shifts in accent and emphasis which necessarily accompanied the likewise / equally essential / significant changes in the social position of the bourgeoisie.

We find a good / another example of this continuity of positions in and during the simultaneous reversal (revolution, rotation, turn) of its polemical tip (top, peak, spike, point) at the most extensive, comprehensive and inclusive of all world-theoretical levels, i.e. the ontological level. Social democracy of the 19th century declared / proclaimed itself in following left-Hegelian approaches, tendencies, trends and above all of Enlightenment and contemporary materialism in the majority for / in favour of the monistic perception of being / Is, since it saw in / considered the abolition of the conventional, traditional hierarchy of the levels of being / Is (to be) the necessary supplement, complement or even condition for the levelling of all class differences / distinctions; the masters on earth were supposed to abdicate / resign (their positions) simultaneously with the master in the sky / Lord in Heaven. In the highly political debate over the fate/destiny of God[188] and the ontological texture, composition, constitution of the world, the decisive, predominant, preponderant bourgeois opinion stood, turned against atheism and monism – however, it did not do that for the first time in the struggle, fight, combat against social democracy[189], but had already done that much earlier when the main concern was completely different. The bourgeois (main current of) the Enlightenment fought, namely, with equal decisiveness, monistic-materialistic tendencies which had come into being / appeared with logical necessity (from

[188] From the scientific point of view, all secular politics is a variation of theology, i.e. belief(s) from a certain perspective and the friend / foe spectrum.
[189] In the 19th century.

with)in the womb / bosom of new-times rationalism, primarily in the 18th century, because it had the fear and apprehension that a confession of faith in such perceptions (of monism and materialism) would give the / its theological opponent welcome weapons (in its hand(s)) at a time in which the traditional binding, bond / tie, tying of norms and of values to the (transcendental) spirit constituted in the eyes of nearly all men / everyone a(n) self-understanding / matter of course / obviousness / naturalness / self-evidence / taken-for-grantedness / thing of course / something self-evident. A suspicion of atheism had to, under these circumstances, amount to / be converted into a suspicion of nihilism, which no party or group, which raised / made serious claims to social dominance, could accomplish / withstand / expose itself to. On the other hand, such claims could not at all be raised / made without the traditional theological position coming under fire in regard to the question of the relations between transcendence and immanence, since the manner how these relations were defined served as the foundation of ethical commands. Bourgeois thought exercises/drills itself in / practices the work of synthesis and of harmonisation by turning against materialistic, potentially (value-)nihilistic monism, and at the same time against rough, rugged, stark, abrupt theological dualism legitimising world-denying / world-negating ethics, and in the course of this attempts to bring nearer/closer to each other the From Here (i.e. This World or Life) and the From There (i.e. That World or Life (as after-life)), the world and God, that is, to comprehend their relation towards/with each other as a harmonic relation, without in principle disputing their independence, autonomy, sovereignty, self-reliance. That is why the bourgeois rejection, refusal, denial, negation of the sharp contradistinction between God and World / the world did not as a rule find expression, manifest itself in pantheistic or panentheistic constructions, but it was articulated in the endeavour to bind God, on the one hand, to (the) scientifically ascertained (established, determined, detected) law bindedness (determinism, law(rule)-based necessity) of nature / natural law bindedness,

[[and]] on the other hand, to the postulates of the new anti-ascetic-secular moral(s) / morality. In the process, it was / became incidental, irrelevant, negligible that God continued to be recognised as the creator of nature and of morals/morality/ethics; because his/His work was from now on / henceforth described and interpreted in the sense of bourgeois perceptions, representations, notions and values.

The harmony in the relations between God and World / the world existed / was based/founded not least of all / first of all in their automatic mechanism / nature / automation / automatism, i.e. in the in(cap)ability or, anyhow, in the lacking readiness of God to confound, stump the law bindedness (determinism, law(rule)-based necessity) of nature with/through/by means of arbitrary and unforeseeable interventions (intrusions). This law bindedness (determinism, law(rule)-based necessity) of nature stood/was, for its part, under the aegis of the thought/idea of harmony, in fact, it constituted the first great bourgeois explication (development and clarification) of the same (idea of harmony). In the law-bound (deterministic, law(rule)-based) order of nature, it was seen / shown paradigmatically how the parts are supposed to behave in order to serve the Whole, as well as the way in which the whole exists without ever being independent of its parts, yet [[with the Whole]] representing and constituting something more and something different than the mere sum of these same parts, namely something which (pervades and) governs the parts through and by means of its not exactly, precisely, accurately localisable, i.e. locatable, yet [[still]] perceptible, noticeable everywhere/all over, effect and impact. The schema “Whole-parts” gains / obtains henceforth more and more / ever more in meaning as the model or pattern of the generally valid representation and of explanation (of things), in relation to which its polemical aspect may / should not be overlooked: because it ousted, put aside or repressed the perception of

societas civilis[190] regarding the harmonic order of the constituent parts/elements of the world, both in the area, realm, sector of nature, as well as in the area, realm, sector of society. If the harmonic Whole in the perception / representation of societas civilis was similar to a pyramid, thus now [[in the bourgeois perception of things/the world and God]] it looks rather like a sphere (globe, ball); the bourgeois need for (social) differentiation accepts or allows room for, of course, differences in tier(s), gradation(s) and (in) status as well, however, these appear to be variable results of later developments or end/goal-rational, purposeful, expedient actions, and not for instance as ontologically and anthropologically bound/tied from the beginning/outset to fixed, settled, definite, established given (actual) facts / actualities (/ and not for instance as magnitudes given from the beginning and reduced to ontological and anthropological factors). Otherwise said / In other words: the by birth (by descent) determined inequality amongst men (humans) vanishes to the same extent and in the same sense as the – in the traditional world image – assumed heterogeneity of the various strata of being / the Is – simultaneously, however, the socially determined inequalities (/ the inequalities due to social reasons) amongst men (humans), as well as the determined in terms of the law bindedness (determinism, law(rule)-based necessity) of nature qualitative differences between the things of the world, remain. The fundamental schema "Whole-parts" could therefore satisfy both aspects of bourgeois matters of concern / desires – in principle, equality *and* the (f)actual differentiation of the parts inside of the Whole –, and hence serve both the struggle against traditional, conventional hierarchies as well as the foundation of claims of power and of (social) status and prestige on a new basis.

The thought, notion or idea of harmony, as it was concretised in the assumption of the strict law bindedness (determinism, law(rule)-based

[190] See footnote 177, above.

necessity) of nature, was aesthetically motivated and oriented only in the wide / broad mathematical-geometrical sense; as beauty clarity and simplicity became perceptible / were perceived, especially in their opposition to the supposedly superfluous, unnecessary, needless, in fact / moreover abstruse, confused constructions of the scholastic-Aristotelian interpretation of nature. However, something else was decisive in the course of this, namely the conviction that the harmony of the world and the law bindedness (determinism, law(rule)-based necessity) of the world/cosmic becoming / becoming of the world means ipso facto the ponderability, calculability and the controllability of nature, which again gave a feeling of security, safety and self-confidence, self-assurance precisely at the difficult moment at which one had to throw overboard and set/put aside many metaphysical certainties[191]. The connection between the idea, conception, representation, notion of harmony and the need for security, safety was from the beginning a constant of bourgeois thought, and took the most different, various, varied forms – from the Promethean urge (drive, propensity, yearning, impulse), which was nourished, nurtured, fed by the above-mentioned confidence in, and certainty of, victory over an indeed not tame, submissive, but anyhow ponderable, calculable nature, up till the feeling of security, warmth, comfort, geniality, snugness of the Philistine, for whom harmony meant above all danger/risk-and-struggle-free life (/ life free of/from danger(s)/risk(s) and struggle(s)). The negative sense/meaning of harmony, in so far as its concept / meaning, notion was identified with law bindedness (determinism, law(rule)-based necessity) of nature, was of course the elimination of everything (i.e. all the hyper/supra-natural / supernatural factors from the world/cosmic becoming) which the theological opponent was accustomed/used to reading into the justification of his (i.e. the theological opponent's) theoretical positions and his practical commands. The connection of harmony qua the law bindedness

[191] From the Church-led Christian past.

(determinism, law(rule)-based necessity) of nature with the wish for the control, rule, mastery, dominance of/over nature gave, lent, conferred, awarded, bestowed (upon) the thought, idea of harmony a positive sense as well/too, but which was double-edged. Because the perception of the strict law bindedness (determinism, law(rule)-based necessity) and of the mechanical character/texture of nature granted, afforded indeed the promise and or the certainty of dominance and rule over nature, however, on the other hand, it threw up/posed/raised the issue, question, problem of the ultimate, normative meaning of the world. From / Out of the texture, composition, constitution and the way/mode of function(ing) of the world machine (machine of the world), normative commands could not be deduced/derived, in fact things were the other way around: norms and values now appeared to be, ultimately, meaningless, to be the mere functions of mechanical stirrings and movements, motions[192]. It was the question (issue) of meaning and of norms (/ Precisely the problem of meaning and of normative principles) – said more concretely : the polemical need of beating/defeating the theological opponent on this field and of proving one's own (cap)ability at dominance / ruling through the offering of better values –, which forced / compelled / coerced bourgeois thought in relation to that, next to / supplementing that concept of harmony, which was primarily / mainly conceived as the (mechanical) law bindedness (determinism, law(rule)-based necessity) of nature, to posit a second concept, which was principally / chiefly moulded / shaped ethically and aesthetically. First of all, therefore, the world image was mechanised in order to secure and safeguard victory over the theological interpretation of the world, and only later was the beauty of nature discovered – this time not as plain, unpretentious and abstract geometric beauty, but as the tangible, palpable beauty of the mountain, of the meadow, of the river

[192] All the discussion here and following assumes a good knowledge of, inter alia, P.K.'s : ***Die Aufklärung im Rahmen des neuzeitlichen Rationalismus***, »**Montesquieu. Naturrecht und Gesetz**« and ***Die neuzeitliche Metaphysikkritik***.

and of the sea, whose form is in itself asymmetrical, but in its being next to one another / side by side with other such asymmetrical forms constitutes a single harmony in the framework of a comprehensive Whole. The fundamental schema "Whole-parts" remains, only it is interpreted not as the mechanical assembly or (con)junction of in themselves symmetrical parts in an already accordingly symmetrical Whole, but as the absorption of the in itself pleasant asymmetry of the parts in the imposing symmetry of the Whole.

Yet beautiful, good and, beside / close to all that, nature functioning in terms of law bindedness (determinism, law(rule)-based necessity) constituted, as it were, the visible and tangible guarantee for the reality of values and of norms. The "living according to nature (/ avowedly living in (accordance with) nature)" acquired / attained / took against the background / on the basis of this perception of nature a concrete content and meaning – exactly that which bourgeois ideas, representations, notions, conceptions placed into or projected inside of nature. The old Transcendental in its abrupt, brusque confrontation with the material world became for the purpose of the founding of norms (normative principles) superfluous to the degree/extent that the From Here (i.e. This World or Life) stopped / ceased being a valley of tears, and nature undertook the task, job, competence / competency of norm-giving authority (/ of determining normative principles)[193]. For this purpose, it (i.e. nature) had to, of course, be more than mute, silent and inert, lethargic, sluggish matter; from pure machine, it therefore became (a) motherly divinity (godhead, deity), which indeed stood/was nominally and always under the patronage (sponsorship) of its creator – a creator, however, who was permitted to create, make only one such – of its mode and way of function(ing) autonomous and normatively self-sufficient (autarkic, self-contained) – nature. From the moment at which to (the) nature as

[193] **The Vale of Tears** is back "BIG-TIME" for all of us who have consciousness that the ***JOOZ*** and their ***ZIO-***ANGLO-GERMANO-ET AL.-***JOO*** allies are bringing about the End of Everyone, as it is written, whether that happens in the twenty-first century or later.

such, a decisive, determinative normative dimension was attached, from the moment, that is, at which nature and Reason, matter and spirit(-intellect) approached, against the background of the aforementioned double delimitation / demarcation against the old (spiritualistic) dualism and the modern (materialistic) monism, the relation between nature and culture could (also) be comprehended / understood differently than previously (too/as well). Culture did not anymore have to be ascetic, and even then uncertain or only a transient (temporary, en passant, passing) overcoming of nature, but it was supposed to make up – through and by means of its normative dimension – nature that has become effective (/ but it had to constitute the outcome, aftereffect, corollary, result of the (having an) effect of the normative dimension of nature). (Healthy, Sound, Wholesome, Fit) culture would be, therefore, the activation of the immanent Reason (reasonableness, rationality, soundness, sensibleness) of nature at the level of human living together, cohabitation, co-existence. Reason is distilled, as it were, out (/ Reason is like the distillation) of (ideational) nature; and although it should be willing and (cap)able (in respect) of taming, restraining, harnessing some in itself/themselves blind or un-rational / irrational / unreasonable aspect(s) of (human) nature, it does this not in the sense of world-denying / world-negating asceticism, but in the sense of the expedient channelisation of the un-rational, i.e. irrational into the – on each and every respective occasion – appropriate (conducive, suitable, opportune, adaptative) realms and areas, sectors of activity. Thus, Reason remains, by establishing, erecting, setting up, composing, constituting, forming culture, still entangled and interwoven with nature; only the centre of gravity and main emphasis/focus must be/necessarily is shifted/displaced here in so far as in culture the normative component/dimension of nature becomes independent, autonomous and reaches and attains a degree of consciousness which is not possible in any other area, realm, sector of inorganic or organic nature. The harmony of nature and culture takes (on) / assumes / adopts, accordingly, the form of a unity of matter and

reason, during / in which / where nature provides, delivers, supplies, yields those materials which Reason will then/thereafter refine in accordance with its value judgement/evaluation/perception/notion/conception – the materials are, however, on the basis of their origin, noble enough (in order) to able to be processed / accept processing according to the normative intentions of Reason, and / whilst Reason never distances itself, for its part, from that which it finds / discovers in the nature (/ nature gives it), i.e. it (Reason) does not understand its autonomy as a right to tyrannise nature[194].

The same wish to reconcile and harmonise (with regard to each other) nature and Reason, the spirit(-intellect) and matter, norm (normative principles) and drive(s), urge(s), impulse(s) in the framework/context of a comprehensive / overarching harmonic Whole, inspires bourgeois anthropology (too). The endeavour and effort at harmonisation which is founded at the ontological level in (/ which at the ontological level rests upon) the double delimitation / demarcation against dualism and monism, or else spiritualism and materialism, in the realm/area of anthropology came into being from/out of the double aversion for / against the complete and total absorption of man / humans in material nature and for / against such a rising above (lifting up and over) nature that only in heaven could it find its true home(land)[195]. From this point of view, the constant reminding / recollection of the taking root of man / humans in nature served as an argument against the harmfulness, maleficence, in fact futility and vanity, unprofitability of ascetic morals/ethics/morality, whilst the simultaneous keeping and adhering to innate, in-born human Reason (reasonableness, rationality, soundness, sensibleness) was supposed to clean /

[194] Whereas under ***ZIO-JOO***-MASS-DEMOCRATIC(-ANTI-BOURGEOIS) ***ZIO-JOO***-ANTI-CHRIST-SATANISM, ***contra naturam*** ways of life and life stances are systematically promoted in order to commit **ETHNIC CLEANSING AND GENOCIDE** against ethnicities standing in the way of ***ZIO-JOO*** AND ***ZIO***-ANGLO-ET AL.-***JOO ZIO-JOO***-DAS-**SYNAGOGUE OF SATAN**-IMPERIALISIM-SATANISM.
[195] Thus, oligarchic bourgeois liberalism as an ideal type finds itself between societas civilis and mass democracy.

tidy up, clean / sweep / put away, put/set aside, the suspicion of nihilism. The perception that man dominates and rules by virtue of his Reason (reasonableness, rationality, soundness, sensibleness) over his own nature, was tightly/closely interrelated / (inter)connected, of course, also with the conviction of the controllability of external nature and accordingly (was connected) with modern natural science and with the belief in the law bindedness (determinism, law(rule)-based necessity) of nature. It had to, however, obtain / take another meaning when with nature exactly human nature was meant, and when the polemically necessary, that is, the – directed / turning against traditional theology – hint at / indication / stressing of the naturalness or natural texture of man / humans was in danger / at risk of being interpreted then in the sense that man is subject / subordinate / subjugated to the iron law bindedness (determinism, law(rule)-based necessity) of nature just as much as all beings of nature / natural creatures, and hence talk of free will and morality / morals / ethics was, in the final analysis / ultimately empty (of content) / void (of meaning). In other words, it had to be shown / proven or, anyhow, be asserted / claimed that man is or can be nature and simultaneously master / lord over / of his (own) nature. Drives, urges, impulses, passions, egoistic motives had to be fully / completely / totally recognised / acknowledged in regard to their complete force and effect/impact, that is in (all of) their anthropological necessity, however, the normative component / dimension of the bourgeois perception of nature asserted and imposed itself also in the conviction that the above-mentioned drives, urges, impulses and motives could be expediently and purposefully channelled and guided because they already contained, of themselves, a principle of self-regulation[196]. The in itself egotistical or unbridled, unrestrained human material of nature / human natural material could

[196] Whereas under the ***ZIO-JOO***-mass democratic ANTI-CHRIST-***GREAT SATAN*** of ***ZIO***-USA from the 20th century, the only self-regulation was not speaking the truth about and not exterminating all ***JOOZ***, Anglo-Saxon Drunkardz and German Pigz.

yield, provide, constitute a highly plastic raw material in the hands of a Reason, which had understood itself neither as foe, nor adversary/opponent of drives, urges, impulses, but only as their benevolent advisor or educator/paedagogue. Under its (i.e. Reason's) guidance, instinctive selfishness, egomania, egocentrism, egoism, whose anthropological range, bearing, reach, scope, carry had to come into consciousness under the conditions of capitalistic competition and in the light of the ideologies legitimising this competition, could be converted/transformed into enlightened self-love, which was supposed to recognise that the respect of others'/alien/foreign rights and freedoms lies in one's own interest(s) (/ capable of foreseeing that its own interest dictates respecting the rights and liberties / freedoms of others). In this manner/way, the anthropological and ethical examination of the problem flowed into and lead to the question just discussed / our well-known issue/matter about / (in respect) of the relations between nature and culture against the background / on the basis of the normative concept of nature.

Here we must interpose and weave/work in an additional remark / observation about the concept of Reason in(side) the bourgeois world-theoretical context. Reason as a concept and slogan / catchword turned in principle and from the beginning against that which one called "belief" and "authority", that is, the heteronomous determination of human thought and action[197]. From this perspective, the centre of gravity / main emphasis / focal point is put down to and located in not so much the cognitive (cap)abilities of Reason, but to/in its fitness / suitability to, with sovereignty, i.e. masterfully and with frankness, represent the normative principles and demands of the bourgeois-new-times world view (/ of the bourgeois world view of the New Times). Reason did not have to, therefore, coincide pure intellect, but in every case (definitely) takes

[197] Which, of course, is absolutely ridiculous, because, from the scientific point of view, every fundamental world-theoretical starting point, including Reason, is "plucked out of thin air" / constructed since there is no immanent in nature meaning of life.

sides in the ideological and social struggle. As the advocate, champion, proponent of norms, which were universal by nature, it (i.e. Reason) raised / made universal claims, and in this (its) universality it possessed the force of the law bindedness (determinism, law(rule)-based necessity) of nature: in its ideational Whole it held together (contained, controlled, governed, checked) the various elements in the same manner as natural law did it with reference to, i.e. it held together and controlled, the material components / constituent parts of the world. In this respect, Reason constituted the organisational principle of harmony, it determined, namely, which place every part was supposed to occupy inside of the Whole. To the extent that this (its) competency had to be expressed in commands and prohibitions, Reason had to be differentiated from the sensorial, i.e. the senses, that is, (it had) to approach the character of pure intellect. Sociologically said / From the sociological point of view, it then represented and constituted that authority (tier of jurisdiction) which ordered / commanded the renunciation (abandonment, renouncement, relinquishment) of immediate, direct or uncontrolled satisfaction at a time / in times (an epoch) in which savings and accumulation had to be made/achieved (/ where there was a need for thriftiness, parsimony, frugality and accumulation), in which, therefore, the hedonism – despite all refusals, the turning down, renunciations, rejections of the ascetic ideal of the old school / style / type – had not yet become a massive social positioning / stance with direct economic repercussions and consequences.

The reasons for the orientation on this side i.e. From Here / in this World of the bourgeois world view do not have to especially / specifically be explained here[198]. The banal indication of the world-historically new and moreover

[198] Money, money, money … and all the forms of power associated with money, because money of itself is nothing, but when it "links up and in" with the centralising power of the economy, state and culture, he who controls it, i.e. the ***ZIO-JOO***-ANTI-CHRIST-ORGANISED CRIMINAL-CONSPIRATORIAL-INCESTUAL-RAT-TUNNEL-PRIMITIVE SECRET SOCIETY-SAVAGE TRIBE-DEVIL-MAMMON-EVIL-SATANISTS, ***grossly disproportionately and vastly asymmetrically*** controls (**KONTROL**) and destroys (**CHAOS**) (from a

characteristic importance, position and value of systematic economic activity / engaging in the economy in the life of the bourgeoisie should / may suffice if one only keeps an eye on / in mind all its implications or concomitants (accompaniments, epiphenomena) – from the concept of (the) (natural and social) law up to the anthropology of homo oeconomicus[199]. The epistemological consequences / aftereffect of this orientation on this side i.e. From Here / in this World existed, anyhow, in the equally strong/rapid development of the sciences of nature and of man, although the first and decisive battle against the theological world view was one on/in the field of the former (sciences of nature). This parallel development, which in the light of today's falling and coming apart, divergence, dissociation of the sciences of the spirit/intellect/man (i.e. the humanities) and of nature may be strange / disconcerting/alienating, was in reality completely natural. Because the ontological revaluation and upgrading of nature turned against the world view of societas civilis to the same extent and in the same sense as the primacy of anthropology, which now moved into / took over the place of the primacy of theology. Man had to step outside of the shadow of God in order to be able to devote himself to the From Here (i.e. This World or Life) or to nature; and nature or the sensorial world had to be re-evaluated / upgraded in order for it to be permitted to make up and constitute the dignified and worthy realm and area of the activity of man emancipated from the From There (i.e. That World or Life (as after-life)). The drastic change/changing of the world-theoretical priorities was seen / shown in the content of the new-times-bourgeois philosophy which

---

certain normative-aesthetical, not scientific, point of view) society, exactly as has happened, especially from circa 1800 and circa 1900 until today. OVER. DEAD. ***ZIO.***

[199] Especially, inter alia, all the ***ZIO***-ANGLO-***JOO***-**TOTAL BULLSHIT** about "institutions" (and later in the post-bourgeois mass-democratic era also "di-mok-rasi") as ONE MASSIVE ***ZIO-JOO***-IDEOLOGICAL SMOKESCREEN OV ***ZIO***-ANGLO-***JOO***-**TOTAL BULLSHIT** OV ***GROSSLY DISPROPORTIONATE AND VASTLY ASYMMETRICAL ZIO-JOO*** POWER in regard to social/political law, "the (natural) rights of man / human rights" and what a human is (i.e. eventually in the mass-democratic era, a massified-atomised TOTALLY ***ZIO-JOO***-BRAIN-WASHED-***ZIO-JOO***-PAVLOV'Z DOG-STIMULUS-REACTION-***ZIO-JOO***-ZOMBEE, whereas in the bourgeois era, he was still largely accumulating wealth, even though the hedonism-consumerism had begun on the margins).

directly or indirectly pushed aside the traditional metaphysical and ontological problem examinations (that is with the help of agnostic arguments) and oriented itself instead (of that), in terms of the theory of knowledge and ethically – both disciplines, which refer immediately / directly to men/man/humans, i.e. to the composition, constitution and texture of his capacity for and capability at knowledge and to the meaning of his action or acts. The rise of the historical sciences, which had become for the bourgeois age typical (a typical product) and trend-setting, pointing the way ahead (for its spiritual-intellectual life), went back and was reduced / due to the prevailing and predominance of the primacy of anthropology. In(side) history, human nature unfolds or is actualised / activated – and the attempt to point out (material factors) in those / inside of kinds of law bindedness (determinisms, law(rule)-based necessities) or to track down the influence of material factors, from geographical up to economic (material factors), sprang / arose in the bourgeois thought (intellectual) framework not so much from the wish to relativise human autonomy, but rather from the intention to put an end to the imponderable and incalculable interference and meddling / interventions of God in the world/cosmic becoming (becoming of the world). Furthermore, the turn(ing) towards history served the likewise polemical intent to found the idea of progress and accordingly demonstrate the unavoidability of the collapse (decline, doom, demise, downfall) of pre-bourgeois formations of society / soci(et)al formations and of the victory of the bourgeois social order and bourgeois values. Bourgeois evolutionism – which appeared and made its presence felt first of all vaguely in the early-new-times perception of veritas filia temporis (i.e. truth is the daughter of time) and still during the Enlightenment was founded in a contradictory manner primarily on a historical basis in order to then in the 19th century be constituted as a universal system encompassing / extending equally to nature and history – made up / formed / established / constituted the counter-concept / antithesis to theological fixism / the theological theory of the solidity or

fixedness / fixity of nature and of the animal species, which for its part projected onto / into the cosmos / world the claim of eternity and of immutability (invariability, unchangingness) of societas civilis[200]. In the bourgeois notion / conception / representation / perception, the idea of progress and of development or evolution was paired / coupled, nevertheless, with the idea of order[201], something which was psychologically and sociologically (seen as) quite understandable. Epistemologically, this ambivalence or double / dual / twin care / concern was expressed in the rise of sciences which wanted to study human society (also) in their static (dimension /) arrangement (structure). Sociology became at least partially such a science, and indeed already since its (Enlightenment) beginnings (in the epoch of the Enlightenment), but also political economy, (having) developed in parallel with it (i.e. sociology), in so far as it (i.e. political economy) allowed itself to be guided by the notion or idea that an invisible hand converts and transforms the chaos of the in themselves selfish or short-sighted kinds of acting or acts of individuals into a harmonic equilibrium[202].

The attempt to match and reconcile with regard to one another in theory, or at least to jointly comprehend, progress and order, development/evolution and the resting in itself (i.e. self-contained and full/complete) Whole, dynamics and statics (i.e. the dynamic state and the static state), represented and constituted a significant aspect of the general bourgeois endeavour and effort at harmonisation, it could not, however, undo, reverse, cancel the precedence of the dimension of time in the bourgeois perception of (feeling for) the world –

[200] And precisely Progress / Change (against Christian and largely rural-agricultural societas civilis) as ideology and practice based on the (***grossly disproportionately and vastly asymmetrically*** ***ZIO-JOO***-ANTI-CHRIST-***GREAT SATAN***-MAMMON-DEVIL-EVIL-)**nova** of circa 1800 (Industrial Revolution) and circa 1900 (mass democracy) (both as a part of ***ZIO***-ANGLO-ET AL.-***JOO***-CAPITALISM-IMPERIALISM-SATANISM) brought about, eventually, very likely before 2100, the end of all things human.

[201] Whereas today the ***ZIO-JOO***-DAS-***GREAT SATAN*** is fully "exploring" disorder as CHAOS.

[202] That's what the Chinese and co. are trying to do now (i.e. trying to find an equilibrium as stability on a world scale), given that the ***ZIO***-ANGLO-ET AL.-***JOO-GREAT SATAN*** "***ZIO-JOO***-MASTER RACE ROOL DA WORLD" era is OVER.

and it was also not so minded (/ and it did not, after all, have that intention). The Whole and order always remained saturated/satiated/filled with time in the sense that they became understood and noticed as the ultimate and highest or as the richest-in-content (fullest, richest, ripest) phase of a(n) development (evolution). Even magnitudes, which because/on account of their central normative status and function(ing) were not allowed to be dissolved (by being converted) into sheer, pure historical movement / motion, like for instance "man" and "nature"[203], were looked at as and considered to be, on the basis of new scientific findings (kinds of knowledge), increasingly from the point of view of time, i.e. products of a(n) development/evolution in(side of) time. The bridge (or chasm, gulf, gap, divide) between their normative character and the fact of their materially determined historicity was built (or bridged) by the assumption/supposition/perception that in(side of) (and through) their historical development/evolution (and through it), an original, albeit only embryonic hereditary set of characteristics / existing layout had been actualised; the bourgeois ideal of education structurally corresponded to/with this model of thought / intellectual model. Over and above that, the constituent elements/parts of the empirically given manifoldness, plurality, diversity, variety of the world were looked at and considered not in their (coincidental) being side by side / next to one another / juxtaposition in space, but in their (necessary) succession in time. What stands / exists there in the present tangible or perceptible space, is simultaneously inserted / included / interpolated in(side) time, so that not the parallel presence of things inside of the same space, but rather their different (pre-)history provides the measure/yardstick/benchmark for their judgement and

[203] Man (still largely ***secundum naturam***) still existed ideologically in the ***ZIO***-bourgeois era, because that era was not fully ***ZIO***-ed, whereas in ***ZIO***-mass democracy from circa 1900, Man ideologically ceases to exist because ***JOOZ*** want to wipe out everyone else and rule the world as a "master race", first with everyone else as inferior numbers/monads, and then with everyone else wiped out so ***JOOZ*** as incestual-lizzard-vomit-freak show-animal-scum can tork to ***JOOZ*** about ***JOOZ*** etc., just as ***ZIO-JOO***-DAS-SLOANE does in the witness box in Welles's *Lady from Shanghai* (1947), but this time with no-one else around larfing like a ***ZIO-JOO-*** ZOMBEE.

evaluation[204]: the primitive folks / peoples e.g., who live in the same age / era / times as the civilised folks / peoples and next to / beside them, are found / find themselves indeed in the same (planetary) space with them, but this fact does not appear to be decisive, but the thought that they represent an early and long ago overcome (outdated, out-of-date, surpassed) phase in the history of mankind / humankind / humanity [[appears to be / is decisive]][205]. The bourgeois world view and perception of / feeling for the world had to insist upon this precedence of the factor of "time" / time factor or of historically understood temporality, since it (i.e. the bourgeois world view) had from the beginning grown together and was interwoven with it (i.e. the time factor): it had in fact summoned and called upon/invoked it (i.e. this precedence of the time factor) in order to shake, shatter, unsettle the claim of societas civilis that its structure embodied (would embody) the supra/hyper-historical will of God in reference to the regulation of human living together / co-existence / co-habitation[206], and to fall back on and resort to it (i.e. the said precedence of the time factor) likewise when invoking the power of the "spirit of the time(s) / epoch", in order to surround its demands with the halo of historical and at the same time moral necessity. This function of the magnitude "time" in the bourgeois perception of, and feeling for, the world explains ex negativo why the analytical-combinatory thought figure[207] had to stress the primacy of the magnitude "space".

---

[204] Obviously, under ***ZIO***-mass democratic "mix everyone and everything up except for ourselves" rule, descent is erased for everyone except for incestual-rat-tunnel-vomit-inducing-primitive secret society-savage tribe-organised criminal-ultra conspiratorial-anti-Christ-***ZIO-JOO***-"master race"-rool da world-lizzard-scum.

[205] Certainly, "primitive" and "civilised" here is the way the then ruling historical subjects saw things, since scientifically everyone is civilised in so far as everyone is a part of a civilisation / culture / society, and "primitive" is simply a relative-subjective term from a particular point of view of a particular way of living / civilisation with a certain technological-etc. development compared to another way of living / civilisation with a "lesser" (less "advanced" / less powerful etc.) technological-etc. development (including, as the case may be, as to numbers and political-military and economic organisation).

[206] This is an extremely important point because it means the difference between Man living ***secundum naturam*** without destroying nature and himself, and living with the Industrial Revolution and thereafter ***contra naturam*** under the "guiding hand" of the ***ZIO-JOO***-PRIMITIVE SECRET SOCIETY-SAVAGE-TRIBE-ORGANISED CRIMINAL-ULTRA CONSPIRATORIAL-RAT-TUNNEL-ANTI-CHRIST-SCUM and their ***ZIO***-ANGLO-GALLO-GERMANO-ET AL-***JOO***-ZOMBEE allies, which, ***as it is written***, leads to the end of all things human.

[207] Of mass democracy.

Nature, Man and History were the great divinities / godheads of bourgeois ideology or mythology, in relation to which / although / notwithstanding (various kinds of tactically determined) syncretism(s) (of a tactical nature) with (a) relevant pre-bourgeois ideas (mindset, body of thought) (had) played a more or less significant/considerable role in the moulding and shaping, forming of the same (pre-bourgeois ideas) in regard to the needs and requirements (/ satisfaction of / in order to satisfy the needs) of the bourgeois pantheon. Their consideration as entities (beings, essentialities, substantialities) or hypostases with an unchangeable / invariable / immutable core, despite all of the change / changing or transience, transitoriness of the accidental occurrences (happenings, incidents, events) (accidents) indicated and showed in itself the inc(cap)ablity or rather the unwillingness (indignation, displeasure, anger, resentment) of bourgeois thought to break with / break away (untie/loosen itself) from the idea (conception, representation, notion) of substance (essence). The bourgeois science of nature (Bourgeois natural science) and philosophy decisively combatted / fought / battled, of course, the Aristotelian-scholastic doctrine (teaching, theory) of (the) substance as well as the resting/based on that ontology and metaphysics by setting against it (the Aristotelian-scholastic doctrine of substance) the concept of the function and the functional perception of the law (of nature) / (natural) law. The functional interpretation of the world was not, however, in the course of this, pushed so far that all substances, material substances too, had to be reduced to the mere sum of variable, changeable functions; this occurred only with the prevailing and predominance of the analytical-combinatory thought figure and had, as we shall see, most significant / far-reaching / wide-ranging consequences for the concept of matter as well as for that concept of the human person. The ontological revaluation and upgrading of nature and of man (i.e. humans), which bourgeois thought undertook against the theological world view, however, would have pulled the solid ground from under its own feet if that which was supposed / it precisely

wanted to be revalued and upgraded were to be forthwith / immediately and completely / entirely dissolved in ethereal, hovering (ghostly, eerie, spooky) functions. The concept of the function was, therefore, used to the extent that this appeared to be necessary for the refutation (confutation, reconstruction) of Aristotelian-scholastic ontology and metaphysics; the concept of the substance was, accordingly / correspondingly, retained, but simultaneously was re-interpreted so that it did not mean any longer formae substantiales etc., but simply the material substratum of things of the prima materia, whose relation with / towards the accidental occurrences (happenings, incidents, events) (accidents), of course, continued to remain unclear / indiscernible despite / notwithstanding all (relevant) endeavours, efforts [[to the contrary (to achieve clarity)]]. So (For as) long as the transcending / transcendental spirit in its traditional, ontological and normative interpretation was the main opponent, the tangible materiality of the world could not(, without anything further,) be (completely) disowned, refuted, disclaimed, disclosed (revealed, exposed, sacrificed, betrayed, divulged, abandoned, given up, relinquished)[208]; simultaneously, (with)in the framework/context of the bourgeois normative interpretation of nature and man (i.e. humans), predicates, which were supposed to take away from / exempt, release, relieve, absolve the ontological revaluation and upgrading of matter (from, of) the odium of materialism and nihilism, were attributed to the material universe. Thus, bourgeois thought here also wanted to harmonise and mediate / intercede / intervene – this time between substance and function, between the ontological actuality and the normative potentiality of matter. It often sought, by having recourse/resorting to or seeking refuge /

[208] Whereas under ***ZIO-JOO***-DAS-ANTI-CHRIST-mass democracy, the word, the idea, the subjective perception under FULL-SPECTRUM-***ZIO***-LOBOTOMIZATION-***ZIO-JOO***-BRAIN-WASHING becomes reality in place of Man, even though Man still exists, because the ***ZIO-JOO***-VOMIT-ANTI-CHRIST-LIZZARD-SCUM-BAG wants everyone dead / non-existent so that eventually only ***JOOZ*** will exist AZ ***ZIO-JOO***-HYPER-AUTISTIC-IN-BRED-INCESTUAL-EXTREMIST-ULTRA-RACIST-ULTRA-SUPREMICIST-***ZIO-JOO***-FANATIC-LIZZARD-MONKEYZ in a world of ***JOOZ TORKING TO JOOZ ABOUT JOOZ***. I don't think the China Man and the Rooskee and the Indian Hindoo and Moosalman and African Man et al. agree with that, though.

sanctuary in an agnosticism, which proclaimed the essence of substance to be unrecognisable and unknowable, and through that provided / procured / got an alibis and room for tactical manoeuvres in controversial / dicey / volatile / explosive religious questions and problems, to avoid / evade / escape the difficulties and contradictions, which in the course of this necessarily / had to come into being[209]. There will be talk about that in the next section / sub-chapter.

[209] And given that the God-fearing peasantries (and to a still large extent, working classes) of Christian Europe were still alive and kicking in the 19th century, along with a petty-bourgeois which was not infrequently still religious and or still was openly strict ethically (regardless of actual "behind the scenes" and "in the closet" behaviour), it made sense for the bourgeois "vanguard", which was tolerant of ANTI-CHRIST ***JOOZ*** to the point of ***ZIO-JOO***-REALLY being ***ZIO***-GB PM circa 1870, of trying to "straddle both horses" of Christ and the ***JOO***-DAS-ANTI-CHRIST-MAMMON-DEVIL-EVIL-***GREAT SATAN***.

2. The shaping, forming, moulding of life / Life and culture

Bourgeois economic, political, ethical and cultural praxis was not always directly and consciously deduced and derived from the bourgeois world view, as it was described in the previous sub-chapter/section; that is, the acting / active bourgeois subjects did not have to be clear about certain interpretations of nature, of man (i.e. humans) or of history in order to be able to be active in a manner which may be characterised as bourgeois. Between that which they (i.e. the bourgeoisie) did (or rather, in the ideal case, would do; here it is a matter of / what is of interest is their self-understanding / the way they understood themselves or (of) the often not substantiated claim (/ of the often baseless claim) that they found and base their action and acts on certain norms and values), and the basic lines of the bourgeois world view sketched above, there was, however, a structural correspondence[210]. Because bourgeois action aimed, at least in its ideal or ideal-typical form, at bringing about a synthesis, which, in the harmonisation of many, multiple, (and) in part opposing / opposed to one another material factors, was supposed to exist under the aegis of Reason (of the Reason of Man (i.e. humans), of the market or of the law-giver, law-maker, legislator). The distinction hit/struck i.e. made here between factual/real and ideal action does not have – self-evidently – anything to do with moral judgements, that is, it is not implied that the bourgeois were accustomed to behaving more hypocritically (deceitfully) than other social strata; rather, it interrelates with the sociologically equally necessary distinction between bourgeoisie and bourgeoisness (i.e. the state of being a bourgeois in terms of bourgeois morals, ethics and ethos), which says/means that not all men (i.e.

[210] In addition to : ***Die Aufklärung im Rahmen des neuzeitlichen Rationalismus***, »**Montesquieu. Naturrecht und Gesetz**« and ***Die neuzeitliche Metaphysikkritik***, another seminal P.K. essential reading "background / reference text" here is : ***Konservativismus***.

humans), who (with the criterion) of their material situation and their calling, vocation, profession were characterised as bourgeois, followed the bourgeois lifestyle (style of life) and made use of the bourgeois symbolic system (system of symbols). Things could of course be the other way around too (/ However, the reverse phenomenon could also appear): thanks to the effect and impact and influence of (the) so-called "lowering or subsidence of culture" ("cultural lowering / subsidence or the sedimentation (sinking, caving in, subsiding) of cultural forms" (Kultursenkung)), such strata endeavoured the taking over, adoption, assumption of the above-mentioned systems of symbols and forms of life (symbolic systems and life forms), which on the basis of their position in the system of production and distribution were not bourgeois, but at most "petty-bourgeois"[211].

The bourgeois effort at effecting and realising the in practice most advantageous harmonisation between Reason and the drive, urge, impulse (passions) or culture and nature was accompanied / went with the/an aversion, dislike, repugnance, repulsion, disgust for the dark forces of the irrational and the daemonic (element)[212]. In the invocation of the hampering, inhibitory, impeding, obstructive and at the same time shaping, moulding, formative, forming power of Reason, the need was expressed to keep, preserve intact the belief, faith in the transparency (obviousness, lack of mysteriousness) and ponderability and calculability of the world[213]. Because a ponderable, calculable world meant through and by means of reason-like, rational (reasonable, sensible, sound) action a governable, controllable, manageable, commandable, dominatable world, and that is why the so/thus understood belief/faith in Reason boiled down to and ended up in the primacy of vita activa, as this had been

[211] ANTI-CHRIST-DEVIL-EVIL-MAMMON-GREAT SATAN ***JOOZ*** were both of the bourgeoisie and the petty-bourgeoisie, but most definitely not of the peasantry and the proletariat (no matter how many entry-ist lizzard ***JOOZ*** pretended to be "peasants" or "proles" (to be frank, not that many compared to all the ***ZIO-JOO***-"socialist/communist" leaders, "theoreticians" and party honchoz and goonz)).
[212] As the bourgeoisie understood them in its mainstream of thought.
[213] How about that for a P.K. classic regarding the ideologeme of "corruption and anti-corruption" !!!

asserted and stressed since the (epoch of the) Renaissance in multiple, many variations against the ancient-Christian primacy of vita speculativa[214]. The ponderability and calculability of the world meant still/even more concretely that success and happiness are not inexplicable gifts (unexplainable presents) of coincidence (happenstance, accident, luck), but rather the foreseeable results of rational action[215]. All of this did not necessarily / have to imply the/a fundamental rejection of the existence and of the effect, impact, influence of the irrational (element) in man (i.e. humans) and in society; however in accordance with the general strategy of the expedient (end/goal-oriented, purposeful) channelisation or sublimation of (blind) nature through and by means of reason, the irrational (element) was supposed to be translated into noble and moreover, in practice, useful visions which could serve as a higher motivation and as guidance for rational action. The pragmatism and rationalism[216] of the bourgeois took root, of course, in that his life was most closely, tightly, narrowly interwoven with his work, which (work) for its part had to do with material goods that were measurable and subject to calculation / calculus (/ that were measurable and calculable). Under these circumstances, action had to stand / be under the sign/influence of the motto, maxim, device: "do what is next / do the next thing" (/ action was oriented towards the practical concerns on each and every respective occasion), and all the same / nevertheless, in the background stood the consciousness / awareness that this action was connected somehow to supra-ordinated, super-ordinated, superior ends/goals, with the good (welfare, well-being) and the progress of society or of mankind / humanity. The consciousness and awareness gave wing to, spurred on and inspired the bourgeois and at the same time comforted / soothed / reassured him (/ calmed

[214] Don't forget, vita activa and vita speculativa (vita contemplativa) are ideal types as to fundamental life-stance orientation etc. and do not mean that people did not act in societas civilis or ancient times, and that people did not think (deeply and or transcendentally) under bourgeois oligarchic liberalism or mass democracy !!!

[215] Hence all the non-stop ***ZIO-JOO***-verbal justificatory diarrhoea about "rationality" "just happening" to be connected with ***grossly disproportionate and vastly asymmetrical ZIO-JOO***-possession of economic, state and cultural power.

[216] This is by no means to say that other types of humans do not share in (kinds of) pragmatism and rationalism.

him down), because it seemed to him as if his own kinds of acting, action and acts were in agreement with general laws (and hence in/under the protection of them/the said general laws) which prevail in / govern, rule nature, the economy and ethics. In this sense, the bourgeois floated / hovered between the prosaic or even / and or hard calculation and the great ideological – but always in practice practicable, implementable, u(tili)sable – dreams of progress and civilisation, although it must be noted / observed that the various aspects of this complex struck a very different chord (/ resonated very differently) in various / different subjective bearers. But at least at the level of ideological construction or of the ideal bourgeois self-understanding (/ or the ideal way with/in which the bourgeois understood himself), it seemed that a path/way/road (of successful mediation) had been found between the material and the ideal (element), between money and spirit or feeling ((on) which (it) could be successfully mediated [[by the bourgeois]]).

The positioning / placing of the bourgeois vis-à-vis the metaphysical (dimension, sphere), and indeed the religious (dimension, sphere) illustrates, exemplifies very well his wish to tolerate or even welcome (approve of and sanction) the irrational to the extent that it could harness or serv(ic)e the ends / goals of rational action[217]. A (higher) form of rational action was, in bourgeois eyes, ethics, and hence a reduction of metaphysics and religion to ethics was obvious / stood to reason. God was supposed primarily / first of all to be the guarantor of a moral order (of things), i.e. of being concerned with and taking care (ensuring, seeing) that action remains ponderable and calculable also in its moral dimension by certain acts / deeds having certain consequences so that e.g. virtue is rewarded at least over the long run by bliss (felicity, rapture) and (a/the) harmony is realised / restored / produced / fabricated / manufactured between Reason and drive, urge, impulse. The far-reaching and broad

[217] I.e. rational in the eyes of the bourgeois.

ethicisation of God and religion (/ equating and identification of God and religion with ethics) simultaneously meant a – at times / sometime indirect, but always clear – rejection, refusal of the claim of theology on / as regards judging, making findings, deciding on physical and cosmological issues and questions, whose investigation, exploration and solution was declared from now on the monopoly of modern natural science (the modern science of nature). The (attempt at) compromise between the need for God and religion to continue to be retained as the prop / support / footing (foundation, basis, ground, underpinning) of bourgeois morals / morality / ethics, and the necessity they (i.e. God and religion) be released from their traditional tasks, jobs, duties set, fixed, designated, determined by an ideologically all-powerful, omnipotent Church, was found / worked out / expressed in the form of an agnosticism, which held / considered / regarded everything which made up and constituted the essence of the theological metaphysics of Transcendence to be unrecognisable, unknowable and inaccessible to knowledge, that is, to be in practice irrelevant and useless. Through that / Accordingly, the turn towards From Here (i.e. This World or Life / On this Side) and to praxis was consolidated, whereas to the (pasture(s), pasturage, freehold of the) old world view and the old metaphysical church or worldly, secular tiers of jurisdiction / authorities, only that which one in good conscience could characterise as (an) irrational mischief (devilment, monkey tricks) and nonsense, was left / entrusted. We know, nonetheless, that bourgeois ideology with regard to / considering the metaphysical options, choices of the foes of/from the left[218], generally was not in the least ready, prepared, willing to give up, sacrifice, abandon its dualistic ontology and go/pass/cross over to and embrace, adopt, espouse (materialistic) monism.

[218] I.e. The "Over There" is going to be a socialist / communistic Utopia where the whole world lives in Peace, Abundance and Harmony(, but which never arrives in this world).

The concept of the calling/vocation/profession constitutes the great resultant in(to) which all essential elements of the bourgeois synthesis flow/converge: ethical meaning / perception / sense and material utility, rational calculation and zest/thirst for action, get-up-and-go quality, practical energy/vigour, self-discipline, self-disciplining, self-denial (self-breeding, self-cultivation, self-rearing), and striving for success. The fundamentally and programmatically intended/striven for/sought harmony of Reason and drive, urge, impulse appears here as the subjection, subjugation, submission of the instinctive and, anyhow, ineradicable impulses to/under a rational aim, objective, or as (a(n)) renunciation, renouncement, relinquishment, abandonment of / abstention from immediate, direct satisfaction in favour of a higher and more stable satisfaction, which is then perceived and felt as certain, secure happiness (fortune); the postponement or the restriction, limitation of the satisfaction of (non-sexual) lust, passion, inclination, pleasure, the drives, urges, impulses, which economically / in terms of economics promotes accumulation, is supposed to at the individual-psychological level create the preconditions and prerequisites of a well-being, whose duration is based / founded on measure and moderation (temperance, moderateness). Self-love and selfishness, which has its economic pendant (i.e. counterpart, complement, analogue, cognate, correlate, correlative, correspondent, equivalent, matched pair, companion piece) in ownership, property, property ownership/possession, and the need for pleasure (enjoyment, delight), can in this manner / way / mode come into their own and be satisfied not anarchically or (self-)destructively, but exactly through and by means of the development and exercising of characteristic bourgeois virtues, like order, punctuality, diligence, industriousness and parsimony, thrift, frugality. The entanglement / interweaving of the work ethic (ethos of work/labour) with the wish for earthly success distinguishes it from asceticism in the pre-bourgeois-Christian sense, and it contributes / has contributed for itself the prevailing and predominance of bourgeois professional ethics (the bourgeois ethics of one's

vocation/calling) inside of a society which could not and did not want to be ascetical any more / longer; not coincidentally / accidentally, the formation and development of a coherent professional ethics took place in parallel with the gradual saying goodbye/farewell to (leave taking/severance from) the ethical priorities of societas civilis[219]. The following, observing of and compliance with (abiding by) professional ethics (the ethics of vocation/one's calling) meant simultaneously the greater ponderability and calculability of the world and of individual and collective behaviour. The personal contribution of the bourgeois to the ponderability and calculability of the world longed for by (him) himself, lay in the fact that he could at any time appear / come on the scene as someone who already through and by means of his own ethos (and morals, ethics) vouched for and guaranteed the protection (maintenance, safeguarding) of the principle of pacta sunt servanda (i.e. "agreements must be kept"); his respectability, propriety, decency, seemliness, correctness, decorum benefited others as reliability and (him) himself as creditworthiness (/ benefited others, provided they made use of his reliability, and himself, provided he thus became solvent, able to pay debts, credit-worthy). The regularity and order of the daily routine and the fixed habits constituted as it were the visible expression of the following of, keeping to and compliance with clear principles, but they were (at the same time) also in practice indispensable and essential in a life, at whose epicentre / focal point stood/was work/labour. In this respect, the feeling of / for time of the bourgeois corresponded with the Newtonian teaching, doctrine, theory on/regarding time; time is like an absolute (/ time exists as an absolute), but in itself is an empty/void of content magnitude, it is also available and it is a matter of what the individual does with it, how he fills and moulds, shapes, forms it. The contrast and opposition between work time and free time, between work and play represented and constituted a natural consequence (corollary,

[219] In favour of Class Hierarchy, Church and The Other World / Future Life, etc..

aftereffect) of the bourgeois perception of professional ethics (and morals) (the ethos of vocation/calling), although, on the other hand, the harmonic being next to each other / co-existence of both of these spheres, in themselves separated from each other, belonged to the desiderata of the bourgeois moulding, shaping and forming of life (/ was included in the goals/ends of a full life).

If the concept of the profession, vocation, calling is grasped so widely, broadly, thus it eo ipso provides the foundation for the development and unfolding of the personality. In the profession, vocation, calling man is realised (reified, actualised) as man – and even if/when the profession, vocation, calling as such cannot satisfy all the needs of man, thus its successful exercising creates the material preconditions for the filling of the gaps in one's free time. Through its binding to profession, vocation, one's calling, the personality ceases to be a mere psychological magnitude[220], and gains both a social and economic, as well as an ethical dimension. The latter (ethical dimension) interrelates with the just now discussed professional ethics / (ethics of vocation/calling), the former (social and economic dimension) goes back and is reduced to personal performance as the real support, prop, pillar, mainstay, linchpin of the claim on / in respect of recognition and recompense (remuneration, reward, payment). The personality is, consequently, not only comprehended multi-dimensionally, but also objectified, i.e. it is understood and evaluated in correspondence / accordance with its activity inside of society and not for instance merely on the basis of its intentions, its motives or its self-understanding (/ the way it understands itself). The personality / Personality indeed remains something unique, singular and individual, but through its social behaviour and the therein embodied values, it is connected with the general and the universal. Therein / In this point is the bourgeois perception of personality distinguished from the early

[220] Everyone has "psychological states", even if ***JOOZ***, who are SICK-FUCKING-KRAZY-PSYCHO-PATH IN-BRED, INCESTUAL, AUTISTIC, CRIMINAL, CONSPIRATORIAL, RAT-TUNNEL ANIMALS, give to themselves the "right" to psycho-pathologise others.

romantic perception, despite all of the commonality of the individualistic approach (beginning, departure, starting point). The interweaving of the individual and the general, of the subjective-psychological and the objective-social in the framework of the concept of personality is a genuine bourgeois synthesis, which we can recognise also in the notion / conception / idea / perception of the ideal of marriage. The anthropological and psychological component / dimension is represented here by the procreative (sexual) drive, urge, impulse, instinct, love (Cupid, eros) or mutual, reciprocal affection, sympathy, however it must be converted and transferred/transported into the institution foreseen for it and (be) shaped, moulded, formed and refined in the sense of bourgeois relations (/ in the circumstances of bourgeois life). Marriage constitutes, in other words, a synthesis of the anthropological and psychological components with juristic (legal, juridical), economic and ethical factors or points of view and concerns, so that feelings and drives, urges, impulses can be objectified; material endeavours and efforts can again be perceived and felt as a service to beloved or respected persons. The for the bourgeois soul so important golden mean (middle) between money and ethics, calculation and heart seems to have been (in this cross(ing) point / intersection) found. Over and above that, in marriage and the family the separation between the private (sphere) and the public (sphere) from each other was concretised, which likewise characterised the essence of the texture of bourgeois life (the bourgeois way/stance of life / the bourgeois attitude to life / the bourgeois lifestyle) and ((bourgeois) politics). As an institution, the family belonged to the public sphere, and the life of families was acted out and took place in public(ness) too, when it came to matters, affairs which had to do with the institutional and social character of the family. On the other hand, it (i.e. marriage) represented and constituted the area and realm of the private (sphere) par excellence, outside / out of the way of the competition in politics and the economy, it was supposed to offer the quiet, calm and safe, secure harbour, port, haven, in which one gave himself breathing space

and gained new strength / drew new powers, and at the same time the ground, terrain upon which feelings and interests flourish, thrive, which are hardly of relevance, importance and of utility, benefit in public life.

The bourgeois stance in respect of life (lifestyle, way of life) can be characterised with talk / the expression of "juste milieu", if in the course of this it has the content in the sense (/ we mean the content) of the synthesis sketched above. The same schema determines or governs, however, also the bourgeois understanding of those areas, realms inside of which the public life of the bourgeois was acted out and took place: the economy, society and the state are meant [[here]]. The given by nature or drive-urge-like-impulsive element in the economy are the needs of the social individuals, which are supposed or ought to be satisfied through and by means of production, exchange and consumption. The rational / reasonable / sensible element appears here not only as the effect, impact and influence of the invisible hand, which, irrespective of the will and the acts of individuals, converts the chaotic great variety of events (happenings) in / of the free economy into a functioning equilibrium[221], but also as the conscious fixing, setting, arranging of the rules of the game, on the basis of which economic activity may / is allowed to develop and unfold[222]. The freer the being economic / economising, i.e. economic activity and the larger / greater the space / room is, inside of which it (i.e. the economic activity) unfolds and develops, all the more general and abstract, but at the same time logically cohesive, coherent, closed, shut, unified, united, uniform, self-contained must the rules be. These rules constitute the counterpart, correlative, companion piece, equivalent, complement, analogue of the law bindedness (determinism, law(rule)-based necessity) of nature / natural law bindedness at the level of (one

[221] Obviously, as the ***ZIO***-bourgeoisie saw things.
[222] There was never any form of capitalism as the dominant economic form of production and distribution, consumption, wealth accumulation etc. without up to very great state involvement, even in the 19th century European so-called "laissez-faire" times.

of the main forms of) social action (in one of its basic / fundamental forms), and they are supposed to inspire / instil the same comforting (reassuring, relaxing, calming) feeling like the laws of nature / natural laws, that namely, the market, notwithstanding apparent / seeming anarchy is no less ponderable and calculable than the world in its all its colourful and motley manifoldness / variety / diversity. Now, the state is that authority / tier of jurisdiction which determines the rules, and through and by means of the legal / lawful / statutory protection / safeguarding of certain fundamental / basic norms / normative principles concerns itself with and cares for the regulated course / sequence (of events) / conducting of social labour / work in all areas / sectors. In this respect, the state resembles the deistic or else enlightened God (/ the enlightened God of deism), who fixes / sets / stipulates / determines the laws of nature / natural laws once and for all and abstains / refrains from being mixed up / interference / meddling / intervention / involvement in particular cases too[223]; the arbitrariness / capriciousness of God is put / set aside in the same spirit and sense as "feudal anarchy" at the social level [[is set aside]][224]. The general keeps and holds together / coheres / binds these particular parts not because of the fact that it levels their peculiarity, but merely through the fact that it sets certain limits and boundaries on their motion / movement, yet which make possible free movement in general. This two-sided / bilateral construction at the level of theory corresponded with the double social-historical process that the formation of society / soci(et)al formation in which the bourgeoisie dominated, ruled or, in any case, set the tone, promoted both free competition[225] as well as the centralistic state to a then hitherto unknown extent / degree. Both turned against societas civilis or its remnants and both were summoned and mobilised for the imposition and prevailing of bourgeois interests. The enmity towards the state of

[223] Oh how convenient for behind the scenes ***JOO***-DAS !!!
[224] The "philosophical" justification for the modern centralising (multi-)national state.
[225] As the ***ZIO***-bourgeoisie saw it.

the bourgeoisie is a legend / myth which was disseminated / spread by the bourgeoisie itself in the struggle against the absolutistic state – a struggle, though, which for its part was very ambiguous, equivocal, amphoteric. The great mass of the bourgeoisie knew or always suspected, felt that without general law-making / legislation and without the apparatus / mechanism for its application, no capitalistic economy could function. The fundamental question was who would build, constitute and control the state[226]. Against the arcana of absolutistic cabinet politics[227] and for the legitimisation of liberal representative institutions, the slogan of publicness / public life was coined, created and used, but the same state, which was supposed to stand / be under the constant control of (bourgeois) publicness / public life, had to, on the other hand, through and by means of its general law-making, legislation concern itself with, care and vouch for and guarantee the separation of the public (sphere) from the private (sphere). This separation indeed took its origin in the endeavour and effort to put an end to the religious wars[228], but it was soon / quickly fused with the mode of functioning of the system of free competition and became the self-evident, but also the doggedly defended foundation / basis of the bourgeois way of life in general. Apart from the fact that it often served the bourgeois as a mantle / smokescreen[229] to be able to hide (away) and conceal behind it smaller and larger false steps, missteps, indiscretions, slips, from discreet brothel visits up to suspect / suspicious methods of enrichment / enrichment methods[230], it fulfilled the important task / function of drawing a/the boundary / border line between the objective and the subjective aspect of the concept of personality, as we described it previously / beforehand / above. We are still to see / Below we shall see that the mixing and blending of both of these aspects in connection with the

[226] And whilst initially "all of this" did not directly involve ***JOOZ***, the door was opened wide open for ***JOO***-DA to take over by circa 1900.
[227] Which, eventually, goes back to the closed circle of the feudal / Royal court.
[228] Especially from 1562 in France.
[229] What the fuck has KRAZY MAN been torking about all this fucking "behind the curtain" time ? !!!
[230] ***AAAA-HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA !!***

raising, i.e. abolition of the separation of (the) private (sphere) and (the) public (sphere) represents and constitutes a basic / fundamental feature of mass-democratic politics, way of life and culture (/ of the politics, of the way of life and of the culture of mass democracy).

The separation between state and society or else between (the) public (sphere) and (the) private (sphere) from each other was the social-political side of that secularisation which on the ideological field (/ in the ideological sector) (has) meant the putting / setting aside of the factual monopoly of (Church-sanctioned) theology[231]. In the framework of ideological secularisation, which for the bourgeoisie was just as necessary-for-life, vital, essential as social-political secularisation, culture or education and learning (cultural formation and development through erudition) was put in the place of (/ replaced) traditional theology – though a culture and an education / learning in which (it) – without anything further – could and was supposed to give a place for a purified (cleansed, purged, refined) and enlightened religion (/ where a purified and enlightened religion could and was supposed to have its place). The double / dual / twin character of the bourgeoisie, i.e. the being next to each other and co-existence or parallel existence of the bourgeoisie of the economy and wealth (the bourgeoisie in the narrower / stricter sense) and the bourgeoisie of education and learning corresponded with the simultaneous de-feudalisation of society and de-theologisation of ideology (/ distancing of society from feudalism and social ideology from theology). This parallel existence was – at the same time in view of the inner / internal heterogeneity[232] of both groups which resulted in different possibilities of approaching each other – not always harmonic or conflict-free, in any case, the distance or else the interweaving

[231] And once that was in place by circa 1900 in most of "the West", it didn't take long for the ***ZIO-JOO***-SYNAGOGUE OF SATAN to impose its ***ZIO-JOO***-ANTI-CHRIST-***GREAT SATAN***-MONOPOLY on everyone.

[232] I.e. ***JOOZ*** versus **non-*JOOZ***, and then all the other real or theatrical-fake differentiations within each of the groups …

between the possessors of bourgeois wealth and the representatives of the bourgeois spirit varied intens(iv)ely from era (times, epoch) to era (times, epoch) and from country to country. Despite all the arrogance, haughtiness, pretension, pride, hubris or impatience, frustration, discontent(ment), malaise, of the bourgeoisie vis-à-vis the poorer bourgeois of education and learning, and despite all the contempt and disdain of the professor against/for the speculator, culture and education, learning (or else the striving after them or their promotion, reinforcement), in accordance with bourgeois feeling, opinion and sense (/ the general bourgeois perception), belonged, nonetheless, to the essential attributes of bourgeoisness (i.e. the state of being a bourgeois) (/ (the) bourgeois ethos, morals, custom(s)). A (large) part of the bourgeoisie did not of course take part (in any way) in bourgeois culture (at all), nevertheless, the concept of culture as such remained connected with the average or mean (ordinary, standard) bourgeois self-understanding or self-consciousness, and this counted / had a decisive meaning. This concept (of bourgeois culture) was held to in general be / regarded in general as specifically bourgeois even when the bourgeoisie started to take over, assume, adopt noble forms of culture and living (/ make its own and appropriate forms of life and culture of the by-descent aristocracy). Because this taking over, assumption, adoption, making one's own, appropriation took place in an era / epoch in which the bourgeoisie found itself on the rise, or even only after its (economic, if still yet political) prevailing, prevalence and predominance[233], when it no longer needed the previous polemical symbolism of demarcation and delimitation in the sense of the puritan(ic)(al) spirit or of unadorned, unpretentious (chaste, austere, plain) classicism, whilst on the other hand, the nobility (by-descent aristocracy) only had pomp and circumstance (luxury and exhibitionism) to offer[234]. Despite all the talk of the "feudalisation of the great(er)/grand/large(r) bourgeoisie", we

[233] Especially in the (17th and) 18th (and early 19th) century (as the case may be).
[234] One immediately, inter alia, thinks of Handel.

should not therefore forget that this “feudalisation” occurred only after the social death of feudalism or else / and of the nobility (by-descent aristocracy), and then again to a limited extent. Furthermore, we must constantly keep in mind / keep in view a decisive difference between bourgeois and noble-aristocratic culture: it is a matter of the mass(-like) character of the former (bourgeois culture), which / as it became noticeable / manifested itself in the development of culture of reading / reading habits and the reading public, as well as in the concentration of educated and learned multitudes of people (crowds, throngs) in theatres, museums, operas and concert halls[235].

The double / dual, twin physiognomy and double / dual needs of the bourgeoisie was reflected / mirrored in its ideal of education / learning (educative, learning ideal), which wanted to take into account and cover both education and learning in the wide humanistic sense, as well as technical and vocational, professional training / schooling / education. Natural science and the humanities (humanistic letters, the study of classical languages and literature / the classics) did not necessarily belong together, but they turned in common / jointly against the traditional Church-theological priorities, which, on the one hand, were overturned by the ontological revaluation and upgrading of nature, and on the other hand, by anthropocentrism. In its connection with technique (technology) and industry, natural science (the science of nature) expressed the progressive or dynamic aspect of bourgeois culture and at the same time the mechanistic version of the idea / notion / thought of harmony, whereas the classical ideal poured a much more plastic perception, conception, notion, as it were, into the statics (or static mould / cast / matrix) of the timeless. However, the classical (element) did not merely, simply embody harmony in itself and in general, but also revealed, disclosed, unveiled its inner laws, whose uppermost, topmost, paramount, supreme, highest law existed in the symmetrical relation of

[235] Now we are firmly or mostly in the 19th century.

the Whole and part with each other (/ of the part as to the Whole), as well as in the perfect correspondence of form and content. Before we point to, indicate, show the meaning of these principles for the bourgeois concept of art, we must recall / remind ourselves of the close, narrow, tight interrelation of the classical ideal with the ideal of nature (natural ideal) in bourgeois thought, which represented and constituted an important aspect of the general endeavour and effort to think of and bring nature and culture together[236]. Classical culture, or that which the bourgeoisie held it (i.e. classical culture) to be / regarded it as, now appeared as the noblest and finest development, unfolding of (the norms of) nature under the conditions of human cohabitation, co-existence, living together. This ideal perception of classical culture got / procured / gave it a quasi-hyper/supra-historical character, which jumped over / overrode the time-and-space-determined / having-taken-root-in-time-and-space relativity of all norms and raised the ideal self-understanding of the bourgeoisie to a universal value and measure, standard, benchmark, yardstick (/ and raised to a universal value and catholic, i.e. general, comprehensive measure the ideal way with which the bourgeois class understood itself). The quasi-ahistoricity / ahistoricalness (i.e. lack of specifically, according to a situation, historical grounding) of the classical could not, nevertheless, undo, reverse, cancel, negate the historical orientation of bourgeois thought going back to and having as its source other, just as strong, world-theoretical needs. The perception of the world under the primary, and of top priority, aspect of time, and the historical way of looking at nature and society became the chief, central, main feature, attribute of bourgeois culture and education, learning. This was seen / shown not only in the prominent position / standing of the historical sciences in the education system, and not only in the historical inspiration of the visual (fine) arts or in the

[236] So even though the ***contra naturam*** ***ZIO***-Industrial Revolution was raging in the ***ZIO***-19th century, the ***ZIO-*** bourgeoisie ideologically were still up to fully within ***secundum naturam*** life stances and ideals, including in light of the fact that peasants / farmers and proletarians / workers still made up the majority of society.

structural similarities between the novel and historiography or else biography, but also, and most graphically, vividly, descriptively, demonstratively, in the founding, establishment, institution of museums, in which the principle of succession in time gradually displaced, supplanted, ousted the merely, simply classificatory points of view / criteria, as they / which still predominated and prevailed in the 17th or / and in the 18th century.

The founding, establishment and institution of museums symbolised in general the conclusive autonomisation and gaining / process of independence of a henceforth codifiable and massively showable and presentable, demonstrable secular knowledge. They (i.e. the museums) constituted the temples of the new religion of science[237], which self-consciously, if not contemptuously, scornfully, disdainfully looked down upon the monuments of the theological spirit. The art museums demonstrated in particular the new autonomy of art, which had ceased to be the ancilla ecclesiae (i.e. maidservants / handmaidens of the church) or the means of/for the representation of "despots"[238], and despite its (i.e. art's) clamping, i.e. use for / as a bourgeois means of representation, it now claimed for itself a much more important status, it wanted, namely, to appear next to science and philosophy as an independent, self-contained organ of / for the interpretation and of / for the experience / experiencing of the world. The bourgeois autonomisation of art led, on the one hand, to the monumental representation of the spirit of individual arts through and by means of the building / construction of theatres, operas or museum art collections, and on the other hand, to the idea of the total, comprehensive, universal (catholic) art work as the illustration or tangible representation of the One art in its unity of

[237] All religion is a form of ideology, but not all ideology is religion in the sense of the organised attendance of believers to places of common worship. In any event, the use of "religion" here emphasises that "science" as presented by the ideological mainstream differs not from traditional religion as to bearing an ideological character.

[238] Since all forms of rule are authoritarian, the use of "despot", "tyrant" etc. has always been largely rhetorical and ideological or more rhetorical/ideological than descriptive.

branches and tendencies. The thematic and stylistic transitions from the one art to the other was desired and sought after in this sense, in relation to which the endeavour and effort at synthesis was expressed, amongst other things, in a rich literature about the symbol, allegory and the metaphor. The synthesis, which served this means, however, also had another aspect and end/goal or intention, which concerned an essential feature of bourgeois art and aesthetics. It is a matter of, in the course of this, the fusion of the aesthetical with the ethical (element), of the beautiful with the idea and the truth, of the experiential with the norm (/ of experience with the normative principle), of the individual with the social. In its constant connection and confrontation with the higher realm of values as well as with the questions and problems moving society, art was supposed to as far as possible be objectified, that is, obtain objective content and firm form. The individual inspiration, fantasy and the elementary force of creation (creative force) of the artist were supposed to be tamed and at the same time made fruitful, fertile to the same extent and in the same sense as it happened with the (on purpose) channelisation of drives, urges, impulses through and by means of Reason in the field of ethics. Similarly, was the relationship between form and content thought about/of and perceived in the work of art itself. Form meant the moulding, shaping, formative force which freed content from the random, chance, coincidental, accidental, incidental or untypical and idealised it[239]; the form-giver or form-maker, i.e. the artist was, correspondingly, not a wild, untamed, unbridled magician and an angry, furious prophet, but rather the reverent, pious High Priest and herald, proclaimer, preacher of the ideal in his connection with the objectively existent and generally perceptible world. The fundamental and programmatical demand of the objectivity of art and of the objectification of artistic creation in the

[239] Obviously, under ***ZIO-JOO***-mass democracy, exactly the opposite happens : everything, apart from ***JOOZ*** who are "chosen", "exceptional", "special" and untouchably "holy", is destroyed in oceans of ***ZIO-JOO***-excrement of ugliness and nonsense where the darkness and vulgarity of the cave predominates, and the Light of the Spirit and the Ideal is banished.

harmony of form and content rested and was based, for its part, on the world-theoretical belief/faith in an (ideal) nature, in whose imitation art was supposed to seek and find its inexhaustible source of inspiration. In the course of this / From this point of view, not merely the landscape or the still life, but also and above all man (i.e. humans) came into consideration. Bourgeois anthropocentrism in art was widely grasped (/ had a broad meaning), and indeed as / it meant the connection of the representation of the world with an idea which was important for man and was projected by him (for his part) consciously in external nature; that is why man appeared in part as the resultant, in part as the source of all (effective) forces and factors (having an effect). In this respect, anthropocentrism had as its basis a synthetic(al) concept(ual plan). This is the deeper reason why the mass-democratic dissolution of anthropocentrism went with / accompanied the putting / setting aside of the synthetic-harmonising thought figure in favour of the analytical-combinatory thought figure or else (/ and at the same time) with the dissolution of every synthesis. As to how this process was carried out, we shall see in the first section of the following chapter. There we shall also discuss and examine the basic lines / elements of bourgeois aesthetics in the individual arts in order, by contrasting and by comparing, to be able to understand better the structure of the analytical-combinatory thought figure in (the) corresponding fields, areas, sectors.

III. The dissolution and replacement of the bourgeois synthetic-harmonising thought figure through and by means of / by an analytical-combinatory thought figure in the realm and sector of spiritual(-intellectual) production

1. Literature and art

a. General

The social predominance, primacy, paramountcy of the bourgeoisie did not last long[240] if one lays it out, i.e. measures it with measures, standards, yardsticks, benchmarks, criteria pertaining to universal / world history; furthermore, the bourgeoisie had to very often share it(s predominance) with other classes or strata – in some countries with the always powerful remnants of the by-descent nobility / aristocracy, in other countries with a self-assured, self-confident, assertive peasantry, and finally, to an increasing extent, with the organised workers' movement inside of a (forming, formative) mass society and mass democracy (taking shape/form / being formed). Correspondingly short was the duration of the predominance, primacy, paramountcy of bourgeois culture, which likewise never and nowhere imposed itself and predominated in a pure form in the whole cultural spectrum, but from the beginning was challenged, contested and disputed by various sides. The reason for this social and cultural ambivalence, which characterises the bourgeois age / epoch, can be easily guessed / divined. The bourgeoisie was the first class in history which had connected its own claim to dominance (dominant authority, rule) with the in principle, programmatic demand for the opening of society and for the free unfolding, development of the forces competing with one another in it[241]. The

[240] Between (one,) two to four hundred years roughly, depending on time, place, situation.

[241] Both as a matter of fact and as the bourgeoisie saw things. All societies, at least potentially, exist, inter alia, within the friend-foe spectrum and with regard to (un)wanted change. Of course, prior to the two **nova** of circa 1800 and circa 1900, emphasis was generally placed on continuity and relative Stasis, and what P.K. is referring to here with regard to the bourgeois (e.g. John Stuart Mill rallying the ***ZIO***-ANGLO-***JOO***-ZOMBEEZ against Custom and Tradition) found its ***ZIO***-ideological ANTI-CHRIST ***ZIO-JOO***-DAS-HYPER-NATIONALIST-HYPER-***ZIO-JOO***-INTERNATIONAL ***JOO***-IMPERIALIST apotheosis in all the ***ZIO-JOO*** "open society" rhetorical-ideological garbage-excrement-filth-***CONTRA NATURAM***-FREAK SHOW ***ZIO-JOO***-DAS-KOST CHAOS in the ***ZIO***-mass democratic post-bourgeois era of the 20th century until today, especially in regard to ***ZIO***-USA and its ***ZIO***-ANTI-CHRIST-***JOO***-DAS-***GREAT SATAN***-IMPERIUM.

apparent, seeming, evident, ostensible paradox existed, therefore, in the fact that bourgeois dominance / rule / dominant authority was possible only (with)in the framework of an economically, socially and ideologically pluralistic society[242]. Naturally, the bourgeoisie endeavoured to contain as far as possible this pluralism within the bound(arie)s which were absolutely necessary, essential for the functioning of the system; nonetheless, it could achieve this only partially and only temporarily. The free competition inside of an in principle open society[243], which did not any longer know estate-based (feudal, corporative), inherited, legal and customary barriers (between the social classes of the ancien régime)[244], developed its own dynamic(s) and logic, so that from the womb, bosom of this same pluralism, which was indispensable for the unfolding, development of the social and political activity of the bourgeoisie, the foes of the bourgeoisie and bourgeoisness, i.e. the state of being bourgeois, had to come (forth) (/ necessarily emerged). Things were no different in the realm, area of culture. The bourgeoisie created culture (education and cultivation)[245] in the modern sense as the secular substitute / replacement for the ideological monopoly of theology; however, precisely because of that it had to proclaim the autonomy and the plurality, multiformity of the cultural sphere, and consequently make possible, enable, sometimes in fact/even encourage, and in any case tolerate, the free development, unfolding of anti-bourgeois forces and ideas inside of this same sphere. The free market of culture / cultural goods was also equally for the foe of bourgeois values and bourgeois culture[246], and it could neither be abolished nor decisively restricted / limited without affecting, influencing negatively / interfering with the structure and the mode of

[242] Don't forget, for scientific observation, neither "pluralism", nor "monotony, homogeneity" is axiologically or aesthetically preferable, better or worse.
[243] Again, the "free" and "open" here are the ideological-rhetorical terms used by the relevant social actors, rather than scientifically descriptive terms, given that, scientifically, there is no absolute freedom, just as nothing in terms of human societies is absolutely open or closed.
[244] I.e. the "free" and "open" are relative to feudalism and its remnants.
[245] Here the talk is not of culture in the social-ontological sense as it pertains to all human societies, but of the bourgeois historical-sociological notion of "culture", particularly as "education and cultivation".
[246] The 19th century was relatively rich in both really, true (Christian) conservative, and, socialistic thought.

functioning of exactly that society, which to a great extent was based on bourgeois values and (the) bourgeois cultural good(s). Of (/ From) this antinomy, which was founded on and took root in its (very same) mode of existence (itself), the bourgeoisie could never divest/rid/relieve itself (/ escape).

Like already the nobility / by-descent aristocracy, thus the bourgeoisie already lost control over / of the realm, area of culture / cultural sector, when it still more or less had in its hand(s) the lever(s) of the economy and of politics;[247] and like parts, sectors of the nobility, aristocracy, before its social decline, downfall, sinking, ruin, degradation, abasement, coming down, flirted in a flamboyant, ostentatious and smug manner with promoting, fostering, stimulating, boosting, reinforcing cultural products which turned against the same noble, aristocratic world, so too did some bourgeois, who wanted to remain at the height of (/ in a position of following) the spirt of the times, even play the role of Maecenas (i.e. the patron of the arts(, first century B.C.)) vis-à-vis artists, who had nothing to do with (or in mind as to) the bourgeois scale of values (value scale) and aesthetics. The attack, assault against the bourgeois cultural, aesthetical and ethical canon was carried out, conducted simultaneously from multiple, many sides and directions, tendencies, schools of thought, which indeed agreed in their contrast and opposition to bourgeois norms, but otherwise were highly heterogeneous in terms of form and content, and oftentimes, most of time were in themselves, i.e. internally shattered, splintered, fragmented, split (up). A reason for that lay, certainly, surely, in the synthetic character of the bourgeois

[247] Obviously, in the real world of the social whole, there is no fixed schema of economy first, then state / politics, and then culture, even though it is conceptually and rhetorically useful as a schematic simplification, and in fact P.K. is referring to situations here where those (first the Christian aristocracy, then the secular bourgeoisie), who still had economic and state / political power, were losing out culturally, whilst P.K. is not concerned here with ***grossly disproportionate and vastly asymmetrical ZIO-JOO***-power specifically, i.e. ***JOOZ*** increasing their economic and state power before ***ZIO-JOO***-DAS-ANTI-CHRIST-***GREAT SATAN***-decimating Christian / Renaissance culture (as cultural references) especially in the second half of the 20th century until today, a process which was started by the bourgeois itself from the 19th century when its ***ZIO***-part did not predominate, notwithstanding the ***gross disproportionality and vast asymmetry*** in the ***ZIO***-RODENT-PARASITE-part's ***JOO***-DAS-ANTI-CHRIST-***GREAT SATAN*** favour.

canon itself: the diverse, varied, manifold, multifarious components or aspects of the synthesis offered just as many / an equal number of points of attack, and the synthesis could be dissolved, abolished, terminated because of the fact that every one of its opponents ripped / tore out of / detached from the Whole an, on each and every respective occasion, different element of it (i.e. the Whole), making it (i.e. the said element) autonomous and directing it against the Whole by giving it a totally different meaning than that which it had as a constituent (element / part) of the original synthesis. Thus, e.g. from the on each and every respective occasion different anti-bourgeois tendencies, modern technique / technology was summoned and mobilised against humanistic education / formation, aesthetics against ethics, feeling and life against work and the economy, nature against culture etc., whereby the core of the bourgeois synthetic endeavour and effort at harmonisation was hit, struck in a – on each and every respective occasion – different manner and with – on each and every respective occasion – different means. The great variety (of form) / multiformity or even the radical heterogeneity of the attacks against (the) bourgeois synthesis can, however, also be attributed to (/ is, however, also due to) another reason, which can only become recognised / obvious / conspicuous in the retrospective way of looking at things overall (/ if we look at / review / go over the course of things in their totality). Through and by means of these attacks, the / that thought figure was (gradually) formed (and developed), which (gradually) replaced the bourgeois thought figure, and which prepared the (ideological) transition to mass democracy. It would not, in relation to that, have been in the position [[to do so]] if it had not (comprehended) in anticipation and adequately articulated elements which to a great extent determine(d) – in whatever variation and vulgarisation – the thought world and life world (world of life and thought) of highly technicised (i.e. technologically evolved, advanced) and massively consuming (mass-consumer) mass democracy. To put it another way / To say it otherwise: the inner heterogeneity of the attacks against the bourgeois

thought figure corresponds – always in the retrospective way of looking at things overall (/ the whole evolution / sequence of events) – with/to the inner heterogeneity of the mass-democratic thought world and life world. Before we discuss the question, issue(,) (as to) what are the great, even if / albeit opposing / opposite (between them) leitmotifs, which were mobilised / put forward / entered the battlefield against the bourgeois synthesis and finally brought it down, we must observe, remark that their originators, creators – whether they were now artists and writers (litterateurs, literati, literary figures, men of letters) or philosophers and scientists – indeed often and openly combating / putting under fire the bourgeoisie and its values, however, in the process, did not have any clear consciousness / awareness of the fact that through their words and works, deeds, acts they were paving the way for that social and political construct which we today know as the highly technicised (i.e. technologically evolved, advanced) and massively consuming / mass consumer mass democracy. To the extent/degree they had foreseen certain aspects or features of this construct, they had incorporated their premonitions in utopias of an entirely, completely different inspiration, and presumably they would have been surprised if they had experienced / learnt in which riverbed (i.e. outcome) history had directed, steered, guides, channelled their efforts, endeavours and plans, designs[248]. The heterogony of ends was also in this case relentless, inexorable, implacable, uncompromising, pitiless, unsparing, deadly: in the struggle against the bourgeois synthesis, a thought figure was formed / developed which was put in the service of other ends/goals and realities than those which had directly determined its (i.e. the said thought figure's) formation / development. The decisive historical criterion, in order to evaluate the relation of the originators, creators of this thought figure towards/with/vis-à-vis highly technicised (i.e. technologically evolved, advanced) and massively consuming /

[248] In other words, all the ***non-JOOZ*** amongst them never thought that their "efforts" in the second half of the 19th century / circa 1900 would lead to ***grossly disproportionate and vastly asymmetrical ZIO-JOO***-dominance.

mass consumer mass democracy, is, accordingly, not this, whether they had felt disgusted (in regard (to)), rather than attracted to, such a form of society (soci(et)al form), but this, whether they had ruined, destroyed and disassembled, deconstructed the bourgeois thought figure, forming another thought figure which satisfied, was sufficient for and corresponded to/with the essential needs of post-bourgeois social reality.

If we now want to group and synopsise the great variety of attacks which since the second half of the 19th century were undertaken against the bourgeois synthesis (a)round the decisive, seemingly diametrically opposed conceptual poles, then the following picture arises / results: on the one hand, a cult of modern technique / technology in its fast-moving, frenetic, frenzied, wild, dynamic, disruptive of and sweeping away self-assured, self-confident traditions or routine (of the highroad of) bourgeois ways of thought, thinking and life, living is counterposed to / set against / contrasted with the humanistic aspect of this synthesis directed towards the static classical ideal (/ with the humanistic, related to the static classical ideal, aspect of this synthesis); on the other hand, against that which one feels to be / perceives as capitalistic (vulgar) materialism and the destruction of the genuine and original (i.e. that which comes from the source of things, spontaneous) [element] through and by means of the vile, base power of money, the mystical, timeless, primeval (primordial, primitive), exotic as well as the creativity of a spirit which obeys other/different laws than those of economic calculation or of narrow-minded, short-sighted bourgeois moralism, is extolled, celebrated. Between both of these anti-bourgeois fundamental / basic positionings there are numerous, many and flowing, fluid transitions, especially since they are not always represented by the same obviously, evidently, unequivocally identifiable bearers, but appear in various artists, men (and women) of letters (writers, litterateurs, literati, literary figures) and thinkers in an – on each and every respective occasion – different mix(ture)

/ mixing / blend. This also explains the/our difficulty of drawing a clear dividing line (line of separation) between (the) literary-artistic modern(ism), modernity and those currents which are usually called / characterised as avantgarde. If one is allowed/permitted here grosso modo to differentiate / make a differentiation, thus one must say that the avantgarde is rather inclined to register or to operate (conduct, pursue, maintain, carry on) the smashing, wrecking, demolition of the bourgeois synthesis in/with the cheerful, glad, happy conviction that, accordingly / through that, the chance of a courageous and fun-loving new beginning is offered beyond philistine conventions and the soothing, calming, reassuring certainties of bourgeois wisdom (prudence, cleverness) and Reason / logic, whereas (the) literary-artistic modern(ism), modernity experiences and looks at the crisis of bourgeois culture as the crisis of culture and mankind in general, the collapse of bourgeois values and notions, conceptions, perceptions of order as a crash and fall into the chaos of anarchy and of nihilism; accordingly, in its (i.e. modernism's) circles, the longing for security, warmth in the bosom of overarching, broader and unspoilt, uncorrupted unities, like e.g. the unity of the myth, religion, the idealised past or of the exotic present, thrives and flourishes. Against that, the avantgarde hardly makes sense of / sympathises with medieval harmonies and agrarian or exotic idylls, it is positioned / positions itself profanely or atheistically (/ it has a profane or atheistic positioning), and to the extent that it seeks utopia, it builds the same (i.e. utopia) in the future in the confident use of / by confidently using the possibilities of modern technique (technology), and with an eye on / whilst keeping in mind the needs of the greater/larger masses. Thus, here optimistic social and egalitarian tones ring much louder than in (the) literary-artistic modern(ism), modernity, in which deep-rooted pessimism went with / accompanied an elitism which did not mean a claim to leadership of the masses as it was the case e.g. with the futuristic demand for a government of geniuses and artists, but on the contrary, avoided, shunned every contact with the profanum vulgus. Naturally, there were

inside of (the bosom of) (the) literary-artistic modern(ism), modernity, as well as inside (of the bosom) of the avantgarde, significant, considerable differences of opinion with reference to the content-related determination of each and every respective (pending) anti-bourgeois ideal (being delineated, outlined) (e.g. of "myth" or of "art") as well as with reference to the hierarchy of anti-bourgeois aims, objectives and values. The content-related heterogeneity and great variety and multiformity of the positions directed against the bourgeois synthesis did not hinder and obstruct, nonetheless, their common, joint effect and impact, action since the synthesis mentioned was hit in a different place / at a different point on each and every respective occasion; exactly the choice of this place / point and the connected with this choice particular, but in any case, anti-bourgeois value option (i.e. axiological choice or choice of values) separated the attackers / attacking parties / assailants from one another. An example from the area, realm of the avantgarde can clarify and elucidate this commonality of the [[said]] effect, impact, action despite all the contrast and opposition in the individual positions. When the surrealists don't think much of / speak contemptuously about science and technique/technology, thus it is because they want to put aside and dispel all forms of rationality, which according to their opinion / way of looking at things essentially / of their essence jointly belong / are connected with the bourgeois habitus[249]; and when the futurists get excited about the cold (chilly, cool, frosty) scientific spirit(-intellect) and about the élan (enthusiastic vigour and liveliness) and drive, urge, impulse of modern technique / technology[250], thus they connect with it / that enthusiasm perceptions, notions, representations, conceptions and wishes which likewise go against and run counter to the bourgeois perception / concept of rationality, i.e. they want, with the help of this spirit and this technique / technology, to break

[249] In other words, ***JOOZ*** and ***JOO***-STOOGEZ rationally attack another form of rationality to spread ***ZIO-JOO-*** meaninglessness and ***ZIO-JOO***-nonsense all under ***ZIO-JOO***-CONTROL (**KONTROL**). Surrealism had its apotheosis to a large extent, but by no means exclusively, circa 1920 in the ***ZIO***-FROG world.
[250] Inter alia, c.f. ***ZIO-JOO***-Fritz ***ZIO-JOO***-DAS-Lang's *Metropolis* (1927).

through the bound(arie)s of common sense and of boring, tedious wisdom, prudence, cleverness, come/pull through and survive and tame extreme situations and live dangerously, as well as found and establish an aesthetic(s) which would differ radically from (the) classicist aesthetic(s) [251].

We have already pointed out that both of the great, heterogenous in terms of content and logic, thought (intellectual) complexes[252] which took hold of and clamped down on the bourgeois synthesis, anticipated and prepared both basic / fundamental aspects of the thought and life world (world of thinking and living) of highly technicised and massively consuming, i.e. technologically evolved / advanced and mass consumer mass democracy. As we shall see in greater detail (ch. IV, sec. 2-3), both of these equally / likewise standing/being in a relationship of tension (stress and strain), i.e. competitive towards each other aspects are, on the one hand, rationality separated from humanistic considerations, cares, concerns, which makes possible and maintains, perpetuates, keeps going the mass production of material goods in all gain-bringing, money-making, profitable, lucrative fields, areas, sectors, and on the other hand, hedonistic positionings, stances and ideologies of self-realisation, self-actualisation, which very often are interwoven with all kinds/sorts of mysticisms and exoticisms and promote, foster, encourage and reinforce the mass consumption of the/what is massively produced, i.e. of mass production by clearing away and disposing of earlier ethical inhibitions. The nucleus (sprout, seed, embryo, germ) or the first outlining, delineation of this ideology of self-realisation, self-actualisation in its interweaving with the mystical, original, prim(ordi)al (primitive, primaeval) or exotic (element) is already found in one of both aforementioned thought / intellectual complexes. Both (the) literary-artistic modern(ism) (modernity) as well as the avantgarde contributed here

[251] All the ***ZIO-JOO***-HOMO-POOFTA-TRANZ-LEZZO-SOOPA-HEEROEZ are not unconnected with this. Futurism was, of course, circa 1910-1920 “big” in Italy and Russia before it got ***ZIO***-USA-***JOO***-JACKED.
[252] Futurism and surrealism.

complementarily to the formation of the leitmotifs or guiding motifs. The bourgeois synthesis of Reason and experience (at the cognitive level) or Reason and drive, urge, impulse(s) (at the practical-ethical level) came under fire and was fought, combatted, resisted by both sides. In the course / context of the radical questioning, doubting and challenging of the claims (in respect of) / to rationality of bourgeois science, which in the course of the last decades of the 19th century became louder / more intense (and) (in order) to programmatically arrive/come on the scene at the turn of the century (also, too, as well), the scientific mode of thought / way of thinking was dismissed and disapproved of as the/a product of a superficial, shallow empiricism, and simultaneously, of a rigid intellectualism. Not only the more flexible and in-greater-depth, profound, deep knowledge (cap)ability of intuition, but also another concept of experience, or else the elementary dynamic(s) of it was contradistinguished to it (i.e. the said rigid intellectualism), something which (i.e. the said experience as an elementary dynamic), in accordance with bourgeois hierarchisations, made up and constituted the lower strata of the soul[253]. The degradation, disparagement or downgrading of science was not meant, therefore, merely in terms of the theory of knowledge, but it went with the replacement of the bourgeois image or picture of man (i.e. humans) by another image/picture, which, for its part, corresponded with/to a world image which was no longer that of bourgeois science; because in the same sense and to the same extent man seemed to be possessed by the daemonic, by the morbid or by the sensorial-perverse (element), mystical and mythical forces also seemed to prevail and rule, govern in the world. The myth, which after a relatively long staying, remaining on/in the margins/sidelines of the history of ideas is honoured (comes into honour) once again by literary-artistic modernism, [[and]] undertakes the task or mission of replacing the shallow, superficial scientific explanations of

[253] Following ultimately, at least in part, Plato / Socrates.

the intellect with better explanations, and joins (rabbets, interlocks) again in an organic unity the universe which had fallen apart, disintegrated, decomposed into fragments as a result of the smashing, wrecking, demolition of rational kinds of law bindedness (determinism, law(rule)-based necessity) and causalities. Simultaneously, it is supposed to be directed to the / what is deeper and original, primordial, primaeval, primitive (primal, pristine, unspoilt) in the human psyche, (in order) to mobilise it and to make it talk/speak. The world myth (/ myth of the world) or the psyche could indeed stand under the aegis of and be ruled by the daemonic and dark, gloomy [element, sphere, dimension], but just as conceivable and possible was the predominance of the originally, primordially (by-descent) good and uncorrupted, which one raved on about and exalted in utopian, exotic or idyllic sketches and outlines. Both of these forms of the mythical, in any case, stood / were found equally far from pondered, calculated and ponderable, calculable harmony, which can / could be dissolved, decomposed into its elements and then be reconstituted from these (elements); both the inner/internal structural law / law (in respect) of (the) structure of bourgeois synthesis, as well as the bourgeois equilibrium of Reason and drive, urge and impulse(s) were completely missing, lacking, absent here. On the contrary, the – in accordance with bourgeois criteria, standards, measures, yardsticks, benchmarks – irrational, elementary, irreducible and hence incalculable or even potentially, possibly explosive and dangerous gave the tone, and even if this crystallised in forms, which in their grace (charm) and mirth (cheerfulness, serenity, merriment, hilarity) seemed to be Apollonian, thus under this veneer (coating, layer, complexion), the Dionysian (element, dimension) lived and raged on undiminished, unabated, unimpaired. The mythical-primal(-primordial, original, primitive, pristine, unspoilt) (element) or irrational-Dionysian (element) in the Dadaistic and surrealistic avantgarde experienced a particularly important metamorphosis amongst its many metamorphoses, where it, under the influence of psychoanalytical teaching,

doctrine, theory as free association, phantasy or dream, was celebrated and praised, in relation to which the discovery of its function in the psyche was connected with the demand for the freeing of the supressed, repressed, oppressed soul-related, spiritual, psychic forces, as well as for the unleashing and releasing of the creativity of the individual[254]. Not by chance / coincidentally, these notions, ideas, thoughts – again mixed up with various irrationalisms and exoticisms – were rediscovered precisely by the cultural revolution of the 1960s and 1970s[255] and played a considerable, significant role in the formation (and development) of the ideology of self-realisation, self-actualisation (see ch. IV, sec. 4).

Not only were the mythical and the irrational contrasted with and opposed to bourgeois synthesis, but also their seemingly, apparently polar opposite / opposite pole / antithesis / antipole / antipodes, i.e. technique (technology) and the machine (were also contrasted with and opposed to bourgeois synthesis). This was done, of course, only by certain, but important currents of the avantgarde, which saw in the machine, in its objectivity, sober pragmatism and in its strict principle(s) of construction (i.e. of the machine), the embodied, tangible contrast with and opposition to that which they regarded as bourgeois sentimentalism, and over and above that, an aesthetic model which was supposed to find imitation / be imitated, emulated in the entire field of art; the bourgeois harmonisation of the beautiful and the ethical with each other was therefore replaced here by the practical and the useful in its impersonal

[254] This is nothing but ***ZIO-JOO***-FREUD AND CO.-***ZIO-JOO***-DAS-BULLSHIT-ANTI-CHRIST-***ZIO***-RAT-RODENT-SATANISM seeking to undermine traditional, patriarchal and Christian social disciplining, which before reaching ***ZIO-JOO***-HOMO-POOFTA-TRANZ-ANTI-CHRIST-SATANISM passed through the "let's turn women into sterile FUCK-ABORT-FUCK-CONTRACEPTIVE-"I CAN HAVE CASUAL PORN SEX WITH ANY MONKEY AND SNORTING COCAINE AND TAKING DRUGS IS COOL ETC."-SLUT" phase. "Suppression, repression, oppression" and individual creativity have always existed and will always exist, and they only become politically-culturally significant because of ***JOO***-DAS wanting to fuck up all of society in order to subjugate it as atomised-massified ZOMBEEZ under his ***ZIO***-ANTI-CHRIST-SATANIC rule.

[255] I.e. the destroying of the last vestiges of Christian society by ***ZIO-JOO***-ANTI-CHRIST-RAT-RODENT-***SICK-FUCKING-KRAZY-PSYCHO-PATH***-DEVIL-EVIL-CYCLOPS AND PLATO'S CAVE-SATANISTS in the name of individual / "human" rights.

austerity, frugality, simplicity[256]. Certainly, industry and technique (technology) had their place inside of the bourgeois synthesis, since they represented the secular claim to / on domination over (control / mastery of) nature , but they were looked at as the products of the spirit of bourgeois-scientific rationality, and furthermore, the classical-humanistic ideal was put, placed beside them partly as a supplement (complement), [[and]] partly as a corrective element. Typically (enough) / Characteristically, art, which revolved around the great bourgeois themes – from nature and (idealised) history to the family and the individual in his individuality – had never directly and systematically made a subject out of / thematised industry and technique (technology) or the narrower capitalistic aspect of bourgeois life. In any case, the – in the bourgeois ideal of education, formation, learning, culture (educational ideal) – sought after synthesis of humanism and natural science (the science of nature), or else technique (technology), had a rather short existence: it was dissolved already in the course of the second industrial revolution when technique (technology) gradually revealed / brought to light its revolutionary consequences and forced, compelled, made inevitable the transition of capitalism in forms of organisation / organisational forms which blasted, blew up, burst, broke open the framework of the family enterprise[257], whereby, simultaneously, the transition from mass society to mass democracy was inaugurated / initiated. Modern art undertook under these circumstances a connection / combining / combination of spirit(-intellect) and technique (technology), which differed radically from the bourgeois synthesis between humanistic and technical education, formation, learning, culture. Through and by means of the breaking away and detachment

[256] I.e. more ***ZIO-JOO***-ugliness and ***ZIO-JOO***-nonsense in a massified-atomised and increasingly undisciplined and degenerate society under more and more and more ***ZIO-JOO***-CONTROL (**KONTROL**).

[257] This, i.e. the smashing of the family enterprise circa 1900 (i.e. in the second half of the 19th century and first half of the 20th century), is a key world-historical step in concentrating ***ZIO-JOO-***economic-state-cultural power in the hands of ***ZIO-JOO***-corporate / group power of the ***GREAT SATAN ZIO-JOO***-ANTI-CHRIST-DEVIL-EVIL-***CONTRA NATURAM***-HOMO-TRANZ-POOFTA-LEZZO-PORN-DRUGS-STERILE-FUCK-ABORT-SLUT-MONKEY-WORSHIPING-***ZIO-JOO***-TOTAL SHIT-TOTAL FILTH-EXCREMENT-SHIT-SKATA-KOST-FREAK SHOW SOOPA ***ZIO-JOO***-DAS-FREAK.

from the bourgeois world-theoretical framework, modern technique (technology) was seen / showed itself in its geometrical nakedness, as the work or manifestation of a hard, unsentimental, manly (masculine, virile) spirit, which in its thirst(ing)/burning for action, champing (chafing) at the bit urge, wish, desire, need, impulse, yearning sought (a) space/room for unfolding and development beyond the bourgeois binding / tying of rationality to ethics and of culture to nature. Because the machine did not represent and constitute an imitation, copying, emulation, mimicking of nature, but its overcoming, surpassing through and by means of the spirit, which in its sovereignty did not in the least feel duty-bound and obliged (obligated, liable) to (reverently) bow down (with reverence/awe) before natural or classical patterns and norms. The avantgarde cult of the machine turned, therefore, not only against the aesthetic principle of the imitation, copying, emulation, mimicking of nature, but just as much against the (tightly / narrowly / closely connected with/to this principle) classical ideal – in general against the bourgeois perceptions of harmony, taste and style, as well as against the bourgeois obsession with (fanatical zeal for) culture (/ mania for education, learning and cultivation / culture). It sounds / seems to us like a prophetic vision of the form(s) of life / life form(s) of mass democracy when the same futurists, who so emphatically pursue and give so much emphasis to the cult of the machine, simultaneously espouse the abolition of humanistic schools and the promotion, fostering and reinforcement of technical education, learning and of sports[258].

The avantgarde glorification of the machine (/ The exultation, praising of the machine by part of the avantgarde) was supported / borne / sustained by an ideal of society (soci(et)al ideal) which was no longer bourgeois (/ which was

[258] It may not have seemed to most futurists circa 1900 that machines and sports lead to sterility, homo-lezzo-sexuality, tranz-monkey FREAK SHOWS and genocide, but that is the trend the ***GREAT SATAN***, ANTI-CHRIST ***JOO***-DAS wanted and got for the death of the historically Christian peoples of "the West" by circa 2000.

different to/from the bourgeois ideal of society), and at the same time was supported by an optimism of / optimistic belief in progress, which in its enthusiasm for vivere pericolosamente and in its iconoclastic force, momentum, impetus, vehemence, fury, rage, passion, ire, virulence[259] rode roughshod over and left behind the bourgeois conception, notion, perception of the unity of progress and order[260]. The opposite positioning, namely the positioning of cultural pessimism, which, of course, took root and thrived mainly, especially, chiefly, primarily in the circles of (the) literary-artistic modern(ism), modernity, and not amongst the representatives of the avantgarde / the avantgardists, had no less an anti-bourgeois effect and impact than this drunk-with-the-future optimism of progress [[of futurism]] (/ than this optimistic belief/faith in progress, which was inebriated and drunk with/because of the/its vision of the future). The slogan, password, watchword, buzzword, parole, emblematic term (“)decadence(”) came already from / appeared already in the forerunners of (the) modern(ism), modernity, that is, in a time when the bourgeoisie found itself at the high point (climax, pinnacle, peak, culmination, apogee, apex, summit, zenith, acme, crescendo) of its self-feeling, feeling-for-itself, i.e. self-esteem or self-conviction as the maker of history, and turned against the bourgeois idea of progress, from which the aesthete in his elite consciousness and awareness wanted to withdraw, retreat and separate his position for two reasons: on the one hand, because he detested, loathed, abhorred the philistine need for security, safety and certainty in general and hence / consequently saw in the belief in progress a clever, cunning, sly, shrewd, crafty trick, device, contrivance, subterfuge, ruse, artifice of the bourgeois, who sought an additional (feeling of) security, warmth and comfort in the supposed certainties regarding the course of history; and on the other hand, because the idea of progress,

[259] I.e. ***JOOZ*** and their ***ZIO-JOO***-ZOMBEE-STOOGEZ.
[260] I.e. ***JOOZ*** and their ***ZIO-JOO***-ZOMBEE-STOOGEZ riding roughshod over ***non-JOOZ***'s order (which included da ***JOOZ*** who were part of that old order but still not in up to TOTAL AND ABSOLUTE ***ZIO-JOO-GREAT SATAN***-ANTI-CHRIST CONTROL (**KONTROL**)).

despite all of its ad hoc modifications and variations, was equally shared by bourgeois[261], democrats[262] and socialists[263], something which seemed to confirm (certify, attest to, bear out) its vulgarity / vulgar-market character. Precisely this anti-socialistic peak, tip, point, spike of (the) ideology of decadence (decadence ideology) and mood, disposition made in a later phase, when the foe became overpowering and superior in strength (overwhelming, overly powerful, all-powerful, hyper-powerful) from below, parts / sections of the bourgeoisie susceptible to it; which, again, on the left side of the political-literary spectrum created the propagandistically useful optical illusion that the "decadent" aesthetes had originally / ab initio / from the very beginning articulated "bourgeois-reactionary" ideas[264]. More interesting for our problem formulation / putting, setting of the question (/ for us) is, however, something else. The idea of decadence was indeed not elucidated, explicated or clarified in detail in terms of the philosophy of history, it could, however, be connected with both an incoherent or fragmentary image/picture of history which did not permit progress conceived in terms of law bindedness (determinism, law(rule)-based necessity), as well as with the longing, yearning, nostalgia for a more or less distant past, which was supposed to make up and constitute (/ which constituted) the graphic / representational opposite of / figurative contrast to the decadent present. Sometimes this past was lost / lost itself in the primeval / primordial times of the myth or in the regions of the primitive and of the child-

[261] Who were per definitionem oligarchical (that's why I laughed so much when in a great Manoel de Oliveira film about a blonde slut, Robespierre was called a "democrat" ***HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA !!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!***)
[262] This is not just the way those social-political actors saw themselves as "democrats". In the 19th century, because massification and industrialisation / technicisation / money-commodification etc. had still not always reached an all-encompassing universal extent even for "advanced" societies, notions of democracy at that time were often closer to really true democracy, based on the polis in a largely still agrarian society of citizens of the same or like descent and of the same or like fundamental religious / ideological beliefs, always associated with (ethno-)patriotism and related collective / community action.
[263] Who in the 19th century were often or at least sometimes up to the same / synonymous with "democrats".
[264] The real-deal Old Left was always against decadence, in favour of labour, work and productivity (albeit with better conditions), but under ***ZIO***-USA in the second half of the 20th century "the Left" became "New" and "flipped over" to TOTAL AND ABSOLUTE ***ZIO-JOO***-OBONGO-HILLARY-ET AL.-CARPET MUNCHING-SMOKE WEED, MY WIFE IZ A HIDDEN TRANNY, ETC. ETC. ETC. DEE-GENERACY.

like (childish, innocent, naïve) so that both the ascertainment of the decadent present, as well as the mythical-primordial/primeval/original (element), could simultaneously turn against the bourgeois idea of progress. What(ever) (with)in the framework/context of this latter (bourgeois idea of progress) functioned as the lowest tier / gradation of historical evolution / development, obtained / got / received, accordingly, a higher status and eminence, and the schema of the philosophy of history was placed / made to stand on its head / turned upside down / turned totally around / reversed totally with polemical intent. The polemics became acuter and sharper / exacerbated / aggravated / intensified whenever decadence was not once bemoaned / lamented / complained about / mourned / bewailed or denounced, pilloried (/ did not even become the object of complaints and reproaches, censure), but was declared as a state of affairs or situation in which one lives enjoyably, delightfully, with pleasure and can destroy himself without regrets and without self-pity or bourgeois-moralistic prejudices[265].

In the thought/intellectual or spiritual world of modern and avantgarde literature and art, the bourgeois synthesis was, therefore, simultaneously attacked by the opposed extremes of the myth or else of the irrational (element), and of technique / technology or else of the machine; of decadence and of optimistic iconoclasm[266]. The same constellation (configuration or arrangement) arose when the concept of art itself was thematised (i.e. made a topic of discussion) and against the bourgeois perception of the character and of the task, mission of art, on the one hand, pure aestheticism or formalism, and on the other hand, the demand of the dissolution of every form and of the abolition, cancelation of art was summoned up[267]. The aestheticism sprang, just like the

[265] Which in practice meant life-stances up to very close to ***non-ZIO-JOO*** Christian ideals.
[266] I.e. ***JOOZ*** and their ***ZIO-JOO***-ANTI-CHRIST-***CONTRA NATURAM JOO***-DAS-ZOMBEEZ.
[267] In order "to get" ***ZIO-JOO***-NONSENSE and ***ZIO-JOO***-UGLINESS, whether it's Picasso (notwithstanding his "good bits") or anyone else from the 20th century ***ZIO-JOO***-STOOGE-"masters".

cult of the machine, from the making independent and autonomous and the absolutisation (making absolute) of an element, which indeed had been taken into consideration inside of the bourgeois synthesis – after all, art was elevated to the status of an equal sister of philosophy and science only inside of bourgeois society –, but in its breaking away and detachment from it, it had to get, receive, obtain an anti-bourgeois sense. Against (/ As we must stress against) a prejudice, which was spread and disseminated by left-wing accusers, prosecutors, denouncers, opponents of "bourgeois-reactionary" elitism and escapism (from social reality) and was substantiated and corroborated (/ and at the same time it appeared to be confirmed) by the fact that the late bourgeoisie, in the/its struggle against socialistic-Marxist(ic) integrative/unifying theses, had to defend the autonomy of the individual social areas (i.e. of the individual areas, realms or sectors of society), the theory of "l'art pour l'art" is not of a bourgeois, in fact it is directly of an anti-bourgeois origin. Bourgeois synthesis demanded an embedding / integration of art in society and its norms, which was supposed to be realised by the binding and tying of the beautiful to the true and the good[268]. Precisely this binding / connection is destroyed by aestheticism, with which the breaking away, detachment of art from its social or else didactic task, mission and its transformation and conversion into the free game of a / the gifted, talented, able subject went. Now / From now on, the aesthetic (element) could be totally/completely separated from the ethical norm and from the normal or natural/physiological in general, and be connected with what from the bourgeois point of view, in which beauty and ethics or ethically understood truth belong together and are interwoven, had to be regarded as ugly, hideous, nasty, grotesque, paradoxical, ludicrous, risible, clownish, laughable, perverse, perverted, distorted or terrible, horrible, awful, dreadful, heinous, scary,

[268] See footnote 253 above.

terrifying, frightening, horrifying[269]. In the place of the beautiful in the bourgeois sense steps (/ The beautiful in the bourgeois sense is replaced by) the interesting, amazing, astonishing, astounding, shocking or confusing, perplexing, bewildering, embarrassing, which, irrespective of its ethical quality, is viewed, regarded, looked at, seen as artistically valuable and worthwhile. Out of / From the contempt, disdain and scorn for bourgeois awe and reverence before the norm and normality (and the natural), value is ascribed, attributed to all things / everything which diverge(s), vary/varies, deviate(s), depart(s), digress(es), differ(s) from the normal; the aesthete in fact does not baulk at / shy from an equating of art and crime[270]. The divergence, digression from the ethical norm, however, is accompanied in the history of (the) literary-artistic modern(ism), modernity by the increasing divergence, digression, distancing from the norm as form, until, finally, all (traditional) formal / form-related norms break down, collapse and crash. Because the interesting and the surprising (amazing, astonishing, astounding, striking), in short, the imponderable and incalculable, appears autonomous and isolated next to other similar elements; it does not therefore obtain its meaning and value through and by means of its being put into order in (a certain place of) a Whole[271], which could have only turned out to be thus and not otherwise / differently. Accordingly, the bourgeois notion, conception, representation, perception of harmony, as the well-tempered relation between (the) Whole and (the) part, is

[269] Whilst the "bourgeois view of the world" as an ideal type is by no means the same as ideal types arising from pre-bourgeois and Christian societies in Europe, there is an up to strong "line / element" of continuity from the pre-bourgeois and Christian eras to the bourgeois epoch (including in relation to continuity from classical antiquity, notwithstanding "Renaissance" mythology), whereas the novum of circa 1900 and ***grossly disproportionately and vastly asymmetrically ZIO-JOO***-mass democracy marks a clear ***ZIO-JOO-GREAT SATAN***-ANTI-CHRIST-***TOTAL FILTH-ZIO-JOO***-UGLY-***JOO***-FUGLY-***ZIO-JOO***-DAS-NONSENSE-break.

[270] I.e. total ***ZIO-JOO***-ANTI-CHRIST-DEVIL-EVIL-CRIMINAL-SATANISM (not unrelated to all the ***contra naturam ZIO-JOO***-STERILE-ABORT/CONTRACEPTIVE-FUCK-SLUT-HOMO-LEZZO-POOFTA-TRANZ-MONKEY-DRUGS-PORN-SELF-RACIST-EXOTICISM-KOST-GARBAGE as well). As much as ***ZIO-JOOZ*** and their ZOMBEES "larf", **it was written** probably just before 100 A.D. that the ***JOOZ*** will bring about the End of all Humans with their ***ZIO-JOO***-ANTI-CHRIST-***GREAT SATAN*** NON-STOP-***JOO***-DAS-CRIMINALITY, and since circa 1900, that process has been ***ZIO-JOO***-turbo-charged, and now we are very, very, very close …

[271] As in the case of relatively static societas civilis, or even (to an albeit up to much lesser extent than societas civilis) oligarchic bourgeois liberalism, as compared to mass democracy.

cancelled / annihilated / becomes unnecessary / ceases, and the transition is carried out from the composition, construction, building of the work of art on the basis of firm form-related (i.e. formal) rules to the subjective handling of the form, and indeed without consideration for/of the socially predominant forms of communication and of understanding. The dissolution of the forms of bourgeois art did not have to, nevertheless, signify the saying farewell to and detachment from every form and every aesthetic. In (regard to) the masters of (the) literary-artistic modern(ism) (modernity), that dissolution was in fact connected with a new strict consciousness of form[272], which in part draws from the sources of aestheticism and turns against avantgarde chaos (/ against the amorphism / lack of form of the currents of the avantgarde). Moreover, the formalism of (the) literary-artistic modern(ism) (modernity) expresses a consciousness which springs from the general aversion of the representatives of this direction, tendency, school of thought/culture against capitalism and capitalistic civilisation; form is worked on here not in accordance with the art of an industrial worker, but rather of a medieval master, who understands and looks at his handwork, (handi)craft, trade as a Whole and has mastered it from long contact and familiarity, interaction, dealing with the object and the secrets of his métier, job, trade, field of expertise, profession.

Against bourgeois synthesis, not only, however, did the aesthetic autonomisation of art and form turn, but simultaneously also the demand for the abolition of art and form in general. Here the avantgarde in its various directions and performances in an – on each and every respective occasion – different manner stood out – and that which it originally, initially desired and called for, was later to a great extent / largely realised, at least as caricature or as advertisement, in highly technicised and massively consuming (i.e. technologically evolved/advanced and mass consumer) mass democracy. With /

[272] Inter alia, Ezra Pound, Picasso, F. L. Wright, Stravinsky et al..

By saying the abolition of art, the representatives of the avantgarde / avantgardists did not, though, mean the mere elimination of the forms of art inside of a society, which otherwise would continue on its path unchanged, but such a parallel reshaping of art and life, that art could casually, effortlessly, in a relaxed manner and completely be absorbed into and by life. This aim, objective was from time to time, occasionally, sometimes pursued primarily with regard to important sub-areas / in part, partial fields / part-fields, thus e.g. in the so-called productivists with their plans about the connection of production and art (with each other). The great dream, as the dadaists and surrealists had in mind, nonetheless existed in / was the all-sided fusion of art and life, whereby both the borders, boundaries between the various arts, as well as between the various areas, realms of life, were supposed to fall[273] – boundaries, which in the bourgeois conception, notion, representation, perception, despite all endeavours and efforts at the reciprocal, mutual complementing, supplementing and harmonisation of the areas, fields, sectors demarcated, delimited from one another, remained clear, and corresponded to/with an essentially different view(point), perception about / regarding the structure of society and about / regarding the role of art in the thus/so structured society (/ in society structured in such a way). Now the poetical (element) as a particular art, and the artistic (element) in general of all particular, in part, individual arts, was supposed to, as it were, be removed, deducted, separated, segregated, dissociated from the poem / poetry and be spread over the whole world of objects and humans, people, in order to form the objects and humans, people differently and manufacture, fabricate, make, produce, restore different relations between them (i.e. the said objects and humans) than beforehand. Under these circumstances and conditions, art can be conducted, pursued, carried on in various forms, in practice, by all men (i.e. humans); the since the Renaissance awe-inspiring

[273] More TOTAL AND ABSOLUTE ***ZIO-JOO***-AND-***ZIO-JOO***-STOOGE-ZOMBEE NONSENSE-BULL-SHIT.

concept of genius is mocked, derided, scorned, lampooned, scoffed, jeered and even the assumption / idea of "talent" is thrown overboard and rejected. If art consists in the free and spontaneous unfolding and development of the creativity of the individual[274], then that is superfluous for which talent was good / needed, namely the (cap)ability at the form-related (i.e. formal) working on, processing, handling of (the) artistic material on the basis of certain rules. The attack against genius and talent struck, however, not only the bourgeois perception of art, but just as much the central bourgeois concept of individuality. The bourgeoisie always had its difficulties in interactions and dealing with the artist and his genuine or put-on, pretended ingenuity, genius, brilliance; it feared / was afraid of his imponderability and incalculability and endeavoured to tame the / what was wild in him through and by means of the institutionalisation of art[275]. Nevertheless, the ingenious, brilliant artist was flesh of its (i.e. the bourgeoisie's) flesh, a/the high or even the highest embodiment of that individuality, from which the bourgeois ideal of man (i.e. humans) and of education, learning, culture lived.

In the area / field of literature and art, nonetheless, not only was bourgeois synthesis fought against, but also the bourgeois himself as a human type (was fought against). To this (bourgeois type of (hu)man), one again counterposed two completely opposed / opposing types of (a hu)man, which as to each other behaved analogously (/ between them were) like for instance aestheticism and avant-gardism. It is a matter here of the dandy on the one hand, and the bohemian on the other hand. Whereas the bourgeoisie, as long as he struggled against the nobility and aristocracy, could step onto the stage as a hero of / in a

[274] So that even in-bred, savage tribe, primitive secret society, organised criminal, and conspiratorially organised, paralysed, intellectually disabled, spastic society, mentally retarded, incestual, autistic ***JOOZ*** and their ***ZIO***-ANGLO-GERMANO-ET AL.-***JOO***-ZOMBEE STOOGEZ can be recognised as "talented", "artistic", "smart", "intelligent", "civilised" and "great", and whatever other ***ZIO-JOO***-BULL-SHIT-NONSENSE one can think of, along with ***JOOZ*** giving to ***JOOZ*** various ***ZIO-JOO***-CONTROLLED (**KONTROL**) "prizez", including involving "nobility" !!! ***AAAA-HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA !!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!***

[275] Which over time was up to completely taken over by ***JOOZ*** and or ***ZIO***-dee-generates.

tragedy; during / in the course of the 19th century he turned more and more into the main person / character of a partly burlesque, partly dirty, sordid, squalid, smutty, filthy comedy. The artist and the literary man / man of letters / literary figure now believe they know which forces move, i.e. set in motion bourgeois society: behind the façade of moralism and good, suave, sleek, cultured manners, naked, bare interests rage and the power of money piles up / burns, everything is for sale, purchasable, buyable and everything is subject to ruthless, reckless, inconsiderate, thoughtless, fearless, undaunted, without-hesitation calculation. Under these circumstances, the bourgeois remains only in regard to his own self-understanding a bourgeois; in the eyes of the artist and the man of letters / literary figure, he is either the (phantasy-less) philistine (without phantasy, imagination), who narrowly interprets and with fear (and in a state of intimidation) follows bourgeois norms (normative principles) and the related rules / code of behaviour / conduct, or a vulgar bourgeois, who as the creator and representative of a spiritless civilisation only thinks about his material interests and his personal well-being. That is why the bourgeois juste milieu (just or golden mean / middle path of moderation and compromise) means in its practical realisation, implementation, application, conversion, half-heartedness, hypocrisy, mediocrity and opportunism; the endeavour at harmonisation means the reverse / other side of bourgeois angst (or fear) before tragic splits, divisions and before direct confrontation with the sharp, spicy alternatives of genuine, authentic life; (the) much-praised sober realism is tantamount to the/an in(cap)ability for great ideas, and moralism to narrow-mindedness, if not to sanctimoniousness and pharisaism. In this world of the philistine and of the bourgeois, the sensitive, as a rule in fact hyper-sensitive, soul of the artist feels alien, foreign, strange, it detests, loathes, abhors the prosaicness, dullness of an everyday life of vulgar materialism, it is bored and turns towards hedonism or it revolts and wants to break, fracture, crack, rupture the dominance of money through and by means of spirit, idealism and bold, daring, audacious deeds,

acts.

In bourgeois individualism, which, despite all in principle acknowledgement and recognition of the independence of the individual, considered as self-evident its binding to socially valid norms (/ socially applicable normative principles) and targets, objectives, as well as its constructive participation in social labour / work; now the dandy and bohemian counterpose a much more radical individualism, which in a certain regard / from certain points of view, albeit still distorted, deformed, anticipate(s) the later ideologies of self-realisation and self-actualisation. Both want through their own life stance and way of living to clearly and graphically project and demonstrate (their) opposition to (the) moderate, measured, restrained and disciplined bourgeois (conducting of) life, only that each does this in his way, i.e. the former (dandy) through the extreme refinement of form, the latter (bohemian) through its destruction. The autonomisation (making autonomous) and the exclusive cultivation of form by / on the part of the dandy was connected, of course, with the aestheticist principle of the superiority of art vis-à-vis nature[276]; simultaneously, however, the disregarding of and indifference to content hinted at and suggested indifference to every utilitarian or practical consideration and concern. The game is / Games are consequently counterposed to bourgeois earnestness, seriousness; to work / labour, leisure and idleness; to sentimental moralism, ostentatious cynicism – this, on the one hand, as the refusal to warm to anything (/ of earnest and zealous participation in something) useful and beneficial, and on the other hand, as the/an insolent reminder to others that a refined observer is always to be found near them, who, by force of his own lack of (having any) illusion(s), sees through the hypocrisy of conventions and of the dealings and transactions in the/a Vanity Fair / (fun)fair of vanity and

[276] Part of the ***ZIO-JOO*** and ***ZIO-JOO***-ZOMBEE ***contra naturam*** programme, obviously.

conceit(edness)[277]. Finally, to the bourgeois wish for/regarding the lust for life, psychical euphoria and health, decadence and morbid moods (ennui, spleen) are counterposed, which are supposed to bear witness to (a) finer and deeper sensibility (sensitivities). Differently than the dandy, the bohemian does not summon / rally this or that / any kind of morbidity, decadence, degeneracy against psychical equilibrium, balance and the sobriety, matter-of-factness, practicality, functionalism of the bourgeois, but a much more elementary lust for life, which is expressed as the free unfolding of phantasy, imagination and of the art of improvisation during the shaping and formation of everyday (daily) life, as spontaneity and nonchalance. With that goes the cheerful, glad, happy, (self-) confident, (self-)assured, imperious defying, defiance, contempt, scorn of conventions, good manners and good upbringing, education, training, in whose place, at least in the ideal case, genuine cordiality, warmth, heartiness, geniality and true, albeit unsentimental comradeship, camaraderie are supposed to go. The type of the bohemian as the main representative of the anti-bourgeois habitus comes since the final decades of the 19th century all the more to the fore / into the foreground, and indeed to the extent / degree that the forms of the underworld and demimonde, from the prostitute, whore and dancer up to the bohemian himself, make their entry, entrance into the thematic circle of literature and of the visual arts or / and in fact are declared to be the (role) models worth imitating for a(n) unforced, spontaneous, casual, open life (/ of a free and open life)[278]. The atmosphere of the Café-chantant, of the bordello or of the (railway, train) station become just as familiar gradually inside of the same

[277] All of this dandy "stuff" (and the "stuff" regarding the bohemian below) is the 19th and early 20th century avant-garde predecessor of the massified life-stances of the 1960s and 1970s ***ZIO***-cultural revolution, which did "everything" except see the hypocrisy inherent in ***ZIO-JOO***-ROOL, which promises and at least in part delivers individual "human" rights, but maintains a generation to generation succession in ***grossly disproportionate and vastly asymmetrical*** collective-group ***ZIO-JOO***-SATANIC-***GREAT SATAN***-ANTI-CHRIST-CONTROL (**KONTROL**), POWER AND ROOL, which is "not hypocritical", and if pointed out for what all that ***ZIO-JOO***-DAS-hypocrisy really is, is deemed a manifestation of Christian "anti-Satanism", which is supposedly "bad", when anti-Satanism is the natural position of every Christian, for whom Satanism and the ANTI-CHRIST ***JOOZ*** and their ***ZIO-JOO***-ZOMBEEZ are TOTAL ***ZIO-JOO***-SATANIC-ANTI-CHRIST EVIL.

[278] Relatively "free and open", because "free and open" as such and in absolute terms does not exist, but only as rhetorical, ideological BULLSHIT, in human affairs.

thematic circle – all places which culturally symbolised precisely the opposite / the exact opposite of what the opera and the grand / great theatre stood for. The early and rapid spreading, dissemination, as well as the increasing salonability (i.e. the greater acceptance amongst higher social circles) of cultural goods / assets, which initially, originally were housed, located in the lower social strata (tango, jazz etc.), constituted an additional sign of the bohemian's victory, of the demimonde – and of mass society[279] over the bourgeois.

Now we can have an overview of / review as to how these developments on the field / in the area, realm of literature and art led to the replacement of the bourgeois synthetic-harmonising thought figure by an analytical-combinatory thought figure, which objectively corresponded to/with the thought style and reality of life / living reality of mass society and mass democracy. The smashing, wrecking, demolition, disintegration of the bourgeois synthesis by attacks which came from various, in fact precisely, absolutely, completely opposed, opposite sides, transformed and converted all that / everything which previously, beforehand could be thought of only as an organised Whole (person, History, Nature), into parts or fragments which no longer stood / were in necessary relations towards / with one another (/ which were no longer found between themselves in necessary relations)[280]. Whereas in the bourgeois conception, perception, notion, representation of harmony, the part was always / always constituted a part of a Whole and lived from this relation for / towards the Whole, which, for its part, only became a true Whole through and by means of the great variety, multiformity and the wealth, richness of its parts, now the

[279] Mass society started to form under the bourgeoisie, but when the latter lost control (**KONTROL**) of it, it became more and more ***ZIO***-mass democracy.

[280] This and what follows is all part of the ***ZIO***-ANTI-CHRIST-***GREAT SATAN*** plan and practice to smash formerly relatively homogeneous as to descent and religion Christian societies, in order to put them under ***ZIO-JOO***-ANTI-CHRIST-***GREAT SATAN*** CONTROL (**KONTROL**) as societies of massified-atomised ***CONTRA NATURAM ZIO-JOO***-PORN-STERILE FUCK-ABORT-CONTRASEPTIVE-FUCK-SLUT-MONKEY-DRUGS-PORN-HOMO-FAGGOT-LEZZO-TRANZ-FREAK SHOW-***ZIO-JOO***-DAS-***TOTAL FILTH***-SHIT-SKATA-EXCREMENT-FREAK SHOW-***ZIO-JOO***-DAS-KOST-ZOMBEE EXCREMENT.

part and the fragment are autonomised (become autonomous); a detail, an isolated event, a moment, an impression become the objects of a profound way of looking at things, whereby and in relation to which one asks / seeks less and less (about) the necessary framework of putting things in order and of classification and more and more (about) the intrinsic, very own depth and meaning of each and every respective part or fragment, or at least one dwells, lingers with it (i.e. the respective part or fragment), even if one laments, expresses sadness for the loss of the Whole. The abolition of the bourgeois hierarchy of the norm (norm hierarchy, hierarchy of norms, hierarchy of normative principles), which necessarily followed the shattering, smashing, wrecking, crushing of (the) bourgeois synthesis, permitted / allowed (it), moreover, that opposites, which had previously / earlier been seen as / felt to be unbridgeable, irreconcilable (good and bad, beautiful and ugly, rational and irrational, necessary and chance / coincidental, male and female etc.), to be viewed / looked at now as sprouts from the same one root, as (it) is the case with the mythical idea, thought, notion of the common origin of all things; in any case, they (i.e. these opposites) were supposed to / could come on the scene, appear as (equivalent, equal) magnitudes (of equal value, with equal rights) next to / besides one another, every one of which could be transformed, converted into its opposite[281]. If, however, the constituent elements / parts of the world are independent of one another and simultaneously in principle equivalent towards / as to one another, exchangeable with one another and transformable, convertible into one another (/ if one can replace the other or be converted into the other), thus/so, the extreme fragmentation, segmentation of the world means eo ipso the homogenisation of the same (world)[282]. The lack of sense, meaning is the/a

[281] In other words, the complete ***ZIO-JOO***-***GREAT SATAN***-ANTI-CHRIST-PROGRAMME of muddling everything and fucking everything up under conditions of ***ZIO***-ANTI-CHRIST-***GREAT SATAN***-mass democracy.

[282] I.e. everything divided and ruled, divided and conquered under ***ZIO-JOO***-ANTI-CHRIST-***GREAT SATAN-ZIO-JOOZ*** and their ***ZIO-JOO***-ZOMBEE-STOOGEZ.

lack of coherence – lack of coherence and fragmentation, segmentation into equivalent and exchangeable magnitudes means, however, unlimited, unrestricted combinability of these latter (magnitudes) with one another, that is to say, the at-will constructability of the world[283].

If what previously, earlier appeared as a Whole and as synthesis is now fragmented, segmented and dismembered, cut / carved / broken / chopped / split / divided up, thus/so, it must, finally, be consciously broken down / decomposed / dismantled / dissected / analysed into (taken apart as) atoms. Against the background / On the basis of the (already-occurred) fragmentation, segmentation (which has already occurred), and in / with (the) consciousness that no idea of the Whole in the old sense is tenable any longer, the search begins for the ultimate constituent (parts) or component, structural elements in the universe of language and in the universe of forms[284]. This search or analysis amounts, in itself, to the decision to replace binding synthesis with free combinatorics (i.e. the free combination of things). Because the latter (free combinatorics) is only possible on the basis of pure and irreducible, ultimate elements, only such elements vouch for and guarantee the absolute freedom of the combining (activity) (equally) a limine. The simpler an element is, the more freely can it be handled or played with (/ so much the more freely can one deal with or play with it), whereas the composite / compound as such has a structure already, that is, (it sets) a firm framework, inside of which one must move if one does not want to destroy the (pre-)given composition, compound or structure. The bourgeois idea of the harmonic synthesis implied that the composition of the parts, which, for their part, were composed, put together (from other parts), should take place, occur on the basis of a (pre-existing) guiding conception,

[283] See footnotes 281, 282 above.

[284] So, now ***JOOZ*** and their ZOMBEE-***ZIO-JOO***-STOOGEZ seek "meaning" (i.e. the reproduction and extension of ***ZIO***-ROOL) in signs and symbols such that "everything is de-constructed" except for ***grossly disproportionate and vastly asymmetrical ZIO-JOO***-POWER AND CONTROL (**KONTROL**), i.e. play around with language and forms, but don't touch the essence of ***ZIO-JOO***-ANTI-CHRIST-***GREAT SATAN*** POWER AND CONTROL (**KONTROL**) in respect of economy, state and culture.

notion, idea, representation of the Whole (existing in advance); now(, however,) the game of free combinatorics decides how that Whole will look like / be, which comes into being from the composition of the ultimate component / structural elements. Not by chance, modern art was connected from the beginning with the demand for the purity of the arts, namely for the reduction of every art to one single decisive element of form / form-related, morphological element, whereby / whilst, typically enough/characteristically, value was placed on the putting aside of every element / all the elements which gave, lent the art on each and every respective occasion / in question the character of a synthesis in the bourgeois sense. Thus, from architecture, the picturesque, the plastic (sculptural) and the ornamental (element) was banished, expelled; from painting, the plastic (sculptural) and the tectonic (the picture/image turns into / becomes (a) pure surface without perspective; in the end, the difference between above and below disappears, vanishes too); from pure plastic (i.e. sculpture, plastic art), the picturesque and tectonic is distanced. In the next section (of this chapter) we shall concern ourselves with phenomena from the area, realm of the language of literature / literary language and of the theory of speech / language theory / linguistics in general. Here we must first of all point to an important consequence of this search for the (“)pure(”) or else for the ultimate component / structural elements or atoms. These are, obviously, not experienced directly and immediately through and by means of normal sensory / sensorial perception, otherwise, in fact, the search for them would be superfluous. The empirically (pre-)given reality cannot, though, contradict straight away the habits and expectations of common sense, and it cannot on each and every respective occasion be shaped, moulded and formed on the basis of (arbitrary) combinations (made at will). There must, therefore, be a distinction (/ It must be distinguished, therefore,) between the reality of the empirical given (actual) facts and the level on which it is (i.e. such empirical given facts are) based, which can only be grasped mentally, in terms of thought (/ and the exclusively

intellectual level), at which the pure forms or else the ultimate component / structural elements or atoms are found. Only this distinction and the constant lingering, staying of the artist at the aforementioned / this level make possible the game of (the) free combination. In actual fact, prominent theoreticians and practitioners, practicians of modern art justified their rejection of bourgeois realism, which rested and was based upon the principle of (the) imitation (of nature), through and by means of the(ir) conviction in respect of (/ asseverating, asserting) the existence, availability of that, as it were, transcendent and – only in the eyes of the intellect – accessible level. But even when such metaphysics was lacking, to the world image of everyday experience and to the on that (everyday experience) grounded, founded science, a dynamic perception, comprehension of reality was pointed out and counterposed, which wanted to see in things merely temporary, provisional, tentative, preliminary, transient condensations of (the/a) pure force and pure motion, movement.

We become here witnesses to the coming into being, birth, genesis of an intellectualism or even / and/or a spiritualism, which, of course, only by chance, accidentally, coincidentally intersects with the corresponding traditional philosophical directions, tendencies, schools of thought, and primarily, first of all, must be comprehended, understood in respect of its contrast and opposition to the bourgeois empiricism of common sense. This intellectualism or spiritualism influences and has an effect upon even those avantgardists who carry on, conduct, pursue the cult of the machine. Because the machine is looked at and regarded as the pure work of the spirit, which here proceeds methodically (as to its work) not differently than, for instance, on the field, in the area, realm of geometry, i.e. with the help of the ultimate component / structural elements, it constructs forms which are free from/of the contingency and asymmetry of the empirically given. Thus seen, it is no paradox that constructivist(ic) schools, which have in mind, dream of, imagine, seek to

process purely objective structures, i.e. lacking any reference to human subjectivity, come on the scene and appear next to currents which thematise and make a topic of mainly, chiefly, principally human subjectivity. Because precisely as structures are moulded, shaped and formed through and by means of the combination of irreducible elements or forms with (regard to) one another, so too human subjectivity is no longer comprehended in the bourgeois sense of a tightly, firmly, fixedly structured ensemble, whole, totality of various, different mutually and reciprocally complementary, supplementary psychical forces, but as the more or less loose, slack, lax sum of elements which are constantly found in a state of flux, flowing and can come (in)to the most varied, different relations towards, with one another, that is, (which can) be combined almost at will with one another[285]. Above all, the unconscious appears as the inexhaustible reservoir of such elements, which are connected, combined in free association or in the/a dream in an – on each and every respective occasion – new and surprising, startling way with one another, and bring to life / into being an unending, infinite variety, manifoldness, diversity of forms. Now this connection, combining can be either passive in the sense that it constitutes the result of the secret work of the unconscious without the guiding participation, cooperation, collaboration, assistance, contribution, process, elaboration, operation of consciousness, or else active, when the intellect of the artist undertakes an analysis and at the same time a reconstruction of the / whatever material provided, made available by the unconscious in order to depict, present the possible structures of the psyche or the possible structures of the objects in / from the possible perspectives of the psyche. The spontaneous confidence in the chance, coincidental or imponderable, incalculable, but aesthetically effective /

[285] This is precisely the basis for all the ***ZIO-JOO***-ANTI-CHRIST-SATANISM promoted today in respect of "change yourself as often as you want (e.g. "Changes" by ***ZIO***-"ZIGGIE-STAR MAN WITH THE SPIDERS FROM MARS"-HOMO-FROOT LOOP-***JOO***-ARSE-LICKING-DEGENERATE-TRANZ-FAGGOT-***ZIO***-NAZI-STOOGE David Bowie) by being what you feel to be at any particular moment", since that leads to a total breakdown of fixed and handed-down from generation to generation collective identities which could counter ***ZIO-JOO***-ANTI-CHRIST-***GREAT SATAN***-DEVIL-EVIL-SATANISM.

rich in aesthetic results connection of ultimate elements with one another implies the/a belief in the (cap)ability of the spirit of giving to everything a meaning and of making everything a means of expression of itself; consequently in its decomposition and free reconstruction by means of the inherent, primordial dynamics of the psyche, the inner and outer world become the organ of the artist (/ the artist's organ) without this artist being forced, compelled to take into account the rules of bourgeois rationality[286].

The subjectivism of modern art has, therefore, a double meaning; on the one hand, it means the primacy of subjectivity as the area, realm, sector in which everything is found in (a) constant flux (flow) and incessantly new combinations of (the) existing / available elements or psychical atoms come about, arise; on the other hand however, it is identical with the intellectualism or spiritualism explained, expounded, explicated above, and then means, signifies the omnipotence of the combining subject, irrespective of whether the free combinatorics / combining of things unfolds (its art(s)) on/in the field of human subjectivity or for instance in the realm of pure forms and pure colours. The subjectivism in this latter sense becomes all the more unrestricted, unlimited, the more the binding norms of the bourgeois canon are dissolved, broken up / disintegrate, melt away. To the extent that art ceases to be / stops being the imitation, copying of nature and ceases to serve / stops serving the corresponding ideal of harmony with the help of the corresponding stylistic means, the artist becomes a demiurge / world-moulder. Art creates the world or else its own world, or at least through and by means of the creation of an artwork puts something completely new and original in the world – and this, again, occurs / takes place / happens in a way, manner which is diametrically opposed to the methodical procedure which was applied during the artistic

[286] In other words, any ***ZIO-JOO***-BRAIN-FRIED-ZOMBEE can produce "anything" ***JOO***-DAS deems "art" or "philosophy" or "literature" etc. and present it as "significant", even if it is nonsensical and or ugly, vulgar etc. garbage, as is most often the case.

representation of the ideal of nature; free combination replaces synthesis resting and based upon fixed rules. The composition, texture and activity of the combining subject now becomes a theme, topic of the first rank (/ of first priority) and often puts into the shade, overshadows, outshines the object or the product of this activity, i.e. (the) artwork more and more becomes the occasion for the posing and the solving of the theoretical and technical problems of artistic creation. This creation itself increasingly becomes the theme, topic of the artwork, which henceforth / from now on does not have to be completed in the old manner / sense, but is allowed / permitted / may be presented to the public as a torso, trunk, skeleton, half-finished piece or as a draft – that is, in a state which uncovers, reveals, brings to light the process of its creation; if the activity of the artist becomes the theme, topic, subject matter of art, thus, the fragments, fractions or else the phases of this activity represent and constitute artworks. The omnipotence of the combining subject and the – with that – connected, interrelated (preferential) thematisation, making into a topic (having priority) of artistic activity explain the large amount, quantity of texts pertaining to art theory and aesthetic texts, which since the final decades of the 19th century were produced, written by artists and literati (writers, litterateurs, literary figures, men of letters). The new consciousness is reflected here (in the fact) that the number of possible combinations is in principle unlimited, unrestricted, whereby and in relation to which every sovereign combinator wants, regardless of (the) other rules, to set up and establish, determine, define – in accordance with the rules which he intends to combine – the ultimate component / structural elements in his own field, realm, area of activity.

We shall now explain how the general tendencies, which were / we outlined in this section (above), were articulated and concretised on/in the individual fields, sectors of literature and of art. At the same time / In parallel, we want to show that and how on every one of these fields / in all of these sectors, the

replacement of the synthetic-harmonising thought figure by the analytical-combinatory thought figure partly brought about(,) (and) partly accompanied the new primacy of the magnitude “space” before / vis-à-vis the magnitude “time”. The precondition for that came into being already through and by means of the smashing, wrecking, demolition, destruction, disintegration, splitting of the bourgeois synthesis and the fragmentation of the world, from which, in the end, the conception, notion, representation, perception of the in principle equivalence of the individual fragments or atoms had to emerge. Through and by means of / Thanks to this conception/notion/representation/perception, space, inside of which these atoms moved, was homogenised throughout, entirely, and at the same time the role of time was minimised, since the aforementioned atoms or ultimate building blocks / structural elements were used by the combinator in their primordial and inherent / very own, as it were, timeless form, whereas the constituent (component) parts / elements of bourgeois synthesis were comprehended as the ripe fruits or historical time or at least of nature becoming / turning into history and culture. The priority of the factor of (“)space(”) in the analytical-combinatory thought figure was, however, determined by / due to other reasons, which will come to light in the course of the following / our analysis.

b. The individual/separate/in part fields, sectors

It would be extremely, exceptionally difficult and at the same time a thankless task, job to concern oneself with the question (regarding) on which field / in which sector of literary-artistic activity did the replacement of the synthetic-harmonising thought figure by the analytical-combinatory thought figure (first) take place (for the first time). Should it be proven that it was carried out / executed on all fields / in all sectors, then/thus the questioned just mentioned is structurally inconsequential, irrelevant, insignificant; in a historical regard, it

(i.e. the said question) remains, again, thorny, because the development, of which there is talk / we are talking about here, embraced in a(n) astonishingly, astoundingly, surprisingly short (period of) time all relevant fields, sectors, whereby and in relation to which the consciousness of its unity, uniformity, united nature/character was frequently expressed in the demand for some or all arts to be reshaped (/ for the reshaping of all arts) in accordance with the same pattern, model. In any case, on all fields / in all sectors of modern literature and art, the turning away and distancing from / avoidance of (the) bourgeois synthesis, first of all came to light / appeared as the analytical search for pure forms and ultimate component / structural elements – a search which, for its part, was conducted in such a manner that it also had to / necessarily entail(ed) a content-related (calling into) question(ing) of the bourgeois world view. Thus, already since the (very) beginning(s) of modern (lyric) poetry, the ideal of (the) pure poem / poetry or of poetry as the pure language / tongue accompanied / went with a disassembly, dismantlement of that world image which bourgeois rationality had constructed. Bourgeois poetry / The bourgeois poem could indeed, and sometimes (it) had to also, thematise and make into a topic language, not however in its purity, but always as the/a means (in order) to demandingly express meaning aesthetically (/ as the means of the expression of a meaning with aesthetical claims). That is also why language conventions, as they were determined and recognised by (the educated stratum of) society, were by and large / for the most part / extensively respected; the poet was allowed, as the case may have been / as appropriate / as the circumstances required, to break / violate them (i.e. the said language conventions) to the extent that this of necessity appeared to enhance the aesthetic(al) effect, but never in such a manner that because of that (breaking of language conventions) he could have caused, brought about, provoked merely, simply amazement, astonishment, wonderment, puzzlement and disconcertment, bewilderment in the (educated)

reader[287]. Language was, in other words, the organised bearer of organised meaning, and through / with it, spoke, again, the bearers of this meaning, i.e. nature and man (i.e. humans), whereby / in relation to which the aesthetic(al) command that language / linguistic form and meaningful content / content full of meaning be harmonically connected, combined with each other, sprang from the same synthetic conception, notion, perception of harmony as the world-theoretical and ethical wish for the having a joint effect, collaborating, cooperating, collaboration, cooperation of spirit (norm, normative principle or meaning) and matter, or, Reason and drive, urge, impulse(s) at the level of nature and of man. Only through / with his detachment, breaking away from meaning (in this specific and multi-dimensional bourgeois meaning of the word) is the modern poet able / can the modern poet declare / proclaim (as the / an aesthetic(al) ideal) the purity of language and of poetry beyond (every) social convention(s) and (every) compulsion(s) / coercion(s) as to / in respect of understanding / need to understand (as an aesthetic(al) ideal). Meaning in general from now on coincides with the meaning of language as such, and since this latter (meaning of language as such) differs radically from meaning understood in a bourgeois manner / in the bourgeois sense of the term, thus / then / so it happens that / that is why language, if it is declared to be only / a single meaning, can only express what according to (the) bourgeois yardstick / benchmark / standards / criteria is meaningless[288]. Pure language also can, therefore, emerge only from a dismemberment, fragmentation of that language

[287] Whereas from circa ***ZIO***-1900 and onwards, all the ***ZIO-JOO***-BALL (post-)modernist TOTAL ***ZIO-JOO-***DAS-ANTI-CHRIST-***GREAT SATAN*** (BULL)SHIT had as its means and end / goal NONSENSE, UGLINESS, FUGLINESS and MEANINGLESSNESS, as well as being ***ZIO***-RUDE and ***JOO***-DAS-FOUL, ***GREAT FUCKING ZIO-JOO-BALL SATAN***, so that "everything is de-constructed" except for ***GROSSLY DISPROPORTIONATE and VASTLY ASYMMETRICAL ZIO-JOO***-DAS ***ANTI-CHRIST-GREAT SATAN*** POWER / CONTROL (**KONTROL**).

[288] In the bourgeois ideological / ideational world, not only Reason, Nature, History, Evolution, the Self-Made Man etc. played their part, but also the "Great Narratives" of Classical Antiquity (Heroism, Mythology, etc.) and Christianity had their say in various ways and in various dosages, to various degrees, whereas under ***ZIO-JOO***-DAS-ANTI-CHRIST-***GREAT SATAN*** all of "that" is gutted, deformed and or destroyed in the name of "Open Society Pluralism and Diversity", always under ***JOO***-DAS CONTROL (**KONTROL**) (as if there wasn't massive pluralism and diversity in the former state of affairs !!!), including meaninglessness and nonsense,

which was the bearer of meaning understood in bourgeois terms (/ the bearer of bourgeois meaning), and a fragmentary reality, or even no reality, corresponds to / with it[289]. Reference in respect of / to reality is no longer any criterion for the meaning of language, but rather something which the reader must retain / hold at the back of his mind in order to measure the distance which separates the language of the poem from the empirically given world, and through that be able to better assess the (desired, intended) aesthetic(al) effect (striven for). Otherwise, the meaning of language results / arises from its own movement, motion and dynamic(s), by virtue of which objects are converted / transformed into language, or rather are absorbed (sucked up) by (the) language; then the universe of (the) language can no longer be distinguished from the universe of things, the language of poetry / the poem constitutes a world which wants to be *the* world.

When poetry / the poem becomes language and language (becomes) the world, thus/then, language also becomes the central theme of poetry[290]. The use of language in poetry embodies a reflection (contemplation, cerebration) about / over / regarding this same use, and the decision over / about / regarding this use coincides with the decision about / over / regarding the constitution of the world. The more consistently the dissolution of the bourgeois synthesis and of the harmonically structured / assembled world image is effected, put through, driven, achieved, so much more relentlessly, inexorably is the earlier, previous meaning(fulness) of the language smashed, shattered, destroyed, wrecked. The

---

because ***JOO***-DAS (***ZIO***), always with his ***ZIO-***ANGLO-GALLO-GERMANO-ET AL-***JOO***-BALL-ZOMBEEZ, wants to "master race, rule the world".

[289] ***JOOZ*** and their ***ZIO-JOO***-ANTI-CHRIST-***GREAT SATAN*** STOOGEZ-ZOMBEEZ-ALLIEZ want everyone brain-fried and eventually dead, so that ***they*** as ***ZIO-JOO***-EXCREMENT can live, and we, as ***ZIO***-IDIOT-MORONS, can die.

[290] By restricting the perception of reality to language use the ***ZIO-JOO***-ANTI-CHRIST-***GREAT SATAN*** VOMIT-EXCREMENT-LIZZARD-RAT-RODENT-PARASITE and its ***ZIO-JOO***-ZOMBEE-STOOGEZ seek to not talk about reality *as reality as a WHOLE*, but seek to control (**KONTROL**) through language use the continuation and expansion of ***GROSSLY DISPROPORTIONATE AND VASTLY ASYMMETRICAL ZIO-JOO***-ECONOMIC-STATE-CULURAL RULE UNDER THE ***ZIO-JOO***-ANTI-CHRIST-GREAT FUCKING ***ZIO-JOO***-BALL SATAN. It might have started with poetry as "high art", but by the ***ZIO***-1960s it had spread to "universities" and beyond.

complete (total) abandonment (renunciation) of a reference to substance(s), i.e. to the I (Ego) and to (the) thing(s) leads to the language game as (the) mere (sound) combination (of (the) sound(s)), to the bruitist[291] or to the abstract poem[292]. However, such avantgardist(ic) extravagances did not decisively / significantly stamp, mould, shape, characterise, emboss (/ did not determine / define / specify) the physiognomy of modern poetry, but that development which reached / attained a first high point / climax with the pushing through and prevailing, predominance of vers libre, and which, accordingly / because of that, initiated the loosening of syntax, culminating in (up to) the complete autonomisation / making autonomous of the word (/ and the resulting loosening of syntax culminated in the complete autonomisation of the word). The vers libre / Vers libre made possible an unhindered and in principle unending, unrestricted, unlimited, infinite admission, inclusion, absorption of motives in(to) the poem, something which the prior / earlier closedness, closure, coherence of the form / closed form did not permit, which in its bindedness in part determined the content of the poem. The unbounded / boundaryless / without bounds/limits vers(e), or else sentence/clause, promoted, encouraged, fostered the detachment / breaking away from the reference to (the) thing(s) and at the same time the unleashing of the dynamic(s) of language, that is, the revaluation and autonomisation of the language / linguistic factor. From now on / Now, phantasy could become active, bestir itself, be activated / actuated as calculation / ponderable calculus and shape, mould and form its own world much more freely than in those times / that era/epoch when the reference to the I (Ego) or else (the) thing(s) and the closedness, closure, coherence of the form / closed form set it (i.e. phantasy) tangible bound(arie)s and limits. The dream

[291] A bruitist poem is a phonetic poem, not so different from a futurist poem, invented by Richard Huelsenbeck (23 April 1892 – 20 April 1974), a German writer, poet, and "psychoanalyst" born in Frankenau, Hessen-Nassau, who was associated with the formation of the Dada movement.
[292] Which, of course, means under ***ZIO-JOO***-ANTI-CHRIST-SATANISM "you are what you feel you are as long as you don't challenge ***JOO***-DAS".

and free association become more and more (the) matter and at the same time the pattern, model of the poem, and correspondingly the technique of the image / picture changes: spatial and temporal interrelations lose their contours and their bindedness, they are mixed at will with (the) things, which, for their part, are ordered, put into order, arranged next to one another in unfinished, unfinalised or full-of-gaps, incomplete, sketchy, patchy rows/series. The loosening of syntax effect(uat)ed / brought about / caused through that ended (up) in the mere / simple series, sequence, apposition, lining up, line up, array(ing) of fragmentary, scrappy, sketchy and deformed sentences.

With / Through and by means of the making autonomous / autonomisation of the individual word, the fetters, bonds of syntax were conclusively thrown / shaken off. Not everyone went so far as to demand / call for the abolition of the declension, of the conjugation, of the adjective, of the adverb and of punctuation, like, for instance, the futurists did (it), none the less, from now on, the word was looked at / regarded / considered first and foremost, above all, chiefly as a word and not for instance as a noun (substantive), a verb or an adjective. As long as words were understood primarily in respect of the(ir) part of speech (to which they belonged), they were automatically put into order in an in advance fixed, settled, set, established, given context / interrelation of meaning (meaning context) and could not be combined with one another at will. The possibility of the detachment / breaking away of the word from its part of speech allows / permits the lining up or stringing together of words which do not fit, suit, match one another either grammatically or logically; the word therefore loses its meaning as this (meaning) was earlier / previously understood, and becomes an aesthetic(al) element and freely useable material. It is no longer a matter of relations between meanings, but primarily it depends / things depend upon (/ of interest are) the relations between words. Language, logic and the order of objects in(side) the world do not correspond any longer

with one another (/ mutually (reciprocally)); the sum (total(ity)) of words, which make up / constitute the poem, does not, therefore, have to be ordered / put in order and arranged in accordance with rules, which would guarantee and vouch for an obvious, patent parallelism towards / regarding / with (regard to) the order of logic or of things. The unity of the text consequently replaces / substitutes for / steps into the place of the unity of the world[293]. This towards the outside / outwardly self-sufficient text is, however, inwardly / towards the/its inside split, cleft and fragmented / fragmentary, it uses an elliptical language in which the object or the subject of a sentence is omitted / left out / skipped; the sentences themselves are uncompleted, disjointed, interrupted, aborted; names (i.e. nouns) without verbs are strung together / lined up next to one another; words are used only for the sake of an etymological allusion, reference, innuendo, insinuation; subordinate clauses are constructed without reference to main clauses; and objective statements can be mixed intentionally with affective, i.e. emotional statements. The dissolution of the firm, steady, stable systems of reference of the bourgeois world image is shown not least of all in the use of adjectives alien towards things [[they are supposed to describe]], which do not go back to and spring from any sensorial / sensory experience, but (probably) from the intention to illuminate the essence, texture of a thing more deeply (than experience and logic could do it) through and by means of an unexpected, surprising connection with a(n) alien / foreign to it (i.e. the thing in question) attribute. Of course, under these circumstances, the concept of the / a good literary style changes entirely, completely, totally, fully. If we are no longer dealing with (/ If what is being sought is no longer) the / an organisation of the poem around the solid, steady, stable axes of form and content, meaning and matter, whole and part, then / thus the style also cannot consist in the successful and or felicitous, happy use of those language / linguistic means

[293] Cf. footnote 290, above.

which appear to be the most expedient and suitable, purposeful, useful for the aforementioned organisation; it is less the/a sovereign balance with complete mastery (control, domination) of the material, stuff (/ where the material, stuff, matter is found under the absolute possession / control of the poet), and more an explosion or a series of explosions at different (and) successive levels; it is a break, rupture and sudden, but complete, full epiphany / revelation of an absolute in every individual, separate, in-part component (part, element) of the poem as the product of (one's own) experienced, lived-through (personal) intensity. The aesthetic effect is achieved, attained, reached not through the flexibility, suppleness of the language and decorative elements, but through a raging, torrential flow, river, flux of images and through / with daring, bold, audacious metaphors, analogies or comparisons, which seemingly connect things, qualities, properties or meanings with one another lying / which are far apart from one another.

All of this should/ought to mean (/ All of this means): poetry ceased/stopped being a synthetic art in the bourgeois sense, and was converted / transformed into a combinatoric(s) (i.e. a means for combining things)[294]. Ultimate component / structural elements are combined with one another, which (i.e. the ultimate component / structural elements) can exist for themselves and in absolute isolation from all other ultimate component / structural elements; however, precisely because of that they are in principle of equal value, equivalent, that is to say they are found on / in / at the same level, surface, area,

[294] Following footnote 290 above, thus something which began in "high art" becomes -(not on the basis of the "idea", but on the basis of the idea in relation to whole-of-society-change pertaining to the two **nova** of circa 1800 and circa 1900)- a principle for social organisation, especially after ***ZIO***-WW2 under ***ZIO***-USA, where the ***ZIO-JOO***-ANTI-CHRIST-HYPER-***ZIO-JOO***-NATIONALIST-HYPER-***ZIO-JOO***-IMPERIALIST-***ZIO-JOO***-SCUM-BAGZ seek "MASTER RACE, ROOL DA WORLD" by maintaining their own in-bred ***ZIO-JOO-***INCESTUAL-VOMIT-CONSPIRATORIAL-CRIMINAL-RAT-TUNNEL-LIZZARD-RAT-RODENT-PARASITE-BLOOD-SUCKING-EXCREMENT-selves whilst mixing the rest of the world up to such an extent that no collective resistance can eventuate. Given that ***that*** TOTAL ***ZIO-JOO***-CATASTROPHE "succeeded" in the "West", the only crystallisations of RESISTANCE are nowadays emanating from outside of the "West" i.e. right now, as we are witnessing the End of the World unfold before our very eyes.

space, face, and can be interchanged, exchanged almost at will; not only individual words, but also whole verses can change, swap (trade) their place with one another in(side) the poem, something which was in the earlier, previous poetry absolutely impossible. The -for the analytical-combinatory thought figure- fundamental constellation (arrangement, set-up) – i.e. the being next to one another and co-existence of in themselves isolated ultimate elements on one single, united, unified surface – determines here the prevailing of the analytical principle of the simple lining up, arraying, sequence, ranking, which enables, facilitates, permits the change in/of place (place swapping), vis-à-vis the synthetic principle of hierarchical arrangement / structuring, inside of which (the place of) every component (part, element) is established, fixed (/ has its fixed place). This re-moulding, re-shaping, rearrangement, remodelling of poetry / the poem on an analytical-combinatory foundation/basis/base was fused and merged with (regard to) two processes, of which we have already spoken. First, the autonomisation of the language/linguistic factor or the indifference of pure language vis-à-vis the reference to the thing (the factual reference) and vis-à-vis meaning strongly promoted / intensely reinforced the combinatoric(s) (i.e. the combining of different things), because that which previously, beforehand made the words and the sentences immobile, motionless, inert and unexchangeable, was exactly their binding to a content and to a meaning, or else the consideration of the correspondence with the real world (/ that is, concern for the existence of correspondences towards/with the real world); this is the reason why modern (lyric) poetry (lyricism) finally, definitively, conclusively won a victory / prevailed over epic poetry / the epic poem, which as to its character and nature, essence was positioned objectively (/ had an objective positioning)[295]. The dissolution of bourgeois synthetic unity of/between form

[295] And this includes, above all, a sense of collective self, collective identity, collective struggle, collective achievement, collective survival etc., something which the ***ZIO-JOO-GREAT SATAN***-ANTI-CHRIST-RAT-RODENT-LIZZARD-VOMIT-INCESTUAL-PARASITE-RAT-TUNNEL-CONSPIRATORIAL-ORGANISED CRIMINAL-SCUMBAG wants only for himself and not for others.

and content and the putting first, precedence of form or of language was / meant exactly the putting first, precedence of that element which can be dismembered, carved / opened / cut / divided up and reconstructed at will. Secondly, the field / area of the combinable / combinations was widened, extended through and by means of / with the consciously anti-bourgeois inclusion of the trivial, ugly, hideous, terrible, horrible, awful, dreadful, frightful, terrifying, horrific etc.[296] in the thematic character / topics of poetry, which also had the complementary effect (/ something which also had the additional result) that, through that / in this way, value hierarchies (hierarchies of values) were levelled, which stood in the way of the free combination of everything with everything. Vis-à-vis this broad, unified and homogenised / homogeneous field, the poet now stands as the sovereign combinator (i.e. person combining up to everything with up to everything), who can freely have at his disposal the ultimate component / structural elements lying on/in this field. In (regard to) this (his) property, quality, characteristic (of his), he operates as the organising intelligence with mathematical (cold) calculation and sober distance / the sober sense of distance, he even handles his own experiences and his own (abiding, enduring, lasting, suffering) I (Ego) like every other component / structural element of his art. Between the poetical and the empirical-personal I (Ego) of the poet, therefore, a more or less clear line runs, whereby and in relation to which the former (poetical I of the poet) makes the latter (empirical-personal I of the poet) the/its theme / topic. Only the empirical I (Ego) or the private existence of the poet allows/permits him/the poet to suffer under/because of that dissolution or dismemberment / breaking up / fragmentation / disintegration, (in respect) of which the dissolution of the (old) form and the dismemberment / breaking up / fragmentation of the (old) content bear witness / attest to / vouch for in(side) the poem. The task, mission of the poetical I (Ego) consists, on the contrary, in

[296] I.e. ***JOOZ.***

organising the dissolution and dismemberment / breaking up / fragmentation with language/linguistic means in such a manner that from that the adequate aesthetic effect/result can emerge, arise[297].

The language of modern lyric poetry influenced the language of important representatives of the modern novel, which took place / happened with (regard to) inner / internal necessity: because in these latter (representatives of the modern novel), the autonomisation / making autonomous of language was conducted / pursued for the same motives and with the same intent(ion) as in (regard to) the lyric poets (/ because the latter proceeded to the autonomisation of language driven, propelled, pushed by the same motives and the same intent as with the lyric poets too). However, in the area, realm of the modern novel[298], when one looks at / surveys / reviews it in its entirety/totality, an ambivalence remains, which in lyric poetry either disappeared/vanished or played a much smaller role after free verse prevailed and predominated conclusively and definitively. The prose poets, i.e. prose writers / prosaists could, namely, break loose and detach themselves less and not in the / by a majority from traditional forms and stylistic means (to the extent this lies in / has to do with the nature of prose and lyric poetry, may remain (an) open (question) here / we do not have to examine here) and that is why (it came to) an apparent / seeming paradox (arose, appeared) that the content-related dissolution of the bourgeois synthesis in the modern novel was carried out / effected by language/linguistic and stylistic means which belonged to the best performances, achievements, accomplishments of the bourgeois novel. Here we must, therefore, distinguish between the content-related and the form-related (i.e. formal) fragmentation /

[297] In other words, the poetical I (Ego) is the process of FULL-SPECTRUM-***ZIO***-LOBOTOMISATION-***ZIO-JOO***-DAS-BRAIN-WASHING-***ZIO-JOO***-ANTI-CHRIST-***GREAT SATAN***-ZOMBEE-FICATION, as occurred on a mass scale all over the "West", especially after ***ZIO***-WW2.

[298] I can't be bothered listing modern poets and modern novelists circa 1900 (say 1850-1950), there are so many of them, including ***grossly disproportionately and vastly asymmetrically JOOZ***. Look them up yourselves on the ***ZIO-JOO***-DAS-INTER-NET-***ZIO***-***JOO***-DAS-LINE.

disintegration / break up of the bourgeois canon. The aforementioned influencing of the language of the modern novel by the language of modern lyric poetry was a consequence of this latter (modern lyric poetry). We begin, nevertheless, with the former (language of the modern novel), which not least of all came about / took place through and by means of the frontal assault / attack against the bourgeois image of man/humans and (the bourgeois) ideal of personality. We know (ch. II, sec. 2) that this ideal had two fundamental/basic aspects: on the one hand, personality was supposed / had to realise and embody in its manner the synthesis of Reason and drive, urge, impulse, or, nature and culture; on the other hand, (personality had to) objectify its individuality, i.e. to develop / unfold (it, i.e. individuality) in the (soci(et)al) framework (of society) and in agreement with supra/hyper-individual norms and values. Both (/ Each one of both) aspects stood against the background of / were based upon the humanistic ideal of education (learning, cultivation, culture) (educative ideal) and both together extensively, decisively, to a great extent stamped, shaped, moulded, influenced the character of the bourgeois novel par excellence, i.e. the Bildungsroman (i.e. of the educational novel where the formation of a character is described)[299]. This (Bildungsroman) rested and was based upon the assumption that the (literarily interesting) person possesses a fixed substance (essence, nature), which at first exists / is available/present as talent, aptitude, gift, tendency, (pre)disposition, inherited characteristics and must go through, undergo, experience a development, unfolding in order to actualise its

[299] A Bildungsroman is a novel dealing with one person's (usually a male's) formative years or spiritual education that focuses on the psychological and moral growth of the protagonist from childhood to adulthood (coming of age), in which character change in accordance with conditions and circumstances (not as to the essence of a character) can be important. The issue of inherited characteristics and socially-environmentally conditioned characteristics is "never-ending" and more often than not is a matter of "a bit up to a lot of both", without anyone being able to ever attribute precisely the percentage or weight of causation between the two. Of course, given the massive ethical and societal changes brought about by the overcoming of the shortage of goods along with mass technicisation from circa 1900 onwards in the post-Bildungsroman era, FULL-SPECTRUM-***ZIO-JOO***-DAS-ANTI-CHRIST-LOBOTOMISATION-PSYCHO-OP-***JOO***-DAS-BRAIN WASHING has played a massive role in destroying the "West" as a whole, notwithstanding any individual resistance to such ***ZIO-JOO***-ANTI-CHRIST-***GREAT SATAN***-EXCREMENT.

potentialities and be able to know, recognise itself (/ and reach self-awareness, self-knowledge); the development, unfolding, seemed, therefore, to be indispensable, essential for the formation of an all-round, all-sided personality, but simultaneously it was the development of an originally, initially existing substantial, i.e. substance/essence-related core, nucleus. It could be, in fact had to be / was necessarily conflict-and-contradiction-rich / full of conflicts and contradictions, nevertheless, the conflicts and contradictions served finally in relation to that to make the eventual, final synthesis full of content. Because the development had to lead towards a synthesis, it was carried out, executed indeed under circumstances which could not always be foreseen and controlled, yet the hero was, at least in the ideal case, in the position / situation to put them (i.e. the said not always foreseeable and controllable circumstances) to use, exploit, make use of or even / and/or to shape, mould them (i.e. the said not always foreseeable and controllable circumstances) in accordance with his own higher aims, objectives and his own ideal of self-realisation / self-actualisation. In his constant confrontation with the objective circumstances of his development, he objectified his development (itself), that is, he did not lose himself in the labyrinth of his own private experiences and monologues – and just as little did the Bildungsroman lose itself in the merely psychological (/ in merely psychological analyses). Naturally, it contained an essentially psychological component / dimension, especially since in certain respects it continued the sentimental bourgeois novel of the 18th century, however, the actually / mainly psychological novel flourished only in a later phase of the history of the genre, when it was no longer a question/matter of the formation, cultivation, education, but of the dissolution of the bourgeois person. On the contrary, the Bildungsroman connects itself from its general concept(ual plan) / conceptualisation with other typical products of the bourgeois spirit, like for instance with the biographies of great individuals. Because in both cases, the accession, integration, incorporation, classification of the person in a certain

milieu / environment is consciously undertaken, and moreover / furthermore / aside from that, time remains the determinative / determining factor of the / one's perception of the world.

Corresponding to both aspects of the ideal of the bourgeois personality, the Bildungsroman was anthropocentric and realistic. It is therefore no wonder that the various directions of the avantgarde, on the one hand, expressly called for / demanded / required the elimination of the I (Ego) and its problems from literature, and on the other hand, the smashing, destruction, disruption of the solid (general and distinct, rough) outlines of the realistic novel. Both demands were sooner or later, more or less fulfilled and satisfied, yet before their fulfilment / satisfaction or in parallel with it (i.e. such fulfilment), the (implicit) fundamental acceptance/assumption of the Bildungsroman, that the person had at his disposal a firm/fixed substance/essence and was capable on the basis of the same (firm/fixed substance/essence) of a rational, oriented towards norms development/unfolding, was, however, with the help of various, i.e. both traditional, as well as modern, stylistic means, combatted. To be more precise / accurate, one (we) must say that the (cap)ability at development / unfolding of the person was disputed/contested/doubted before its (i.e. the person's) substantiality (/ still before the fact that it/the person possesses a fixed substance/essence was doubted) – during/with the exclusion of the (cap)ability at development and unfolding, however, (/ when, however, the ability of the person at developing ceased to be accepted,) something completely/entirely different was regarded as the substance/essence of the person than what supported / bore the development and unfolding of the character in the sense of the Bildungsroman (/ as the Bildungsroman described it). The great questioning, doubting of the bourgeois image (picture) of man/humans in literature began with the naturalistic description of the fatal dominance and imposition of blind

drives, urges, impulses and passions over and on the Reason of man/humans[300]. Against the bourgeois attempt, undertaking, venture, effort at comprehending man as nature, and at the same time as master/lord over his (own) nature, he / man here is completely, totally absorbed by nature. And this time it is no longer a matter of that normatively interpreted nature, which willingly allowed itself to be guided by Reason (/ which willingly let itself come under the guidance of Reason), but of a nature which sits, resides as an elementary / elemental instinct in the deepest layers / bowels of the flesh, and sooner or later breaks / crushes every resistance of Reason[301]. Man (i.e. humans) appears as the slave of powers which are tantamount to an inescapable fate / destiny / lot, his consciousness / conscience becomes / turns into a toy, plaything or even an instrument in the hands of his unconscious (mind), which thirsts above all for two kinds of things: for power (as dominance / dominant authority, as fame (glory, renown, stardom) or as wealth) and for sexuality, sexual satisfaction[302]. In their isolation from every other consideration (concern), both these aims, objectives must / necessarily destroy the equilibrium / balance between Reason and drive, urge, impulse; between culture and nature, whereby and in relation to which uninhibited, unchecked, unrestrained, unbridled sexuality / sexual satisfaction threatens to blow up / blast / burst specifically bourgeois conventions and

[300] The most famous example of naturalism in literature is the supreme, all-time ***ZIO-JOO***-STOOGE, "I lick ***ZIO-JOO***-ARSE AND SUCK ***ZIO-JOO***-WHATEVER-BIG TIME, ***JOO***-DAS MAKES ME FAMOUS" Émile Zola, obviously.

[301] The reality is that humans are always at least potentially both nature, and "Reason" as culture and self-disciplining, no matter how much more "animal" some specific, concrete humans, individuals and or groups are compared to more "reasonable" / disciplined / self-restrained specific, concrete humans, individuals and or groups. It's da ***JOO*** and his ***ZIO-JOO***-ZOMBEE-STOOGEZ who seek to turn everyone into slaves and animals of the ***ZIO-JOO***-HELL-ON-EARTH cave, "de-constructing everything" (e.g. family, normality, tradition, history, nation, genos, etc.) except for ***GROSSLY DISPROPORTIONATE AND VASTLY ASYMMETRICAL ZIO-JOO-DIVIDE AND RULE, DIVIDE AND CONQUER***-MONETISE-COMMODIFY-MASSIFY-ATOMISE-TECHNICISE-FULL-SPECTRUM ***ZIO-JOO***-DAS-ANTI-CHRIST-***GREAT SATAN***-LOBOTOMISE-BRAIN-WASH-power and control (**KONTROL**) in the economy, the state and culture, especially from circa 1800 and circa 1900 / 1945 / 1960 until today.

[302] As we've always said in "Krazy Man world" da ***JOO*** (and his ***ZIO-JOO***-STOOGE-ZOMBEEZ) "lets loose" lust for money / power and lust for promiscuous sex up to sexual depravity and the most vulgar forms of vulgar hedonism via increasingly controlling (**KONTROL**) economy, state and culture in order to further atomise-massify and disorientate ***ZIO-JOO-***STOOGE-ZOMBEEZ who lose up to all sense of collective identity connected with History, Mythology, Genos, Patria, Popolo, Religion, Tradition, Custom etc..

institutions ((the) family). The anti-bourgeois peak, tip, top, spike of this image / picture of man (i.e. humans) is seen / shown even more clearly when, for instance, the wild unleashing of sexuality / the sexual instinct is not deplored, regretted, pitied as the enslavement of the rational / reasonable part of man (i.e. humans), but is celebrated as the freeing of the whole/entire or of the "true" man and a mysticism, mystique of the flesh is propagated, which makes the sexual act out to be the redeeming/liberating/relieving rebaptism of the individual in the genuine, authentic, real, true, pure sources of life. The revaluation of the unconscious and of the irrational appears in a positive light also in the cases in which the liberating, freeing, emancipating effect, impact of the dream and of phantasy is counterposed / contrasted / opposed to the infertile / unfruitful inhibitions, obstructions, hindering, stemming of Reason. If the real, actual mechanisms of human thought / thinking in general are to be found in the dream, thus/so no Reason can exist which could / can stand up to / confront / defy the powers of the instinct; the endeavours and efforts of normative Reason are, therefore, in reality superfluous, pointless shadow battles (schiamachies, forms of shadow boxing, battles with shadows or imaginary enemies)[303].

Inside of the bourgeois synthesis, the dominance of Reason in man built the bridge between nature and culture, and consequently objectified personality and individuality in the social and cultural framework (/ inside the conditions of society and culture). That is why the dominance of the instinctive or irrational had to bring about (cause, effect) the opposite (result), i.e. it detached / cut the individual (away) from (his) social and cultural context / interrelations and threw him back / again into the dark regions of his existence, in which he could basically only be alone (/ he could not but be alone)[304]. But no less lonely,

[303] Of course, all of that is TOTAL ***ZIO-JOO***-BALL AND ***ZIO-JOO***-ZOMBEE-STOOGE BULLSHIT. Man always acts in regard to and "between" drives, urges and impulses / "instincts" or Nature, and, Reason, Discipline, Restraint or Culture. Where, however, the "red lines" of acceptable and unacceptable behaviour / acts are drawn is a matter purely for the correlation of forces of Power and Identity.
[304] See footnote 302, above.

solitary, isolated, alone, on his own, lonesome, secluded is an entirely, completely different anti-bourgeois type, who appears, arises, comes/crops up in the novel of the 20th century. This anti-bourgeois type obeys the sovereign decisions of his spirit(-intellect) and can undertake, shoulder, face up to all (de)privations, hardships and sacrifices in order to act in accordance with his own decisions. That, for / in favour of which he decides, is, nevertheless, pure action, which is supposed to free him from his suffocatingly narrow/tight horizon, from mediocrity and from the cowardly, pusillanimous compromises of bourgeois life; he is the actionist/activist, the desperado, someone who wants to struggle for (the sake of) the struggle. Certainly / Of course, this struggle stands / is always of necessity in the service of a cause, however the cause in itself does not intoxicate him, but the feeling there is something for which one can struggle. Consequently, the aim/objective of pure action appears to be interchangeable / exchangeable / replaceable; the same activist can, if need be / should the situation arise / if applicable / in a given instance (case), struggle for opposite / opposed aims/objectives, or else activists who are / (belong to) (in terms of being a human) (of) the same (human) kind/type face one another as foes, whereby / in relation to which they know / knowing that that which connects them with one another is stronger than that which forces, coerces, compels them to shoot one another. The norm / normative principle, the value or Reason are subjected / subjugated / subordinated to the logic of pure action, and accordingly, the precedence, primacy, priority of the spiritual / intellectual in / during (the) pure action is not comprehended / understood in the bourgeois sense of the taming, harnessing, subduing, controlling, mastering or the channelling of the drives, urges, impulses by (means of) / through Reason. Rather, the spirit(-intellect), which decides for / in favour of (/ to indulge in) pure action, and is active inside it (i.e. pure action), is itself pure action, it is namely itself a drive/urge/impulse, and that is why, from the bourgeois point of view, just as irrational or blind as, for instance, the (detached) sexual instinct

(left to its own devices).

In both of the cases (described) above, we can still speak about a substance of man (humans), even though this no longer contains normative (pre)dispositions and origins, and that is why it is not capable of development / unfolding in the sense of the Bildungsroman. In question / Possible here is only an outer / external development / unfolding which often ends in the (self-)destruction of the so/thus defined human subject. The next and final step on the road / path to the shattering, crushing, destruction, disintegration, smashing, splitting of bourgeois synthesis takes place when the howsoever defined substance of the I (Ego) is dissolved in a plethora / great variety of functions, which wander around and search (/ here and there searching) in vain for a stable, steady, firm, fixed point of orientation (orientation point). This dissolution takes / assumes / adopts various mild, strong/intense and extreme forms. It can begin with / during unceasing/incessant introspection and self-torturing self-analysis, with / during probing (hard) questions about one's own true motivation(s) and the sincerity/honesty of one's own acts (kinds of acting) – with/during self-mutilation / self-harm / personal heartbreak, that is to say, which in the end leads to a dead end / impasse / blind alley / stalemate / deadlock whilst the persistent preoccupation and dealing with even narrower / tighter angles of one's own psyche effects/causes/brings about the increasing narrowing and contraction of the horizon. That is no (/ That does not constitute any) sovereign self-recognition and self-understanding which accompanies and crowns the development and formation of an all-sided personality, but it degenerates into a monomania and means / signifies exactly the abandonment and renunciation of universality and of the constructive unfolding of one's own (pre)dispositions and origins. The dissolution of the I (Ego) progresses (/ goes even further) when this I (Ego) cannot even be held together around the pole of (its (own)) self-

mutilation / self-harm / personal heartbreak[305]. Then it (i.e. the I (Ego)) constitutes merely a constantly interrupted and constantly continuing current, stream, flow of (sensorial) perceptions and impressions, which, however, has no riverbed and no recognisable, obvious direction; to the extent / in so far as this flowing, fluid mass still exists as an I (Ego) at all, it takes / assumes / adopts the form of the/a vessel, receptacle, container in which it finds itself on each and every respective occasion; in other words, the I (Ego) exists only as the/a product of a transient/temporary/transitory/passing constellation / arrangement, or exactly as the/a product of the / a momentary (instantaneous) belief in the existence of an I (Ego). A fixed feeling of identity can hardly be formed, moulded and developed, the I (Ego) feels constantly like another (I (Ego) / person) and stops/ceases, finally, searching for mediations and reconciliations between its various identities; it is a matter basically of the precise predominant impulse (/ it (i.e. the I (Ego)) acts / is active simply on the basis of its – on each and every respective occasion – predominant urges), whereby / in relation to which its inner life is splintered, shattered, fragmented, split up and this fragmentation (splitting, dividing, disintegration, breaking down) is then transferred to the external / outer world. The fragmented (splintered, shattered) I (Ego) and the fragmented (splintered, shattered) world can meet and intersect obviously only in a highly contradictory and imponderable, incalculable manner – in any case, the/a situation no longer occurs, arises in which a whole / entire man (or man cut in large sectors / pieces [[rather than being fragmented into tiny bits]]), like for instance the/a tragic hero, stands firm and inflexibly against the world, and in the course of this, knows what connects him with it and what separates him from it. Since the person does not possess (any) fixed substance, but consists of relations, he incessantly (unremittingly) changes / is unceasingly

[305] What is being described here and in the following passage is not only the description of an ideal type in our age, but also the programme of the destruction of human beings as social-political animals under ***ZIO-JOO-***ANTI-CHRIST-***GREAT SATAN***-MASSIFIED-ATOMISED-TECHNICISED-DEVIL-EVIL-***JOO***-DAS-SATANISM.

transformed in accordance with the character and the peripetiae (i.e. sudden changes of events or reversals of circumstances) of his relations towards/with others; he bears / wears on each and every respective occasion different masks with which he identifies every time, and since he is merely the sum of his own masks, he cannot be in agreement and in harmony with himself, nor can he convince others of his unity (uniformity, homogeneity). There is always a yawning gap/gulf/chasm between the self-assessment on each and every respective occasion of the person and the opinion which the other persons / others have about this or that mask of his, and the sole / only way of escaping from / avoiding/eluding the difficulties coming into being unceasingly from that [[situation]] is the creation of always / more and more new masks and (the) flight/fleeing into always new roles[306]. Finally, it happens that reality exists only from the perspective of subjects which themselves do not know from [[the perspective of]] (as regards to) which motives they see reality thus / so / in such a manner and not differently / otherwise, and for which reasons they act or are supposed / ought to act thus / so / in such a manner and not differently / otherwise.

The dissolution of the substantial (i.e. substance/essence-related, pertaining to substances / essences) core of the person into variable/changeable functions ends with the elimination of the person as a person. Then, that which was earlier a person appears as a mere point moving along a line, which, for its part, intersects with / cuts (across) other such lines without (a) compelling / convincing / necessary reason. Looked at from the inside, the point which represents the person continues to remain loaded / charged with dreams, mythical or sexual associations, phantasies or neuroses; however, decisive now

[306] In other words what ***ZIO-JOO***-FREAK SHOW-LIZZARDS have always done "to survive", becomes a norm in ***ZIO***-massified, ***JOO***-DAS-atomised ***ZIO-JOO***-hyper-technicised FREAK SHOW society. Of course, "role play" has always been a part of human existence, but not to the extent which arises in circumstances of ***ZIO***-controlled (**KONTROL**) social mobility and "value pluralism".

is the way of looking at things / consideration / contemplation from the outside, which shows that persons loaded / charged in such a manner, that is dissolved persons can only represent and constitute mere points, when one sees them not individually, but in the totality / entirety of their relations towards/with one another. The society of inwardly / internally dissolved persons then appears to the observer as a heap of ants which move in various directions, and in the course of this, bring into being various constellations, arrangements and combinations. When the individual-psychological analysis reaches its conclusion through and by means of the dissolution of the person, thus no social psychology follows it – as soon as the question is posed about the society which such persons make up – but an abstract teaching, theory, doctrine in respect of structure, which deals with the entirety / totality of relations between the persons converted / transformed into points. Said otherwise / In other words: the inwardly / internally dissolved person is, as a member of society, only a weaker, identity-less (i.e. without / deprived of an identity) and anonymous point which is absorbed by / lost in the colourlessness and anonymity of impersonal structures, whereby / in relation to which the individual traits, attributes, features, characteristics of the person are reduced to mere signs[307]. The inner / internal dissolution of the person suddenly changes / changes abruptly into the atomisation of social life – and then comes the moment in which the dissolved person feels himself or herself to be a mere point or a toy / plaything in the hands of uncontrollable and inscrutable, impenetrable, unfathomable powers[308]. Only a dark and oppressive, overbearing authority[309] can stand above a chaotic psyche, which (i.e. the dark and oppressive authority) is accordingly unassailable precisely because it represents and constitutes nothing other than those anonymous structures which hold persons together / restrain persons after

[307] That's just the scientific way of saying FULL-SPECTRUM-***ZIO***-LOBOTOMIZED-***JOO***-DAS-PSYCHO-OP-ANTI-CHRIST-***GREAT SATAN-ZIO-JOO***-BRAIN WASHED-ZOMBEEZ.
[308] Which is exactly why almost no-one can see the OBVIOUS about ***JOOZ***.
[309] I.e. ***ZIO-JOO***-ANTI-CHRIST-***GREAT SATAN*** TYRANNY posing as "di-mok-rasee".

these (persons) as social existences have been converted and transformed into points or atoms[310].

The reduction of the person to an irrational substance (essence), as well as its dissolution, constituted perhaps the most spectacular act in / during the crushing, smashing, destruction, disintegration, splitting, wrecking, shattering of the bourgeois synthesis. Because in this (bourgeois synthesis), the person as personality or as unfolded / developed individuality stood / was at the (epi)centre (midpoint, focal point), and over and above that was not merely a part, but also the type of the Whole, i.e. the most beautiful and most valuable incarnation of its structure and spirit. That is why it is misleading to overlook the specifically anti-bourgeois sense / meaning of the new literary image of the person or of the I (Ego) and to conduct vague or passionate, emotional, dramatic, emotive, histrionic talk about the hopelessness, impasse, deadlock, dead end, cul-de-sac and the inner / internal collapse, breakdown, crash of man after the death of God etc.. God had around / circa 1900 (since very) long (ago) ceased to guide / direct / steer human matters of concern; in the bourgeois world image, He stood / was (entirely) in the background or was mainly, primarily, chiefly an ethical authority / tier of jurisdiction in the sense that He functioned as the guarantor of bourgeois norms (normative principles) and values. That God, therefore, whose death was proclaimed by (the) literary-artistic modern(ism) / modernity and the avantgarde could no longer simply be the old one, He only was the pensioner, which (the) modern (bourgeois) natural science / science of nature had made out of him – although the foes of the bourgeoisie tended in relation to that – with understandable polemical hyperbole / exaggeration / overstatement – to identify the bourgeois concept of God with the traditional Church / ecclesiastical concept of God, or else to look at the bourgeois and the pope as equal / equivalent pillars of “reaction”, whereas, vice

[310] No ***JOOZ*** could rule in the pre-(post-)Modern world.

versa / the other way around, some / many bourgeois or bourgeois thinkers, in their angst / fear before the radicality / radicalness of the new currents, threw themselves in the arms of the traditional Church / ecclesiastical God. Thus, the optical illusion came into being that the death of "man" had to / necessarily follow(ed) the death (of a not (precisely) defined (in detail)) God. God, however, did not die alone, but with him the bourgeois synthesis perished / sunk too – and exactly this latter process (of the perishing of the bourgeois synthesis) determined the dissolution of the person; because not Christian-medieval (man), but bourgeois-modern man was dissolved, not to mention that man and the person were as ontologically independent, self-sufficient, self-reliant magnitudes essentially bourgeois discoveries, which then were rediscovered in traditional Christianity with the intention of making Christianity useful for bourgeois ends/goals. The inner / internal relation between the dissolution of the person and the dissolution of the bourgeois world context (/ cohesive bourgeois world image) is unmistakeably shown / seen in the bourgeois novel in the fact that apart from the I (Ego), also that loses its clear contours inside of which the I (Ego) moved and was formed / constituted. And since the confrontation or mutual / reciprocal penetration of the I (Ego) and the world in the bourgeois novel was carried out in the framework of a plot and was illustrated / depicted by the corresponding stylistic means, thus / so the/a coherent and continual, consecutive plot is now lacking. The epic component fades, dwindles, wanes, vanishes, the form becomes free and open since it must remain elastic enough in order to grasp and enclose, encompass, contain objects in itself which do not group themselves around any meaningful / meaning-filled epicentre / focal point. The novel's plot can, as it were, come into being out of nothing and everything / all that is imaginable can temporarily dominate the scene at any time (/ and any element of it (i.e. the plot) can be found temporarily at the epicentre / centre of attention); sometimes (even) the story, which the novel was supposed / set out to narrate (tell), is exactly not narrated (told), and then the

novel is nothing other than the depiction / narration / description / portrayal of the impossibility of narrating (telling) a story. In the place of the formerly, previously, erstwhile striven for continuity, now steps / goes programmatic discontinuity and the sudden turn of events and of (the) narration; the chain of internally necessary actions becomes replaced by a series of decisions which can be taken / made intuitively or coincidentally / by chance. When(ever) the novel is not structured / assembled as a sequence, succession of dream(-like) images, then it consists of parts, segments, sections of happenings / things that happen / events, of fragments of conversations, of unfinished / uncompleted actions; reality appears to be amorphous and spreads itself and extends like a river without shores, (river)banks. That which connects the fragments floating (suspended, pending, hovering) in chaos to/with a whole is only the activity of an associating and combining subject, namely that of the author.

As / If the plot as a factor of / in the composition of the novel is reduced, downgraded or even eliminated / disappears, vanishes, so / thus the description of the social and historical background / surroundings fades, pales, wanes or is dropped, lost, becomes inapplicable, before / inside of which the plot was acted out and took place. The novel turns mainly, chiefly, principally or exclusively towards the inner / internal world, it becomes psychological in a very subjective sense[311]. The subject, about which it is now a matter, no longer unfolds, develops and evolves, however, in accordance with the model of the Bildungsroman, because such a development could only take place through its active confrontation with the social world, that is, only by means of a plot. Consequently the characters are not described as firm, steady, stable, albeit unfolding, developing and evolving entities, but are, as it were, photographed, in various moments of their life and deeds, doings, action, in relation to which /

[311] This is exactly what the ***ZIO-JOO***-HYPER-NATIONALIST-***ZIO-JOO***-HYPER-IMPERIALIST ***GREAT SATAN*** SCUMBAG wants : everyone to be de-racinated, de-collectivised, atomised and massified ***ZIO-JOO-***PYCHO-OP-***ZIO-JOO***-BRAIN-WASHED-***ZIO-JOO***-ZOMBEEZ, so that the "MASTER RACE, ROOL DA WORLD" ***ZIO-JOO***-RAT-RODENT-EXCREMENT-VOMIT-SCUMBAG can rule over them.

whereby it is left to the reader to close / fill in the gaps / blanks and to put together, compose, draw up the overall / whole / total picture. This psychologism destroys, cancels the bourgeois claim in respect of / as to the objectification of (the) personality through and by means of reflected and rational action in the framework/context of society. Paradoxically, however, the subject becomes all-powerful, omnipotent precisely at the moment of its greatest weakness. Because from now on / henceforth reality exists only from the perspective of consciousness and as a function of consciousness, without, because of that, ceasing to be regarded as the full and complete, or in any case, as the sole relevant (interesting and crucial) reality. The stuff / matter / material or the (remnants of the) plot are presented / depicted / portrayed as they are dismembered, carved / broken up and reconstructed in the stream of consciousness[312], i.e. they are seen through the lens of memories, remembrances, recollections, of feelings, of phantasies and of impressions of each and every respective subject; it is not a matter here of the mere going deeper into the psychology of the characters, but of the way of looking at, or even / indeed the creation of, things through / by means of the mechanisms of the conscious and of the unconscious part of the psyche. The stylistic means, which in the course of this are used (the inner / internal monologue during which free association(s) predominate; the outer / external monologue during which the subject addresses others in his imagination and hence makes use of (a) coherent speech / talk / discourse; the description of inner / internal processes from the point of view of the all-knowing / omniscient author), were already known in the realistic novel, but now they change their function by finding application inside of a composition which is originally, initially conceived subjectively (/ which is from the beginning planned by the shadow of

[312] The most famous example is "DA ***JOOZ*** WILL MAKE ME FAMOUS" ***ZIO-JOO***-STOOGE and ***ZIO-JOO-***ARSE-LICKER James Joyce's *Ulysses* (1922).

the subject)[313]. Furthermore, the technique of montage (montage technique) is now applied much more consistently, in fact programmatically, in order to partly reproduce, render, represent, [[and]] partly with regard to the needs, requirements of the narration to bridge the fragmentation (segmentation) of space and time in the stream of consciousness. The component parts / elements of the stream of consciousness, as they are analysed microscopically, appear in themselves to be self-contained, independent and of equal value / equivalent, that is why all (of them / such component elements) can equally make up and constitute the first, or, the on each and every respective occasion, start in (regard to) / of the narration. Precisely because of their in principle equivalence / equal value / parity, can they only be edited, assembled, put together with regard to / as between one another, yet / but not be put into order and included in a synthesis in accordance with the schema "Whole-parts". Montage represents and constitutes a necessity which arises / results from the prevailing / predominance of the/an analytical positioning against the/a synthetic (pre)disposition / intention.

The stepping back, i.e. retreating, abdicating of the epic element vis-à-vis the reflexive / reflective element, of the objective element vis-à-vis the subjective element and of the architectural / architectonic vis-à-vis the musical element now effects / brings about / causes an approach(ing) / convergence / drawing nearer / rapprochement between the novel and lyrical poetry, which is seen in (the) language use and at the same time in the perception about/regarding the function and value position / importance / significance of language. Only the flexibility or also / and/or the ambiguity (having many meanings) of lyrical language makes possible the bridging of (the) logical gaps and (the) contradictions; it, therefore, makes possible the new, more or less loose (lax, slack, limp, flaccid) assembly, assemblage, splicing, joining of the fragments of

[313] Without the (up to much broader) social and historical (collective, mythological etc.) context predominating or even existing at all.

that which once appeared to be united, uniform. In the process / Now, language should / does not through and by means of its cohesion, unity, solidity outline firm, stable given facts, but reveals, exposes something in the gloss, shine, lustre, sheen, brightness, radiance, glare of the fragment, in the originality and suddenness, abruptness of the epiphany, it momentarily (/ and in this original and surprising revelation in one moment) illuminates deeper interrelations. On the other hand, the spontaneous or targeted, deliberate, on-purpose violation, transgression against (the) common, usual grammar and syntax (/ grammatical and syntactical rules) is supposed to indicate, and at the same time aesthetically reproduce, the (already-taken-place) dissolution of the meaning-related / meaningful or logical cohesion of the world / world context (interrelation, correlation)(, which has already happened, occurred). Distinctive, idiomatic languages come into being, in respect of which every such distinctive, idiomatic language can, with the help of / by means of the technique of montage and of collage, incorporate into itself elements or quotations, citations, quotes from other distinctive, idiomatic languages or simply documentary material. Language becomes caricature, and the parody of language means the parody of the supposed, alleged logic of the cohesion of the world (world context, interrelation, correlation)[314]. A change of a letter can bring about a change of the meaning of the word, consequently meaning is exposed / reveals itself in all of its / its whole contingency and proves itself as the fleeting intersection of elements inside of / in the context of a function, behind which no substance stands / is found[315]. In extremis, the reader himself must find the grammar and the syntax, with the help of which he can decipher the text or else the meaning of the language / linguistic material, matter, stuff offered[316]; he is therefore left

[314] I.e. the ***ZIO-JOO*** ANTI-CHRIST-***GREAT SATAN***-DEVIL-EVIL programme of CHAOS.
[315] Which means that ***JOOZ*** and their ***ZIO-JOO***-ZOMBEE-STOOGEZ are leading you straight to ***ZIO-JOO***-HELL.
[316] The most famous example is "DA ***JOOZ*** WILL MAKE ME FAMOUS" ***ZIO-JOO***-STOOGE and ***ZIO-JOO-***ARSE-LICKER James Joyce's *Finnegans Wake* (1939).

to manufacture, fabricate, make, produce, restore the necessary functional relations between the language / linguistic elements. He can do that without further effort / difficulty because these elements, with / through / by means of their simple coordination, series, sequence, lining up, arraying in the text, are not supposed to bring forth any “beautiful style” in the old sense, and that is why they are mobile, movable, agile or even exchangeable, interchangeable, replaceable (as between themselves). What cannot be exchanged against/for another thing, is only language in its entirety, totality (/ Only language as a whole cannot be replaced with something else). When the (bourgeois) concept of reality is omitted, dropped, not applicable, disappears, vanishes and the art of the novel, already because of that, cannot be the imitation, copying, emulation, mimicking of reality, thus language remains / is left over as the sole real universe of literature; the limits, boundaries of the world and the limits, boundaries of language also coincide here. Fiction (The writing of novels) does not represent, depict the world, it builds, constructs its own world, it consciously becomes an artifact behind which the figure of the author-demiurge / creator is erased, deleted.

Perhaps even more important is the process whereby the precedence of the magnitude “time” in the bourgeois novel is replaced by the precedence of the magnitude “space” in the modern novel. This must first of all sound / appear to be a paradox, since the principal thematisation / making a topic of the stream of consciousness very often took place / was realised precisely as an analysis of the consciousness of time, for instance, in the form of memory (recollection, remembrance, reminiscence). But the decisive question is not whether time is spoken about / there is talk about time, but whether time is comprehended on the basis of spatial thought patterns / spatial models of thought or is put in order and classified / included in such spatial models of thought. The replacement of a description of an act / acting / action by a description of a stream of

consciousness meant in itself a shift, transposition of the examination of the problem of time from the level of external / outer time to that level of internal / inner time. External / Outer time, in which the act(ing) / action was acted out and took place, was a linear time of the event / event time, that is, in it the various events appeared in an irreversible sequence, order, succession so that the time factor / factor of time(,) in its bindedness / being binding with reference to / for the arrangement, order, layout of the individual events appeared to be decisive / generally to be determinative. Because it represented and constituted a magnitude which existed before the events, facts and was gradually filled with / by the same events, facts, but thus / in such a manner that no later, posterior, subsequent event, fact could take / occupy the place of any earlier, anterior, precdent/previous event, fact or vice versa; the events did not determine the structure of time, but time made available / provided the medium / framework / context for the structuring of the events. Things are / behave entirely different(ly) in experiential time / the time of experience (experiencing things), that is, in the time in which the stream of consciousness flows or more precisely / rather with which (time) it (i.e. the stream of consciousness) is identical / identifies. To the extent that the dissolution of the person made superfluous the plot in the sense of the bourgeois novel, it had to also give / necessarily also gave experiential time / the time of experiencing things priority (precedence) over / vis-à-vis / before the time of events (event time); it, therefore, necessarily brought about / had to bring about the subjectification or liquefication / making fluid, flowing of the until then firm, stable time factor / factor of time. However, precisely the subjectification of time permitted the spatialisation of time, namely its apprehension in accordance with spatial models, patterns. Only as subjective time, could time – or else the event sequence / series of events which had already been acted out and taken place in time – be fragmented / dismembered / cut (carved, broken) up into individual, isolated remembrances, memories, recollections, which then could be spread or put in order, arranged on

one sole surface in such a manner as consciousness wanted it (/ in accordance with every desire of consciousness on every respective occasion), i.e. regardless of what the outer/external linear time of the plot demanded. In(side) of the memory, recollection, remembrance, entire / complete time is simultaneously present, it can be dissolved, decomposed at will into constituent parts or else events, and then be again reconstructed at will in such a manner that its constituent parts occupy in every new reconstruction another place. However, the presupposition, precondition, prerequisite for the free reconstruction of time by means of and through recollection, memory, remembrance is that time is not imagined, understood as a line which determines the sequence, succession of events once and for all, but as a surface upon which (the) events can be lined up, joined and combined with one another at will. The unbroken flow of the narrative / narration does not arise / result from the logical coherence of the content, but the logical discontinuity of the content makes new means (image patterns, images, leitmotifs, analogies and contrasts) necessary, required, essential for the connection of the constituent parts of the narrative in a continual flow, especially since the abandonment, putting aside of the linear time sequence / succession of time / chronological order annihilates, obliterates the causal relations between the individual events and things, which implies the temporal preceding, i.e. precedence of the cause vis-à-vis, before the effect, and consequently shatters, bursts, disperses, scatters a/the fundamental framework of orientation of the narrative. One could compare the psyche, in which the stream of consciousness spatialises time, with a big city, mega city, megalopolis, upon whose surface innumerable events separated/independent from one another are simultaneously acted out and simultaneously take place. This psyche, though, not only is similar to a big city, but moves in one such big city too. Not by chance / coincidentally, did the big city become (/ was the big city)

the cradle of (the) literary-artistic modern(ism), modernity[317].

A comparison of the development / evolution on/in the field of literature with the almost simultaneous / concurrent / contemporaneous development / evolution on that (field) of the visual (fine) arts baffles / perplexes / confounds / dumbfounds / bewilders / nonplusses / flabbergasts / stupefies / bamboozles first of all (/ first of all gives rise to a surprise / astonishment) through / on account of the many similarities which concern central aspects and go up to into detail; thus one can think of / about the on-both-sides / bilateral / mutual / common dissolution of the firm systems of reference, of / about the parallelism between the isolation of the object and the autonomisation / making autonomous of the individual word, of / about the analogy of the colour alien to the thing and the adjective alien to the thing, of / about the interrelation between the flatness of the image/picture (/ the shallow image) and the spatialisation of time etc.. The most astonishing, surprising and at the same time the most instructive [[thing]] appears to be, nonetheless, the inner / internal necessity with which also/even the conversion, transformation, change of the visual arts since / from the final decades of the 19th century ended up in / flowed into the formation of the specific / characteristic – for them (i.e. the visual arts) – version of the analytical-combinatory thought figure. The great variety / diversity of the schools and the styles (stylistic directions/tendencies), as well as their almost breathtaking, dizzying, breakneck succession / sequence has a less confusing,

[317] And not by chance is the big city of mass society in the "West", especially after ***ZIO***-WW2, the locus for mass numbers of "missing persons" disappearing forever without "anyone" ever knowing what happened in the ***ZIO-JOO***-RAT-TUNNELS of body parts, blood sucking, ***ZIO-JOO***-VAMYRE-blood transfusions, organ transplants, GORE, child and other rape, child and other cannibalism etc. etc. etc., because what "cannot be seen" "does not exist" under ***ZIO-JOO***-ANTI-CHRIST-***GREAT SATAN*** RULE. OVER. DEAD. ***ZIO***. Likewise, all the full-spectrum ***ZIO-JOO-***LOBOTOMISATION-***ZIO-JOO-ZIO-JOO***-PSYCHO-OP-***ZIO-JOO***-BRAIN-WASHING via up to totally ***ZIO-JOO*** controlled (**KONTROL**) mass media, mass entertainment, mass advertising, mass "schooling", "just happens", and "it just happened" that historical peoples who still had strict patriarchal Christian values circa 1900 at the mass level, by circa 2000 had been TOTALLY NO FUTURE decimated and destroyed by ***ZIO-JOO***-MASS-PROMOTED "love is love" mass-atomised-technicised "stay connected" casual sex abort-contraceptive fucking, homosexuality, TRANZ-FREAK-SHOWS, porn, drugs, pills, mass depression, the rejection of traditional religion and the traditional family, as well as the ***ZIO***-imposition of the "new state religion" of monkey-***ZIO-JOO***-DAS-KOST-FREAK SHOW ***TOTAL FILTH***-SHIT-SKATA-EXCREMENT-KOST-WORSHIP. OVER. DEAD. ***ZIO.***

bewildering, baffling, effect, or appears to be in fact a meaningful context (/ and / or gives the impression of a meaning-laden function), if we consider / reflect upon / take into consideration that every one of these stylistic directions praises, extols the preparatory (preliminary) work of the precisely previous stylistic direction with the stereotypical, and at the same time fundamental, reservation (proviso, caveat, qualification) that this previous stylistic direction did not dare to go far enough down the path of the finding of the first elements and of their free combination without consideration for / without being interested in external / outer nature. The / This reproach shows us the direction in which we must search/seek, i.e. do our research. However, even / still before the formation of the analytical-combinatory thought figure in the field of the visual arts, the anti-bourgeois direction and the tip, spike, point, peak, apex of the development / evolution was seen in content-related innovations, novelties, to which, of course, sooner or later stylistic-form-related/formal innovations, novelties were joined / added. One of the most important of these innovations, novelties hit a nerve point / raw nerve / concerned itself with the sore spot (i.e. the touchy subject) of bourgeois art, namely the image of man. Its (i.e. the image of man's) full, complete, total dissolution and final, conclusive elimination was the natural end of a process, which as a whole was directed / turned against the bourgeois world view and synthesis. First of all, however, bourgeois man in art, who with / through and by means of his idealised depiction was supposed to embody the striven for harmonisation of nature and culture or norm / normative principle, was edged out, ousted and displaced by another man, whose appearance, look, manifestation revealed a preference for other values. Naturalism in painting had already discovered the types from / out of the lower strata – the tortured, tormented, no longer the merely picturesque farmer, and over and above that, the beggar or the vagabond (hobo, bum, vagrant, tramp, hoodlum); above all, industrial life, from the point of view of destitutes, outcasts, more and more attracts the interest (/ becomes increasingly popular in respect) of naturalistic

artists, who paint work scenes / scenes of labour in the factory or industrial landscapes. The favourite types of the Impressionists stem, likewise / also, from the urban lower strata (/ lower strata of the cities) or from the demi-monde of the cafés, of (the) bohemian stratum/caste/circle(s) and of the art studio(s), i.e. they are persons who live on the margin(s) / edge of the universe of bourgeois norms. Still another human type at the same time gains entry into painting, who likewise stands / is (found) at the Antipodes of the bourgeois form of life: the noble savage, the wise primitive (person), who in the literature of the 18th century served together with other exotic figures as the yardstick, benchmark, standard, measure of judgement against which the evil of the at-that-time / then West European societies was measured, but now with / through and by means of his natural(ness), naive(ty) and cheerful kind/nature / cheerfulness, he is supposed to no longer shame, embarrass, humiliate the old aristocracy, but the bourgeois. Artist and primitive join forces / go into an alliance / ally with each other against the bourgeois[318]; the former (artist) seeks, in fact, in the works of art of the latter (primitive) the stylistic means in order to overcome once and for all the academic rules of bourgeois art; this invocation of the negro precisely at a time in which the imperialistic thought / concept / notion of the mission of the white man (/ the imperialistic ideology of the civilising mission of the white human) had reached its absolute high point[319], truly constituted a provocation

[318] Which post-***ZIO***-WW2 (with the bourgeoisie dead for decades) under FULL-SPECTRUM-***ZIO***-USA-LOBOTOMISATION-***ZIO-JOO***-DAS-PSCYHO-OP-BRAIN WASHING becomes ORGIES of ***ZIO-JOO***-ZOMBEE-STOOGE **SELF-RACISM**, **SELF-ETHNIC CLEANSING** and **SELF-GENOCIDE**.

[319] None of this means that "white man" exists except as being part of an ideology, or, of a gross, crude, vulgar class of humans compared to other gross, crude, vulgar classes of humans, which only from a very gross, crude, vulgar perspective on a global, imperialistic, predominantly ***ZIO***-ANGLO-SAXON-***JOO*** (and to a much lesser extent ***ZIO***-GALLO-GERMANO-ET AL.-***JOO***) "master race, rule the world" scale has any relation to non-ideological reality, or, in the case internal to the USA, "white men" exist as a group of persons known as "white Americans" who originate from Europe as a whole as opposed to "black, redskin, mixed-race, Asian, Latino, brown etc. Americans", and not just from the English-speaking countries. There is not a China Man anywhere in the world who would consider himself the same "yellow" type of Human as a Japanese, Korean, Indian, Thai, Burmese, Indonesian, Filipino, Vietnamese etc., and that's because China is not historically part of ***ZIO***-ANGLO-ET AL.-***JOO*** imperialism and or had its own equivalent. To this day, the ***JOO*** as an absolutely ***SICK-FUCKING-KRAZY-PYCHO-PATH***-INCESTUAL-HYPER-CONSPIRATORIALLY AND HYPER-CRIMINALLY ORGANISED PRIMITIVE SECRECT SOCIETY, SAVAGE TRIBE, RODENT-PARASITE, RAT-TUNNEL, HYPER-NATIONALIST, HYPER-INTERNATIONALIST "INTERNATIONAL ***JOO***" MAFIOZO DOES ***ZIO-JOO***-LIZZARD-ENTRY-ISM into all the historical races / genoses / ethnicities of "the

vis-à-vis / for the bourgeois understanding of culture and history. Moreover, all these unbourgeois (i.e. non-bourgeois) or anti-bourgeois human types were presented / depicted / portrayed in a manner which (completely) contradicted (across the board / all along the line) the bourgeois understanding of the public appearance of the person and of the necessity for a noble and dignified, worthy stylisation of his behaviour. Humans / Men / People were / are shown in chance, coincidental and spontaneous stances, in fact in intimate / extremely personal moments without consideration for/of good manners and ethical, moral conventions. This turned on its head the bourgeois separation between private and public and at the same time betrayed indifference against / as regards the person as a consolidated, established, identity, which has a certain background in respect of education, cultivation, learning and appears in such a manner that its internal, educated, cultivated, learned essence becomes unmistakeable, obvious (/ its inner world and its inner cultivation become apparent). The precedence of the moment (instant) and of the momentary (instantaneous) impression makes the history of the personality in the sense of formation, education, cultivation, learning, culture irrelevant. The incursion, breaking in, invasion of the (what is) current, moment(ary), as well as the wish for the moment / instant to be eternalised, perpetuated, immortalised instead of the eternal being fixed in an ideal moment / instant dealt a hard blow to the bourgeois value hierarchy (hierarchy of values), in which firmness, solidity, steadiness, stability, duration and ponderability, calculability belonged together / were organically connected. Not by chance / coincidentally, the art of

---

West" (and not only "the West") to undermine them from the inside, and in its "master race, rool da world" madness, is simultaneously both an "anti-racist leftist" (in "the West") and "hyper-racist, white nationalist, neo-NAZI rightest" (in Ukraine, but also to a much lesser extent in "the West") in order to keep up to everyone divided, ruled and conquered and unable to unite against da ***JOO***, who ***GROSSLY DISPROPORTIONATELY AND VASTLY ASYMMETRICALLY*** rules the "West" in all main sectors of the economy, state and culture in ***ORGIES UPON ORGIES*** of ***ZIO-JOO-***HYPER-RACISM, ***ZIO-JOO***-HYPER-PRIVILEGE, ***ZIO-JOO***-HYPER-BIGOTRY, **ZIO-JOO**-HYPER-CHAUVINISM, ***ZIO-JOO***-HYPER-PREJUDICE, ***ZIO-JOO***-HYPER-SUPREMACY, ***ZIO-JOO***-HYPER-ANTI-CHRIST-***GREAT SATAN***-DEVIL-EVIL-SATANISM, whilst propounding totally ideological inanities such as "equality", "freedom", "anti-racism", "anti-sexism" and "human rights", etc..

photography was developed in parallel with the rise of impressionism: the camera revealed the charm of the fleeting glance and the surprising perspective (/ by virtue of the photographic camera, the allurement/attraction of the fleeting glance and of the unexpected viewpoint / angle was discovered). And the impressionistic painting was, from its concept(ual plan) / as to its intention, a product of the moment / instant; it wanted to hold onto / cling to / keep hold of a moment / instant and because of that it was supposed to, in the ideal case, be completed and enclosed in one single moment / instant – at any rate, it sought to be crafted, produced, made / ended / completed on the spot / in situ / on-site / on the scene.

We have now reached the point where the inner / internal relation between the content-related and the stylistic innovations, novelties, which impressionism introduced, can be made visible and understandable. The dissolution of the objective world context / interrelation (correlation) of the world, as this was comprehended inside of the bourgeois synthesis, is carried out / takes place / occurs through and by means of the reduction of the (what is) real to a series (row) of moments, instants or impressions as its true / real constituent parts. At / On the cognitive level, this corresponds to the stepping back / withdrawing / retreating / abdicating of the synthetic mode / manner of cognition (synthetic knowledge), in / during which Reason or else understanding and (reflected) experience jointly had a harmonic effect in (/ worked together, collaborated, cooperated harmonically for) the construction / building / constitution of the objective world context / interrelation (correlation) of the world before the directness, immediacy of sensory perception (the sensorial impression / the sensation of sense), which internalises external stimuli, not, for instance, to put in order the same external stimuli in a broader framework and consequently to relativise them, but in order to retain, preserve, keep, conserve them as far as possible in their first freshness. This autonomisation / making autonomous of

the fleeting (passing, ephemeral) or of the momentary and of sensory perception necessarily / had to entail the priority / precedence of colour vis-à-vis / before form or vis-à-vis / before the object. In bourgeois painting, indeed the aesthetic equilibrium / balance of colour and form was striven for, yet the form implicitly, tacitly, silently retained the upper hand, and its firmness / solidity indicated the firmness / solidity of the objective world context / interrelation (correlation) of the world. The tectonic element here remained determinative / decisive, and there were kindred arts like sculpture or architecture in which exactly the by-definition predominance / prevalence / priority of the tectonic (element) made possible the renunciation / abandonment of colour, in fact for the purpose of the highlighting of the tectonic (element) (/ and in fact it made such a renunciation (an abandonment) appear plausible precisely in order to underline the tectonic element). Seen thus / From this point of view, the making fluid / flowing of (the) form was the necessary concomitant / side effect of the ontological priority of the momentary and of the cognitive priority of sensory perception; this making fluid / flowing, however, could be achieved / attained only through and by means of the free use of colour. Because colour, which in the ideal case renders / reproduces a sensory perception with a brushstroke alla prima / à la prima[320] can build bridges between various forms or objects; only colour can in fact / after all be spread – form(, contrariwise,) is defined exactly by its boundaries / limits and is forever fixed / determined. The material heterogeneity of things is lost / erased in the homogeneity of the colour so that things can be classified on the basis of colour criteria / criteria in respect of colour in new classes and groups. Forms are sought in colours, not colours in forms. Only with / through and by means of the wealth / richness of the colour does form obtain / attain / reach its greatest / highest fullness, only through that does the mere / simple

[320] Alla prima (Italian: *at first attempt*), wet-on-wet, direct painting or au premier coup, is a painting technique in which layers of wet paint are applied to previously administered layers of wet paint. Used mostly in oil painting, the technique requires a fast way of working, because the work has to be finished before the first layers have dried.

draft become a genuine painting. As colour frees / By colour freeing itself from the form or from the object, it relieves itself of / gets rid of / releases itself from the duty / task of rendering / reproducing the game of bright and dark / (the) chiaroscuro(s) (as between each other / one another), which rested and was based on the acceptance / assumption of the stable outline of the object and did not allow the purity of (the) colour to be projected / emphasised; now there is no longer light and shadow / shade, but only colours which connect with one another in this or that way / manner.

The superiority of (the) colour vis-à-vis (the) form could take / attain / reach / achieve such a degree / dimensions, that it appeared as if / the impression was created that the objects in the picture come into being from the fluid, flowing masses of colour and no longer (would) reproduce nature. In actual fact, the immediate successors of the Impressionists, including the Fauvists, had a strong / an intense feeling that with / through and by means of the priority colour they would be able to overcome the perception of painting as the/a(n) imitation, copying, emulation, mimicking of nature; in their eyes, beauty and nature, exactness and truth were no longer identical[321]. Others, however, could either opine / think / believe that the mere priority of colour in / during / with the retention / maintaining / maintenance of the form was not enough for the overcoming of academic doctrine, teaching, theory, or else, this in itself correct perception / positioning will not be / is not applied enough / consistently by the Impressionists and their immediate / direct successors. And in truth / as a matter of fact / indeed: as much as the latter (Impressionists) had also shaken / shattered / rocked / shocked the ideal of imitation, they yet remained in a very wide / broad sense oriented towards nature, whose originality, virginality (virginity) and purity they wanted to counterpose to bourgeois culture or

[321] In other words, ***JOOZ*** and all their ***ZIO-JOO***-ZOMBEE-STOOGES set about (step by step, drop by drop of) destroying any notion of beauty (including symmetry, proportionality, human forms to the fore and or nature *as is* as transcendental etc.) as was known in "the West" since classical antiquity and or the Renaissance.

civilisation. They stressed, therefore, the factor “nature” in order to unhinge / disassemble / break apart the bourgeois equilibrium between nature and culture, whereby and in relation to which they felt that the destruction of this equilibrium as their own freeing of themselves / liberation from the cultural command of the artistic imitation, copying, emulation, mimicking of nature, but at the same time as justification / authorisation, in relation to that, of devoting themselves to nature in a new manner, which essentially, substantially differed from the bourgeois paysage (landscape) portrait or paysage historique (historical landscape). This impressionistic naturalism, if one may express oneself so/thus, was set/put aside at two levels and in two phases, which simultaneously became / constituted the two decisive steps on the path to the formation and development of the analytical-combinatory thought figure in this field / sector. On the one hand, the individual form or else the individual object was dismantled / broken down / dissected / analysed into its ultimate constituent parts / elements (components) in order to then be reconstructed and interpreted anew on the basis of this analysis (as the separating of any material or abstract (intellectual) entity into its constituent elements (opposed to synthesis)); on the other hand, the analysis of the of the individual form or else of the individual object ended up and resulted in an analysis of this analysis itself, i.e. in the search for the original, primordial elements into which every analysis must finally run (bump) and meet / encounter, that is to say, in the search for the pure form and the pure colour, whereby and in relation to which the object no long would be interpreted anew, but rather interpreted away (i.e. be decreased and diminished and nibbled away by means of its interpretation up to being interpreted into thin air), and / whilst (the) painting would be defined and conducted as the thematisation (i.e. making into a topic) of the essence and inner/internal texture of (the) painting itself (i.e. of (the) painting as art).

The spreading / overlapping / encroaching of colour beyond the (boundaries

and limits of the) object had to, as (we have) said, make fluid / flowing / liquid the form of the object, that is, form and object were made to appear as unstable and problematic magnitudes. The fact that the object becomes a problem, results, thus (consequently), as the necessary consequence / concomitant / side effect of the questioning (doubting, disputing, challenging) of (the) natural forms, as these were seen on the basis of the rules of the bourgeois aesthetic canon. Of course, these forms were refined or idealised so that they could correspond to / with "true" nature i.e. nature comprehended / understood normatively, and exactly because of that, that (direction of) style, which was called / named "naturalism", (precisely) on account of its different understanding of nature, turned at least in part against the bourgeois aesthetic canon. With the spreading of colour beyond the (boundaries and limits of the) object, this (object) (however) distances itself / is distanced from its empirical natural form / form of nature, no longer to be idealised, but precisely to be deformed; that which earlier was seen as / seemed to be a mere caricature, becomes now the artistically legitimate rendering / rendition / reproduction of an object[322]. After (the) saying farewell to / severance from the bourgeois ideal of beauty, the deformation, nevertheless, is not regarded as deformation for lack of (/ since) the previous / earlier yardstick, measure, standard, benchmark, criteria (was eliminated / disappeared); rather it serves – from the later / last Impressionists and their immediate / direct descendants up to the offshoots of the expressionist(ic) movement – for (either) the depiction/portrayal of the inner / internal dynamic(s) of a person or else of a thing, or, of the dynamic(s) of a process in which the person or else the thing participates directly. Since now the object becomes the bearer of its own dynamic(s), thus it becomes autonomous / independent, it can, hence, be torn out of its usual context / interrelation and either be converted / transformed into pure activity and pure becoming, or else

[322] I.e. ***ZIO-JOO***-DAS-UGLY-STOOPID-RETARDED-SIX-YEAR-OLD-CARTOON-LIKE-DOODLES are now "art".

be endowed / equipped with symbolic and quasi magical properties, qualities, characteristics, which enable it to constantly flow beyond its own boundaries and limits and be connected with other objects in an unexpected manner. These were both / the two consequences that the dynamisation of the isolated object led to / brought about in / with the futuristic and the surrealistic avantgarde. The isolation of the object equally constituted, however, the precondition for the undertaking / venture of (analytical) cubism, because only in its isolation could the object be looked at as an independent / self-contained structure, whose analysis could be made / turned into a particular, distinct and realisable, achievable, satisfiable, solvable problem, task. In the framework of the further development / evolution of the impressionistic approach / impressionism, the separate handling of the various aspects of the object, which was already announced / prescribed in the elimination of every fixed relation between form and colour, had already begun to accompany the attempt to dissect, analyse, dismember the formerly, previously integral forms into their constituent parts, which then accordingly were harmonised with one another in such a manner that they would be subordinated to a common rhythm or a (loose) overall, general line. This same dissection, dismemberment, analysis in cubism took place through and by means of a geometrisation, which was supposed to expose, uncover, reveal, bring to light the form-related (i.e. formal) structure (morphology) of the object. In the course of this, however, not the geometric element, factor, moment, but rather the analytical intent(ion) and methodical procedure (modus operandi) is decisive; geometrisation appears to be the most suitable way for the analysis to be carried out, executed, accomplished and for its results to be presented in a clear and concise manner; simultaneously, however, it is supposed to / should / wants to signal something else (as well): that the essence / internal, inner form of the objects cannot be disclosed through and by means of / discovered by sensory / sensorial organs, but only when they (i.e. the objects) are detached from their daily / everyday practical context /

interrelations, and are analysed by the intellect or else with the help of the pure forms of the intellect. The intellect finds again, therefore, in the empirical object its own structure by dissecting, analysing, taking apart this empirical object; and the cubist reconstruction of the object, which takes place through and by means of the enumeration and the placing next to one another of its individual aspects, combines only the elements with one another which the intellect has found in the depths of experience, i.e. symbols which stand for / represent experience. Hence, the cooperation, collaboration, interplay of the intellect, senses and feeling, as it was postulated (axiomatically accepted) by the bourgeois synthesis, is lacking. However, during / in the reconstruction of the object, not merely an analytical reduction to (the) geometrical (elements), but also a deformation takes place. The enumerated aspects and the aspects placed next to one another or constituent parts of the object no longer appear in their original, initial i.e. empirically given analogies towards / as between one another, but they are enlarged, reduced or simply reshaped / change form according to the meaning or the function which the optics of the analytical intellect gives / grants them in the picture; in fact, some disappear, vanish entirely, so that the rest can better come into their own / be stressed, and/whilst the simplified overall / total structure can develop a greater aesthetic effectiveness (/ reinforce the aesthetic impression).

The aesthetic message of cubism was (the message) that form and object are not the same (/ do not coincide), since the true form of the object hides behind its (i.e. the object's) empirical appearance (view, face, aspect, look, sight, countenance)[323]. The initial unity of colour, form and object was, first of all, smashed (to pieces) / crushed / shattered / broken up / fragmented by the

[323] And since that "true form" has nothing to do with God anymore, it can be anything, which simply increases (mental) CHAOS and CONFUSION, just as ***JOO***-DAS ANTI-CHRIST ***GREAT SATAN*** wants to … on the way to his "one world, global village" under ***ZIO-JOO***-DAS-DEVIL-EVIL-EVIL-DEVIL-SATAN (just like e.g. ***ZIO-JOO***-SYNAGOGUE OF SATAN-President Biden in 2024 announcing to the world he is "a black woman").

impressionistic separation of (/ when the Impressionists separated) colour and object, which was also a separation between form and object in so far as colour could be spread over / overlap the bound(arie)s and limits of the empirical object and, in the course of this, bring into being and create a form different, varying / which varies from / than this latter (empirical object). None the less, the difference between form and object had still not consistently been thematised (i.e. made consistently into a topic), because the empirical object was absorbed, as it were, by the form, which the colour created in its just / newly discovered own (and self-contained) dynamic(s). Typical / Characteristic in this regard is (the fact) that the conscious analytical endeavours of (certain) (neo-)Impressionists concerned, affected, pertained to / turned towards (the direction of) the analysis (decomposition, dissection, dismantling) of (the) colour and not the analysis (decomposition, dissection, dismantling) of (the) object; the object was, because of that / accordingly, analysed (decomposed, dissected, dismantled) only to the extent that it could come apart (undone) / be cut up into the smallest units of colour / colour units / monads. In contrast to that, cubism conducted / operated / carried on / pursued the analysis (decomposition, dissection, dismantling) of the object, beginning / starting from the form, i.e. it subordinated (made) its analytical effort to (dependent on) form-related (formal, morphological) points of view / criteria, and from this point of view impressionism had to / necessarily appear(ed) as a late variation of the old ideal of the imitation (copying, emulation, mimicking) of nature. In line with / On the basis of this same syllogistic reasoning, it however could be objected against cubism (/ however, the reproach could be expressed / formulated) that the imitation of nature is not overcome so / for as long as there is talk of the object (at all, in general) and for the finding of pure forms the analysis (decomposition, dissection, dismantling) of an object is needed (at all, in general). This objection (reproach) was, after the previous double separation of (the) colour from (the) object and of (the) form from (the) object, obvious

(plausible, reasonable, justifiable) and logical. All three constituent elements of the old trinity (triad) are / were now isolated, and because the notion, idea of pure objects (of / in nature) yields no (does not result in / produce) meaning[324], thus, the search for the pure must / necessarily become(s) (mean(s)) the search for (the) pure colour and (the) pure form, that is, the search for the primordial, original (primal, primary) elements of painting – and painting itself becomes / became / meant the thematisation (making into a topic) of its own primordial elements or the theme / thematisation / (making into a) topic of itself. Here it is obviously a matter of something much more fundamental than that game of some representatives of the Jugendstil[325] with pure colours and forms free of all / every perspective, which takes place still in the framework of decorative ends / goals, purposes. One could achieve / obtain the purity of form by one looking at (the autonomous, self-contained) geometrical forms which cubism abstracted from the object in order to then (re)present, depict this object analytically, i.e. by completely / entirely / wholly disregarding, ignoring, being indifferent to the volume of the object and by ignoring, overlooking, bypassing, skipping undiluted line construction (/ the undiluted construction of the line) (/ occupying oneself exclusively with the construction of lines) on a bare, naked surface; that which started / began / commenced as the reduction of a natural form to a geometrical form, is completed / accomplished with the reduction of the product of this first reduction to the constant elements of (the) form in general. But also concerning / with reference to colour, a reduction to the second power (i.e. a double reduction) was necessary in order to obtain / gain the pure or elementary colour. The first reduction was already undertaken when the immediate and

[324] Colours and forms relate to different objects but every object stands alone and can't be "pure" in the sense meant here.

[325] Jugendstil, artistic style that arose in Germany about the mid-1890s and continued through the first decade of the 20th century, deriving its name from the Munich magazine Die Jugend ("Youth"), which featured Art Nouveau designs. Two phases can be discerned in Jugendstil: an early one, before 1900, that is mainly floral in character, rooted in English Art Nouveau and Japanese applied arts and prints; and a later, more abstract phase, growing out of the Viennese work of the Belgian-born architect and designer Henry van de Velde. See Art Nouveau. (https://www.britannica.com/art/Jugendstil)

direct successors of the Impressionists, and the Fauvists, distinguished natural and pure colour from each other, [[and]] demanded the purity of the means of their art, and, in the course of this, questioned / doubted the impressionistic binding/tying of colour to sensory / sensorial perception or impression. (The) Pure colour remained, however, furthermore/also to them (finally) a colour of an (of course deformed) natural object (object of nature), i.e. colour was always thought about together and connected with light or with the phenomenon / appearance (apparition) of light. The detachment of light from the object and its autonomous depiction, (re)presentation, illustration as it for instance was imagined, envisioned and sought-after by the (so-called) Rayonnistes / Rayonists[326], constituted a paradoxical, but necessary middle / intermediate station between the Impressionists or else their successors, and the abstract painters. Pure light and pure colour were – beyond all / any reference to the object / objects – the same, and the problem, task from now on consisted in finding the, on each and every respective occasion, matching chord, consonance, harmony, combination of pure colours – or, even more so, of formulating the laws in accordance with which pure colours may permanently, perpetually express something, and in this capacity, property, quality of theirs (may) be used separately or together as matching with one another. To the extent that here there continues to be a distinction between form and colour, the form constitutes the unfolding space / space of unfolding of colour and in no way is it (i.e. form) allowed to interfere with and impair the effect and impact of this latter (colour). Even in abstract painters, who made use of strictly geometrical forms, these (strictly geometrical forms) were above and first of all / primarily bearers of colours, i.e. the form was supposed to arise and result from the psychical or musical content of (the) colour. Thus, the programme of futuristic painting appeared to be realised, in which not only colours and forms without an

[326] See (https://www.britannica.com/art/Rayonism) and (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rayonism).

objective (re)presentation and depiction, but over and above that / additionally, colours without forms as the expression of irreducible / ultimate states of mind / emotional states, were foreseen.

The search for the pure, elementary or abstract was, of course, perceived as the freeing [[of oneself]] / liberation from bourgeois sentimentalism and as the/a going together with new unsentimental powers like, for instance, the machine. The bourgeois aesthetic canon was, however, over and above that, struck / hit (hard) at its core, because the putting / setting aside of the object was at the same time the refusal, rejection, cancellation of that meaning with which the object was connected in bourgeois art. This latter (bourgeois art) did not concern itself with (/ was not interested in) any objects whatsoever, but with (/ in) such objects which either embodied / incorporated the normative concept of nature or specified / particularised / specialised the individualistic-anthropocentric way of looking at things, and indeed in the form of men / humans / people who were depicted / portrayed as bearers of a substantial (i.e. substance-related, bearing-a-substance) identity or as products of an education / culture / cultivation / acculturation / training / learning. The meaning of an object built bridges between its physical and its value-like / axiological / values-bearing aspect, it was the refuge or stronghold of norms / normative principles and of the higher / deeper meaning of things, which at the same time were recognised in their thingness, materiality, tangibility. Since this meaning (/ *that* meaning) was bound / tied to certain objects and to a certain perception of the object (in general), thus it had to / necessarily decayed and perished / went to ruin after the object disappeared, vanished in general and as such. Against the so understood bourgeois coupling of object and meaning or else of nature or man (/ nature (of man)) and norm / normative principle, the abstract painters now assert with all emphasis and in all tones that nature and art do not have / would not have the slightest to do with each other, art does not represent and constitute

any imitation (copying, emulation, mimicking) of nature, in fact it is superior to nature[327], because it comes into being / is born from the autonomous activity of the pure spirit, i.e. it creates its images / pictures on the basis of primordial (original, primal, primary) elements, which are not findable (/ cannot be found) in visible nature, but are only accessible in the spirit (mind, intellect (cum emotions)). From this perspective, empirical nature and natural objects do not have any deeper dimension which can be seen from / manifests itself in their meaning, but they are a mere appearance (pretence, veneer, guise), which the artist must break through, burst, perforate, rupture, pierce in order to be able to look at, stand by and watch, gaze, stare at, contemplate behind it (i.e. the said appearance) the inner / internal construction of the world and the primordial, original, primal, primary elements and primordial, original, primal, primary symmetries bearing, carrying this construction ((of the) world). Declarations against sensualism and materialism are connected in the abstract painters with mystical-pathetic (i.e. emotional, dramatic, lofty, histrionic, solemn, melodramatic, impassioned) metaphysical statements about / regarding that glorious (extraordinary, exquisite, splendid) realm of pure colours and forms, which, as it is said, makes up the true reality and the true essence of things[328]. It is not difficult to guess, divine why here an entire metaphysics had to be summoned / enlisted, recruited: only in the name of a highest / supreme authority can one dare to contest, challenge, dispute the certainties of everyday, daily experience – and only with, through and by means of reference to the metaphysical shine, gloss, lustre, splendour, sheen, glamour, brilliance of the pure can one console oneself about (/ provide consolation as a counterbalance

[327] This is not unconnected to the rejection of God and ***contra naturam***, i.e. against-God life stances such as ***ZIO-JOO***-ANTI-CHRIST-HOMO-LEZZO-TRANZ-PORN-DRUGS-MONKEY-FREAK SHOW-***JOO***-DAS-***GREAT SATAN***-KOST-WORSHIP.

[328] The irony here is that by rejecting traditional Christian substances / essences as "constructs", the bearers of ***ZIO-JOO***-ANTI-CHRIST-***GREAT SATAN***-DEVIL-EVIL-EVIL-DEVIL-SATANISM are promoting what has been plucked out of their arseholes, i.e. constructs !!! with different content, this time in favour of ***ZIO-JOO-***ANTI-CHRIST-SATANISM and against the Christian God.

to) the monotony under which the eyes suffer / are tormented in the realm of abstraction, whilst they (i.e. the eyes) are accustomed to the colourful great variety / diversity of experience. Even metaphysics remains, however, bound to (a certain) time / time-bound(/tied), and hence it is hermeneutically more interesting to ask about the concrete content of metaphysics on each and every respective occasion than to look down on its vagueness and arbitrariness (/ view its vagueness and arbitrariness contemptuously, disdainfully, scornfully). Because the concrete content shows the point at which the real doing(s), deeds, conduct, stance of the metaphysician belies, shows to be false, misrepresents, contradicts his self-understanding / the way he understands himself, at which point, therefore, the time-bindedness / being bound to time / time-dependence and the objective historical function of the metaphysical notions, perceptions, representations, ideas become noticeable, conspicuous, obvious. Thus seen / From this point of view, it was e.g. symptomatic, indicative that the realm of the pure (has, had) not seldom / very often / frequently exhibited, showed (shown), presented similarities with the somewhat / somehow prosaic, but likewise / equally geometrically structured field of the technical construction[329].

It is clear / obvious that the shift(ing) / transfer(ral) / moving / displacement of artistic activity to the realm of the pure or abstract had to make / necessarily made (the) combinatory work / job considerably / substantially easier. Empirically given magnitudes or objects are not combinable with one another at will / arbitrarily unless one deprives / withdraws (revokes, extracts) from them (of) the meaning which they have inside of the(ir) empirically given interrelations. Thus, the surrealists could combine objects with one another from the world of everyday experience inside of dream images, nevertheless, they could do that only because they detached / tore the same objects from their interrelation(s), context, that is, they took from them the(ir) customarily

[329] Because "the realm of the pure", regardless of its content, is no less a construct than what is constructed in a physical sense.

attributed / usual meaning and gave them another meaning, which resulted, arose from the new, not empirical interrelation, context. The combinatory game / game of (the) combination(s), however, assumes, adopts now / from this moment / at that moment another form in which object and meaning are simultaneously thrown on the scrap heap and set / put aside. Now ideational magnitudes are combined with one another, whose sole meaning lies in their capacity for combination / (cap)ability at being combined or in their (f)actual participation in the combinatory game / game of (the) combination(s), which now, as one says / opines, can be freed from every coincidence, contingency, randomness, and be endowed with the eminence (dignity, grandeur) of scientific calculus / calculation[330]. The ideal is to bring about / the production of endless, infinite combinations with the help of a restricted, limited number of ultimate elements and rules/norms of construction. The (main) focus / centre of gravity of theoretical attention lies, in the course of this, not so much at the deduced, derived, derivative level of individual combinations, but rather on the field of irreducible, ultimate primordial, primal, primary, original elements and of the fundamental axioms of construction. This field is, however, nothing else / other than the field of the elementary means of expression of painting, which now must be thematised (i.e. made a topic) in the process of painting itself. In bourgeois painting, the means were regarded as objectively given limits, boud(arie)s, (behind) / in relation to which the artist indeed was not allowed / permitted to lag (behind), whose existence, however, he had to tacitly, silently, implicitly presume; only in the depiction of the object was it shown what he knew of these limits, boundaries (and hence / consequently about the essence of his art) and how much / the extent to which he commanded, controlled his craft, trade, handiwork, business. Now, however, the painting itself becomes / turns into the object of the painting. The free combinatory game / game of (the)

[330] When no such thing actually exists except as ***ZIO-JOO***-FANTASY-BULLSHIT and the imposition on others thereof !!!

combination(s) alone did not suffice, the rules and the starting point (position) / initial situation had to still be defined. This of course was the combination of all combinations. Outside and next to it there were numerous forms of the combinatory game which in their totality / entirety made clear how central its function was to art (from now on). In this regard, the dream images of the Surrealists, the collages of the Dadaists and the various forms of the technique of montage belonged together / are tightly/closely connected as between them. They all rest and are based upon the conviction that everything is in principle combinable (/ can be combined) with everything[331].

The combinability of everything with everything is, however, for its part, only possible when everything lies on one single level surface, when, that is, space is homogenised so much that all the elements of interest / (coming) in question for the game of combinations, can occupy any place whatsoever in it (i.e. the said combinatory game); because, otherwise, the non-uniform, asymmetric, uneven structure of the space could partially / in part or completely (pre)determine the place of the elements in it and hinder, obstruct, impede partially / in part or completely their unlimited, unrestricted mobility, agility, movableness or interchangeability, exchangeability. In pre-modern painting, the object stood / was (found) in a space, and indeed not in any place whatsoever of the same space, but in that space which its own texture, constitution, composition assigned / allocated / dictated to it. The structured and finite space constituted a medium of order, i.e. that medium in which the objects were ordered / put in order according to the laws of perspective or else according to the structure of the space. The flattening / levelling (out) of the space, i.e. the replacement of the structured and restricted, limited space by the flat, shallow and unclosed, unlocked, limitless, unrestricted space means eo ipso the detachment of (the)

[331] ***JOO***-DAS SAY : YOU COMBINE YOURSELF WITH EVERYTHING AND ABOLISH YOURSELF (**ETHNICALLY CLEANSE** AND **GENOCIDE** YOURSELF OUT OF EXISTENCE), WHILST I KEEP MY ***ZIO-JOO***-INCESTUAL-CRIMINAL-CONSPIRATORIAL-RAT-TUNNEL CORE FOR MYSELF.

objects from the/a firm, stable system of reference, (i.e.) their (the said objects') free availability – and combinability. Characteristic for painting since the Renaissance was the tension, stress, strain, strained relationship between the flat surface of the image/picture, painting and the three-dimensionality of the objects painted on it, which made the viewer forget the flatness of the image / picture. The modern abolition, cancellation, nullification, transcendence of this tension, stress, strain(ed relationship) takes place / occurs through and by means of the flattening / levelling (out) of the image/picture, i.e. through and by means of the abolition of perspective and the transfer(ence) of the depicted, portrayed, represented objects on one single surface, which must / necessarily coincide(s) with the surface of the image/picture, whereby / in relation to which the objects themselves flatten / level out on this surface and are dissolved in their ultimate constituent parts / elements. The development / evolution / unfolding in this direction already began / had already begun with the precedence, priority of colour vis-à-vis form, which promoted, fostered, encouraged, facilitated the flattening / levelling (out) of the image/picture. Because if colour is autonomised vis-à-vis objects seen in terms of perspective (/ which are seen from a certain perspective), thus it can use the surface of the image/picture for its own unfolding and spread out (more) freely; the abolition, discontinuation, ending, cessation, omission, removal, cancellation of chiaroscuro makes, by the way / incidentally, the image/picture in itself flatter, more shallow, whereas its frontality must / necessarily grow(s), increase(s) through and by means of the placing / putting side by side of pure colours. At the same time, pure seeing discovers next to pure colours, (also) pure forms and shapes/facets (as well), which, as it were, exist before natural objects and first constitute the same natural objects. For pure seeing, space therefore no longer constitutes the medium in which objects exist, but it is the manner which colours and forms appear in their mixing with the (great) variety, diversity of the objects. Perspective is perceived as both as the narrowing of space as well as the

separation between space and object; an infinite, endless widening, extension of space and at the same time a mutual, reciprocal penetration of space and object is counterposed to it (i.e. to perspective), which, in the end / finally, must effect / cause the dissolution of the object. The abandonment of the earlier, previous perception of space, in which the object stood / was found, and the dissolution of the object, constitute, therefore, both aspects of the one and the same development. This was in the work of the cubists particularly clear, distinct. Here space and object flow into one another (/ Here space flows into the object and the object into space), whilst the various aspects, faces, facets and sides (sides of a view) of the object simultaneously make up the image, picture or else the space captured, recorded, included in the image, picture (/ the space which the image, picture occupies). At the same moment, that is, at which perspective becomes / is converted into a shallow surface, sequence, succession becomes / is converted into simultaneity too / as well. The object must be (re)presented, depicted, portrayed on the shallow surface, and this cannot be done differently, otherwise than through and by means of the placing / putting side by side of its various aspects, faces, facets and sides (sides of a view), i.e. through and by means of the simultaneous showing, pointing to the same (various aspects, faces, facets and sides (sides of a view)) in(side) space, and not for instance through and by means of their succession in(side of) that time which the viewer, observer, beholder of the same object would have needed in order to see that object whilst he moved around it. The end of this development, evolution, which begins with the first flattening / levelling (out) of the image, picture as a result of the pre-eminence, primacy, priority of colour, and continues through and by means of the interweaving of object and shallow surface, ends with the mere / simple colouring, colouration or division of this surface itself. Only abstract painting could achieve, reach, attain the absolute flattening / levelling (out) of the image, picture and bring the new perception of space to its consistent end; exactly because of that, the problem of painting as a problem of

the combination of ultimate elements with one another was also looked at and handled in/with such openness and clarity (/ so expressly and so clearly).

The new determination, definition of the factor of space / spatial factor in modern sculpture (statuary) played a just as great, significant role. Before we turn to this question, matter, we must remind ourselves / recollect / recall, nevertheless, that the struggle against bourgeois synthesis on/in this field, sector, like on/in the field, sector of literature and of painting too, was conducted still before the complete dissolution of traditional forms by (content-related) shifts and displacements or changes in the main focus/emphasis, centre of gravity (of content), which for obvious reasons were concerned above all with the picture/image of man. In the course of this, it was not a matter merely (/ The key point here was not in respect) of the early naturalistic discovery of the simple or working man (i.e. human, person), who was (re)presented, depicted, portrayed in non-stylised stances and as the bearer of everyday, daily concerns, cares and feelings, but of something more fundamental. Bourgeois sculpture stylised or idealised the human form/shape in such a manner that in it the living actualisation of the (striven after/for) synthesis of spirit and matter; Reason and drive, urge, impulse; nature and culture could be espied, seen, beheld, spotted. Tension, strain, stress and restlessness, uneasiness, disquiet were often not lacking, they were, however, thought of / understood either as the regrettable, pitiable, deplorable loss of equilibrium, balance or as the struggle for its (i.e. equilibrium's) attainment, obtainment. Wherever equilibrium, balance and harmony were so highly rated, classified, graded – however with / and despite all the deliberate, well-aimed allusions at a rich and dynamic inner life – a certain statics (i.e. static state or state of being static) must arise / inevitably arises, the extreme form of which is rigid (stiff, inflexible, obdurate, unbending) monumentality. Against these stylistic features, and at the same time against the normative concept(ual plan), perception standing behind them (/

which supports them), turns the attempt to introduce into the mass of sculpture (the sculptor) as much movement, motion and dynamics as (is) possible. In regard to the depiction, portrayal, (re)presentation of man (humans), this had as a consequence that this man is no longer shown / seen as the representative or the seeker of an ideal harmony, but, on the contrary, (he is shown / seen) in extreme situations in which a passion and the highest intensity dominates, prevails beyond good and evil in the/a bourgeois sense[332]. Such situations are no longer referred to in the sphere of the private / the private sphere, of the shameful, disgraceful, outrageous, obscene, or in any case, of the normatively and artistically indifferent, but are thematised (i.e. made a topic) in/with the intent(ion) of penetrating (forcing themselves into) the deepest layers / strata of human essence (the essence of man), which cannot be apprehended, comprehended on the basis of bourgeois notions, conceptions, perceptions of rationality. Above all, human sensoriality, sensuousness and corporeality in their complete, whole, total explosiveness are shown, the sexual act is no longer a taboo[333], and even reflexive / reflective activities appear as efforts, endeavours which make a claim on (/ demand the participation of) the whole of man and set in feverish motion his flesh and blood no less than his spirit. In this sculpture, the harmony between Reason and drive, urge, impulse, and the separation between / of private (sphere) and public (sphere) are (equally) shelved (in parallel), something which in terms of form / formally is noticeable in the conscious saying goodbye, farewell to / dismissal of / distancing from the ideal of beauty as perfection in the relationship between Whole and part. The so / thus understood ideal of beauty is completely and ostentatiously abandoned, whilst the fragmentary and the unfinished, that is the torso, obtains, attains the status,

[332] And as we have already noted, "in the/a bourgeois sense" means up to very strong roots in classical antiquity.
[333] Under Christianity and neo-Platonism, the sexual act pertains to the darkest realms of the cave of bestial acts and behaviour, i.e. to ***JOOZ*** and to their ***ZIO-JOO***-ANTI-CHRIST-***GREAT SATAN***-DEVIL-EVIL-SATANISM.

value and the dignity, eminence, prestige of the/a work of art[334]. The abolition of the pedestal, base sealed the rejection, cancellation of the monumental (mammoth) seclusion, isolation of the memorial (monument) (/ the haughty self-sufficiency of the monument), which stood at a sublime, lofty distance from the viewer in order to make him think and (/ which gazes from on high and from a distance at the viewer, to inspire him with awe and to make him) reflect upon higher things and values. Sculpture should, therefore, no longer serve bourgeois ideological and representative ends/goals/purposes (/ bourgeois ideological ends or bourgeois needs in respect of (re)presentation).

When the motion, movement of the object is summoned (up) / mobilised against the calm, quiet, peace of the memorial / monument, then / thus the decomposition or deformation of the object is seen / regarded as the form of movement, motion which breaks, shatters, fractures, smashes, destroys, bursts the clear line of the in itself, self-sufficient (and) resting, dormant, serene, tranquil, calm form. Movement, motion can flow out of every side and corner of the object, and this implies that the sculpture no longer necessarily has any central axis and any ideal means. The in itself / self-sufficient resting, dormant sculpture was centripetal, i.e. its non-interrupted surface encompassed / enclosed inside itself a volume which was shaped, moulded, formed starting from the centre. The sculpture, which, as it were, radiates, emits, exudes movement, motion and lives from movement, motion, appears to be, on the contrary, centrifugal, i.e. its constituent parts are not directed, oriented towards a centre, even though they can / perhaps (continue to) remain interdependent; furthermore, here discontinuity and openness towards all directions steps into / takes the place of solidity and seclusion, isolation (/ of the compact and closed

[334] This is all part of the ***ZIO-JOO-GREAT SATAN***-ANTI-CHRIST-DEVIL-EVIL programme of fragmenting and destroying, atomising and massifying everyone's inherited collective identity, except for that of the absolutely HORRIFIC-INCESTUAL-VOMIT-INDUCING-ULTRA UGLY-SCUMBAG-RAT-RODENT-PARASITE-BLOOD-SUCKING-CANNIBAL-VAMPIRE-***ZIO-JOO***-DAS-***ZIO-JOOZ***.

construction). The introduction of movement, motion in the sculpture changes, consequently, radically its position, status, stance in space or its relation towards / with the surrounding space. Whereas the stable, firm, solid, fixed (and) non-interrupted / uninterrupted lines of pre-modern sculpture served as the boundary / limit between volume and space and assigned, allocated, allotted, left to space the function of the mere framework, context, now a mutual, reciprocal interpenetration of volume and space takes place, which first of all is supposed to render, reproduce the movement, motion of the sculpture in space. As the sculpture moves in space, it of necessity changes its own structure; it can no longer be the idealised repetition, recurrence of a corporeal / body mass (mass of a body) or the filling of the space by an in itself, self-sufficient resting, dormant volume, but it must open itself, showing the complete wealth, richness of its possible individual views, facets, aspects and revealing all of its previously unimagined (/ until then unthinkable, inconceivable) inner complexity. The sculpture spreads in(side) space and accepts, for its part, in itself space and everything that is available in(side) it / that space; space itself, therefore, becomes a plastic element to the extent the sculpture becomes open and transparent on all sides. The plasticity of the element of space is (made) noticeable in the fact that now the concave becomes just as important as the convex, the cavities possess just as much meaning in respect of form (/ morphological meaning) as volume itself. On the other hand, the spatialisation of the sculpture, that is, its free stepping out (i.e. extension) into space, finally causes, effects, brings about, induces, gives rise to, results in a dissolution of fixed forms into energy and (a) dynamic(s); (the) material mass is looked at in its active expansion, in its fleeting, volatile, cursory, passing, ephemeral and, in the end, inapprehensible essence – in short, stuff, i.e. matter, substance becomes force, strength, power. Corresponding to/with / In parallel with the shifting, transfer(ral), moving of the centre of gravity (main focus/emphasis) from (the) mass to movement, motion, the material becomes de-materialised as far as

possible / if possible too / as well / also, it is, namely, used mainly, chiefly, principally, as a bearer of force/strength/power; in the extreme case / in extreme cases, one in fact sought to replace it (i.e. the material) with optical suggestions or at least to intensify the immateriality of the plastic (/ to make the materiality of the plastic lighter) with effects of light / light effects. The new feeling of form, in any case, needed / demanded new materials, which, for their part, were considered to be possibilities for the creation of new forms. It is (well-)known how far one (i.e. sculptors) went/proceeded in this direction, and which / how much (great) variety, diversity came into being in the course of this, not only from sculpture to sculpture, but also in the individual sculpture itself, which from now on could be composed, made, assembled, put together (out) of / from various stuff(s), i.e. materials. In this use of stuff, material(s), the fundamental conviction in respect of the any (kind of) combinability whatsoever of everything with everything in its conscious connection with the rejection, cancellation of the bourgeois perception (in respect) of / regarding beauty, artistic activity and style, is seen / shown. In accordance with this perception, art was supposed to ennoble, refine its each and every respective stuff, i.e. material, and the artist was supposed to develop his own style exactly in the ennoblement and refinement of / by ennobling the stuff/material; the renunciation and abandonment of work in regard to / working on the material also means the renunciation and abandonment of style in the old sense of the word. The ready-made represents the extreme consequence and form of this renunciation and abandonment of style, namely the wish that art is fully absorbed by and assimilated, dissolved, broken up (and integrated) in(to) “life” (see ch. IV, sec. 5).

The world of thought(s) / ideas of modern sculpture intersected not only in / at this particular point with the programmatic articles of faith / principles of modern art in general / as a whole. Modern sculptors believed just like modern

painters or poets that their art is not / does not constitute any imitation (copying, emulation, mimicking) of nature, but a completely / totally new creation, which indeed rests and is based on always, continuously available, present, existent, but as a rule, invisible ultimate elements, which have to be sought / located with the organ of intellectual contemplation, supervision, intuition in a mystical reality. That which is sought is not the illustration, depiction of objects or the (re)presentation of feelings, but the relations between elements and the free shaping, moulding, formation of the relations, function between stuff, i.e. material, volume, space and form. The harmonic analogies of bourgeois aesthetics are replaced by the/a sense for proportions / the equilibrium as this is dictated by the leading / underlying / sustaining / supporting / fundamental idea and the inner / internal logic of the artwork; correspondingly, the spectator / viewer / bystander / onlooker, for his part, is supposed to / has to apprehend this idea and this logic in order to be able to comprehend / understand the function and the meaning of the details, and not seek / search for objectified / reified symbols or symbolic objects in the earlier sense. Another central characteristic, feature, attribute of (the) literary-artistic modern(ism), modernity appears likewise in the field, area of sculpture with particular clarity / clearness. It is a matter, in the course of this, of that that trend-setting / pointing-the-way-ahead and promising / with-a-great-future rift / gap / conflict / gap / divergence / dichotomy between myth and technique (technology), whose both limbs / legs / members / parts, nevertheless, necessarily co-exist. The one basic current / stream of modern sculpture orients itself here towards the timeless and the cosmic, it seeks / searches for (the) primordial, primary, primitive, original forms, and in this spirit it rediscovers / discovers again primitive and archaic or organic formations of form / morphological formations. The other (stream / current) wants to take the path of the future as modern science and technique (technology) predetermines / preordains it, and chooses as a means of expression geometric abstractions and architectonic, architectural correlations,

the pure, clean surface and the pure, clean line, transparent forms and the strict constructivist construction process / constitution / composition / formation. Both currents / streams are directed / turn complimentarily against the bourgeois aesthetic canon and both flow into / end up in various / different detours, bypasses, roundabout ways in the two-sided / double-sided spiritual-intellectual universe of mass democracy.

Of all the forms of art / art forms which expressed the (matters of) concern(s) of (the) literary-artistic modern(ism), modernity, architecture was the one (art form) which hardly needed recourse to myth in order to unhinge the bourgeois synthesis. Here, the ideational alliance with contemporary industry and technique (technology) was completely sufficient, and the reason for that lay in the material necessity of this same alliance, i.e. in the original, from-the-beginning adherence, attachment of modern architecture to (/ interweaving of modern architecture with) rapidly rising / increasing industrial and technical needs. The new architectural / architectonic forms were formed / developed, first of all, in industrial(ly functional) buildings (/ buildings for industrial use); the main / basic / chief representatives of (the) architectural / architectonic modern(ism), modernity welcomed industrial architecture as the harbinger / precursor of the (precisely, just [[then]]) dawning epoch, era, and stressed not only the material interdependence of their art with industry and technique (technology), but also commonalities in style, mode of work. Nevertheless, modern architecture did not want to be a mere appendage or byproduct, spin-off of industry, but it developed / formed its self-understanding on the basis of assumptions, perceptions which had equally moulded, stamped, shaped the rest of the modern arts. First of all, a determination / definition of the pure essence of architecture or of its specific character was sought in antithesis / contradistinction to the other arts, in order to separate the purely tectonic (element), for instance, from the ornamental, decorative or pictorial, visual

scenic, picturesque (element). Inside of the demarcated, delimited area, realm, space of the tectonic element, the pure or ultimate elements were then sought, upon which every architectonic, architectural combinatorics (i.e. combinatory ability / "system"), i.e. every construction plan, blueprint had to be established / founded / form the basis. Inside this search speculative tones are sometimes heard (/ sometimes sound), which directly remind one of / recollect the theoreticians of abstract painting: there is talk of the eternally, forever fixed and valid, applicable forms which in architecture hide behind the world of appearance / dream world / virtual world (reality) / illusory world / make-believe world of the ornament (/ of the appearances, veneers, semblances, guises, manifestations of the decoration), and / whilst in the universe they hide behind / are covered by the empirical great variety / diversity / multiformity, whereby / in relation to which / and architecture is defined as the pure creation of the spirit(-intellect) in agreement with these cosmic primordial, primeval, primary forms (/ primal cosmic forms). Somewhat more prosaically / In more prosaic terms, the same thought / world of thoughts / intellectual world is expressed as a wish to return to the foundations, bases and fundamental rules of (all) building, construction (in general), that is, as the wish to dissolve, break up, analyse the structure of the building, construction into its ultimate components, to bring to light its / the primordial, primal, primeval cell or its pure nuclear / core form, in order to then on the basis of this analysis to go / pass over to synthesis, i.e. to construction; thus, the new architecture could be called, in that sense, "elementary" because it develops from the ultimate elements of building, construction. And since these ultimate elements are by definition of the same value / worth, equivalent and with equal rights / equal, thus/so, it was not permitted in the building which came into being from their combination, for there to be any superordination and subordination (/ superordinate and subordinate sectors); the hierarchical arrangement, formation, order, layout, set-up of the parts must be eliminated / disappears / vanishes from the moment (in

which) the Whole is no longer comprehended / understood as an organic construct, but as a/the composition, combination, assembly, compound of simple and equally indispensable, essential elements.

The precedence of the functional point of view exposed modern architecture to the accusation that it serves the narrow utilitarian spirit and tramples on / disdains / scorns the ideal of beauty. In the cases in which one / the representatives of modern architecture felt the need to answer this accusation / reproach at all, the answer was basically / essentially a tautology, namely in the reduction of beauty to the norms of modern architecture or else in the assumption that functionality is not only functionality, but also beauty. To the extent, therefore, that modern architecture continues to represent and wants to defend aesthetics and beauty, it identifies the same (aesthetics and beauty) with the functional necessities which retrospectively are characterised as beautiful or satisfactorily aesthetical (/ aesthetically satisfactory) – more likely in order to satisfy the common usage of words and tactical-polemical needs (/ and that is done rather for reasons of compliance with the current language use or for tactical and polemical reasons), than out of an interest to found and justify anew aesthetics in the conventional / traditional sense. At the highest level of abstraction, the aesthetical element was made safe / secured / fortified / consolidated of course by the assertion that the truly beautiful forms are the primordial / primal / primeval / primitive forms; harmony could, for its part, be defined as a logical construction, as the economical handling / use of the means or as the spiritualisation of the material element by abstraction(s), whereby and in relation to which the good “style” in the bourgeois sense was said goodbye to / put aside without nostalgia, melancholy. But even the highest level of the primordial / primal / primeval / primitive forms was only one step away from the area, realm of practical application, in which functional points of view alone were decisive / came first / excelled. Because the intentional / willed / wanted

renunciation of everything dispensable / superfluous meant a restriction / limitation on basic/fundamental forms, which merely had to be repeated. When repetition becomes the most important means of style and construction, thus the thought / idea / notion of standardisation and of industrial series (serial, batch, assembly-line) production is close by / plausible / justifiable / reasonable / obvious; the analysis which led to the primordial / primal / primeval / primitive forms or the ultimate architectural / structural elements / component parts proves consequently to be the mere theoretical groundwork, preparatory work for the practical aim, namely for the adaptation, adjustment of the art of building and the activity of building to the age of mass production. Series / serial building is glorified, and it is expected that it will become the task (/ constitute a work) of great / large industry; the replacement of natural and heterogeneous building materials by artificial and homogeneous building materials was supposed to exactly make possible / facilitate standardisation and series (serial, batch, assembly-line) production[335]. In addition, however, something else was required, namely the prevailing of that positioning, stance or mentality, cast of mind / stance of life which belongs to / matches with residing and working in such (kinds of) buildings: the spirit of the collective / collective spirit or the sense for/of the general and the universal is supposed to replace the sick spirit of individualism[336], which in architecture manifests itself in the form of eclecticism and (in) the search for originality at any price.

The open polemic(s) of the advocates, champions of modern architecture

[335] The centralisation of economy (including control (**KONTROL**) of banks and general ***ZIO-JOO***-SATAN-DEVIL-EVIL-MAMMONISATION-MONEY-FICATION of up to everything), state and culture was the way in the 19th and 20th century for ANTI-CHRIST, GREAT SATAN ***JOOZ*** to control (**KONTROL**) up to everything in the "West", completely destroying "western societies" in the process, by circa ***ZIO***-WW2. OVER. DEAD. ***ZIO***.

[336] Given that "individualism / collectivism" are always present in some form in relation to groups of individuals (there is no individual without reference to a group), "individualism" here should be taken in the ideal-typical sense referring to degree of individualism under conditions of oligarchic bourgeois liberalism compared to the increasingly more and more ***ZIO***-ed HERD-massification-atomisation-standardisation and ***ZJO-JOO***-ZOMBEE-STOOGE-ification under conditions of ***ZIO***-mass democracy.

against bourgeois individualism shows in itself that here the concerns and interests of mass society, which finds itself on the path / road to mass democracy, makes the difference / is/are decisive; the starting point of their thought is always mass needs or else the "interests of the community"[337], and the problem of the residence / apartment / flat / lodgings / dwelling / habitation / tenement / home / accommodation / domicile of the individual is correspondingly discussed and solved in connection with the apartment / housing / residential block / block of flats, (the) street scene / streetscape / building of roads / road construction and of urban development / town (city) planning. The declared negative aim, objective remains, in the course of this, the destruction, annihilation, extermination, extinction, obliteration of the independent, autonomous, separate, stand(-)alone, standing-on-its-own, self-contained, self-sufficient, self-administering and isolated bourgeois house, which seems to serve representative rather than practical ends / goals. The simple, unpretentious, plain, unadorned, unostentatious, stripped-down, stripped-back object of use / everyday object should take the place of the showy, flamboyant establishment, facility of the bourgeois and or upper class / the ostentatious mansion, and the house / residence should be converted / transformed into an instrument like for instance the automobile, car. Against (the) ornament(ation), decoration, the form-related (i.e. formal / morphological) argument is put forward that it (decoration) conceals, cloaks, shields the pure, tectonic shape, form, facet, view, face and the necessary inner / internal relation of the elementary constituent parts of the building, construction, edifice, which hence appears as heterogeneous and its cohesion, coherence, solidity and unity is impaired, reduced, interfered with, harmed, detracted, reduced, restricted, distorted (/ ceasing to be coherent and united). This form-related (i.e. formal)

[337] In other words, ***JOOZ*** and their ***ZIO-JOO***-ZOMBEE-STOOGEZ want to control (**KONTROL**) everyone in favour of ***ZIO-JOO***-INCESTUAL-ORGANISED CRIMINAL-HYPER-CONSPIRATORIAL-RAT TUNNEL-***ZIO-JOO***-ANTI-CHRIST-***JOO***-DAS-***GREAT SATAN*** "community" ***ZIO-JOO***-FUCK-SOOPREMACY-PRIVILEGE-PREJUDICE-BIAS-BIGOTRY-CHAUVINISM-RACISM AND HATE.

argument in which the contrast, opposition between (the) synthetic and analytical-combinatory intent(ion) / matter of concern / concern is latent, dormant, hidden, is accompanied very / most often, frequently by another argument, in which the social contrast, opposition becomes (more) apparent (/ which makes obvious, clear the social antithesis). (The) Ornament(ation), Decoration is namely condemned as the means of representation of a certain class, and indeed of the bourgeoisie, and the stressing, highlighting of function against (the) ornament(ation), decoration serves, – beyond every / all form-related, formal consideration, idea, possibility –, the refutation of (or the challenge to) bourgeois claims to/on the leading role in society. Differently to (the) ornament(ation), decoration, which in the final analysis remains a matter / cause of imponderable, uncalculable personal taste, function is something which applies to everyone equally and whose practical necessity can be clear to (/ becomes perceptible to) all / everyone and can benefit all / everyone – function is, therefore, of its character, ubiquitous, universal and correspondingly egalitarian[338]. In reality, bourgeois architecture had neither overlooked nor disdained, scorned, despised (the) utilitas (i.e. usefulness, utility, expediency, advantage), however, this utilitas, in accordance with the fundamental notion, idea of harmony was supposed to stand under the sign / be under the influence of / conform with the aesthetic(al) idea or (of, with) the Idea in general; the building, construction, edifice was supposed to, in other words, exceed, transcend, go beyond, climb over by means of and through its aesthetic(al) form the mere, simple purposefulness (end (goal) orientation or expediency) (usefulness) and with / through refinement, ennoblement, improvement, finishing, processing or the elegant covering up of (the) naked, bare stuff,

[338] And because up to everyone as a ***ZIO-JOO***-ZOMBEE-STOOGE accepts that ***ZIO-JOO***-LIZZARDZ can be anything they want to be, from an American and Englishman and German and Frog and Italian, to a "Russian", a "Turk" and a "Greek", then "nobody notices" what "just happens", i.e. ***JOOZ grossly disproportionately and vastly asymmetrically*** rule up to everything in the "egalitarian, functional, human-rights and dee-mok-ratik West".

material, make visible, illustrate, exemplify, demonstrate a higher meaning and superior, superordinate(d) values. Architectonic / Architectural classicism was first of all / initially connected with the demand for tectonic austerity / strictness / rigour / austerity, transparent symmetry and natural simplicity, which turned against the decorative tendencies, trends of rococo[339]. This / That was still the heroic times / age of the bourgeoisie, when its ideologues and artists wanted / undertook to draw models, patterns and ideals from republican or humanistic myth in respect of antiquity. However, this / things changed already before the middle of the 19th century when the victorious or (comprehended to be) in a rapid rise / the rapidly rising bourgeoisie felt / perceived / developed needs of representation, partly in order to align itself with and equal the nobility / by-descent aristocracy, partly to demonstrate to(wards) the outside that in this area, sector it could successfully compete with the blue bloods / blue-blooded. Then / At that time a new blossoming, flowering of the decorative style begins, whereby and in relation to which (the) ornament(ation) / decoration more and more conceals, disguises, covers up the core, nucleus of the building, whereas the surface almost becomes autonomous, independent, self-contained, self-reliant vis-à-vis its (structural) shell / framework; harmony arose here from / out of the symmetry of different (individual) parts, (and) not from / out of the rhythmic repetition of the same forms. The search for ornaments / ornamentation / decoration led to the imitation (copying, emulation, mimicking) of various building, construction, architectural styles and building elements from the past and consequently to an eclecticism with / of (a) historical impact / texture. Bourgeois historicism found its architectonic / architectural expression in the attempt at imitating or connecting, combining with one another various handed-down (from the past) (traditional) building, construction, architectural styles; in the framework of historical eclecticism, in fact stylistic imitations like

[339] Especially of the 18th century.

for instance neo-gothic architecture found use / were used, which originally, initially were undertaken with the intent(ion) of counterposing to / blowing up (an) aristocratic religiosity(,) (with) a pagan/heathen-profane bourgeois classicism. The revival, resuscitation of old forms of style / styles in the 19th century meant, in any case, no organic further/(meta-)development of the same old styles, but rather their putting in order / classification / ordering / incorporation / integration in(to) a modern concept(ual plan) of (the) decoration (/ decorative perception); only the decision in favour of (the) decoration made the path / road for / to the rediscovery (of aspects) of architectonic / architectural tradition free (i.e. opened the path/road for the rediscovery (of aspects) of architectural tradition). In any case, eclecticism gave to every (respective) builder the possibility of asserting / satisfying in an individual manner his personal needs of representation, since the choice and arrangement of the decorative elements was free for him (/ since he could freely choose and arrange the decorative elements)[340]. To this extent / From this point of view, the multiplicity, plurality, great number and great variety, diversity of the decorative forms were / constituted an expression of bourgeois individualism.

The new building materials had already since the middle of the 19th century revealed, made obvious their consequences for construction, however, bourgeois architecture continued, without regard for those new building materials, to fulfill ideological and representative / representational functions so that the overall / total development in this area, sector was (proceeded) by no means (in a) united or (recti)linear, lineal (manner). The contrast, opposition between the function and form of a building, construction, edifice became sharper / was exacerbated / became more acute / intensified / was aggravated, in any case, and gradually the alternative(s) (solutions) clearly emerged. On the one hand, the principle of building (construction principle) rested and was based

[340] I.e. “free” in the sense of both the ideal type and within a confinement / limitation of choices.

on aesthetic(al) points of view, whereby / in relation to which beauty was comprehended as the consonance, harmony ((harmonic) combination, matching) of the parts in a Whole under (the aegis of) a higher law of form / morphological form; symmetry and axiality were regarded as paramount, uppermost, topmost, supreme values, and the axis of symmetry was supposed to awaken, raise, arouse, give the impression of balance and cohesion, unity so that space became finite / had a finish both through delimitation, demarcation against external / outdoor space as well as through the perspectivist(ic) construction, composition of the relations of space / spatial circumstances, conditions (/ the constitution of space in terms of perspective). In contrast, modern architecture started / began from the principle that construction should determine the form and not the reverse. A thus determined form / A form determined by construction had to, however, distinguish itself by means of simplicity, clarity, straightforwardness, (recti)lineal / (recti)linear alignment, hardness (severity, toughness, harshness) and angularity; the assembly, structuring of the building (structure) had to be made visible, obvious exclusively through the gradation, escalation of the mass of the building(,) (and) through the distribution of the windows and openings, apertures, orifices. For our setting / posi(ti)ng of the question, problem examination, it, nonetheless, is most (more) important / of greatest importance that the new precedence and priority of (the) construction or of (the) function entailed / brought with it the primacy of the magnitude “space” vis-à-vis the magnitude “time”. In view of the narrow, tight, close binding of the decorative style to historical reminiscences, the challenge to / polemic(s) against / declaration of war on (the) ornament(ation), decoration implied a rejection of historicism in architecture and at the same time to / against / on history in general or to / against / on historically loaded / charged time as a source of inspiration(s) and as an aesthetic(al) authority. On the other hand / Contrariwise, function did not need (any) historical time in order to be defined and legitimised, it (i.e. function)

needed only space in order to unfold. Over and above that, the elimination of the factor of time (time / temporal factor) contained a (s)pike / barb / jibe which was directed especially against bourgeois habits in respect of life / lifestyle (living) habits and evaluations / representations or notions of the value (values) / moral values. The functionally comprehended space of modern architecture took indeed into consideration the current, present-day needs of the persons who were supposed to work or live in a building, but in contrast to the inner space of the bourgeois house, it did not take into consideration the pre-history of these same persons, i.e. the anchoring or taking root [[of these persons]] in a certain family tradition / tradition of the family, which as far as possible would have to be cultivated, maintained, fostered and continued, and wanted just as little to take note of the propensity, inclination, tendency, proclivity of the bourgeois subject of withdrawing or even of occasionally / now and then / now and again / sometimes isolating himself. The arrangement of space without consideration for time as historical and as subjective time was supposed to destroy, crush, ruin, demolish, wreck bourgeois individualism and at the same time the stronghold, bastion, bulwark of such individualism, i.e. the house as the crystallisation and as the bearer of a family tradition / tradition of a family. In the ideal case, the houses were shorter (i.e. lasted less) than men (i.e. people), every generation would be able to in fact build its own cities[341].

After the prevailing and predominance of the functional point of view / criterion and the connected-with-that elimination of the historical element or the

[341] Since ***ZIO-JOO***-DAS-ANTI-CHRIST-***GREAT SATAN*** bases its existence as a ***ZIO-JOO***-RAT-RODENT-INCESTUAL-CRIMINAL-CONSPIRATORIAL-PARASITE (starting in relation to Anglo-Saxons, Germans and Frogs, but also many others) on profits and power ***in this world***, it wants to cyclically destroy (including via Great, World ***ZIO-JOO***-DAS and other wars, as well as "Spanish flooz" and "corona viroosez" etc.) and build everything (again), controlling (**KONTROL**) every time the circulation of ***ZIO-JOO-GREAT SATAN***-ANTI-CHRIST-MONEY and all the other mechanisms of economic, state and cultural / ***ZIO***-BRAIN-WASHING power and control (**KONTROL**), and a concomitant of all of this ***ZIO-JOO***-ANTI-CHRIST-***GREAT SATAN***-MAMMON-DEVIL-EVIL-MADNESS is the mass inflow of "cheap labour, you are CHEAP" migrants, including anomic monkey-apes, into the "West", as well as constantly seeking to retain and conquer "new markets" world-wide under ***ZIO-JOO***-CONTROL (**KONTROL**).

time / temporal factor (factor of time), the building, construction, edifice appears mainly, chiefly, principally as the moulding, shaping, formation of space – in fact its essence is nothing other than space, which is condensed in the building, construction, edifice, and in its shaping, moulding as a building mass / structural mass it more or less clearly adopts, takes, assumes the form of stereometric shapes, forms (of a sphere, cube, pyramid). The condensing of space in the building, construction, edifice does not mean that the (this (here)) building, construction, edifice accepts in itself and, as it were, absorbs (the) outer / external space. The thing, matter, cause, case is put forward, presented / appears rather as if the building, construction, edifice constituted a piece of space, which through and by means of the expedient, purposeful, end/goal-oriented use of the – in relation to that – suitable materials and means would have been / was cut out of (the) space as a whole; in the course of this, however, between (the) space as a building, construction, edifice and the rest of space, that is cosmic space, no insurmountable boundary / dividing line / demarcation line / border should come into being / be created; rather, emphasis is placed on the fact / special, particular care is taken that the unity of the space is preserved, retained, conserved, protected and that consciousness / awareness / apperception remains awake, alert in respect of living in space as a whole and of having to constantly grapple, deal, face off with (the) space as the elementary precondition, prerequisite, presupposition of being (t)here / existence. Modern architecture wants to go / pass over from closed to open, from limited, restricted to unlimited, unrestricted space[342]; that is why the space of the inside and the space of the outside / internal, inner and external, outer space must mutually, reciprocally penetrate, pervade, permeate each other and in this (their) perviousness, permeability, translucence, porosity, leakiness, penetrability (of

[342] This is not at all unrelated to ***JOOZ*** as a primitive secret society and savage tribe of criminal, conspiratorial, incestual, rat-tunnel, parasitical, rat-rodent SICK-FUCKING-KRAZEE-PSYCHO-PATHS and their ***ZIO-JOO-*** ZOMBEE-STOOGEZ wanting to "get inside everybody's space" in order to control (**KONTROL**) and or destroy them.

theirs), awaken a completely different experience of space / spatial experience than the closed structural masses / masses of (the) building(s). Because here not merely the demarcation / delimitation / rough, rugged, broad separation of the inside and the outside from each other disappears / is eliminated, effaced, obliterated, but simultaneously the harmonic proportionality in the sense of classical architecture and in fact the distinction between up and down / above and under / top and bottom [also disappears/ is eliminated, effaced, obliterated]; as in abstract, modern painting, a picture, painting, tableau, also in modern architecture, a building, can be turned upside down / stood on its head or on its side without the aesthetic(al) impression being changed by/through that / for that reason. Nonetheless, no monotony is intended / planned / aimed at. On the contrary, the abolition of axiality and of perspective should / is supposed to make possible insight into multi-dimensionality and the inner/internal great variety, diversity, abundance of space, which is seen / shown both in the transition / merging of individual spaces into one another or in the frequent cutting / section / slicing / parting of horizontal and vertical elements, as well as in the great variety, diversity of perspectives, which arise / result from the putting / setting aside of the one sole / single / one and only focal point. The wealth / richness of the inner / internal relations of this multi-part, consisting-of-several-parts, multipartite, multifarious, polymeric and yet united space can be apprehended and described only from a single standpoint. One must move in space in order to become aware of the structure of space, in order to look at the inner (space) / inside and the outer (space) / outside in their lining up / stringing together / sequence / apposition / concatenation as if, in the course of this, the cubist(ic) (re)presentation, portrayal, depiction of an object was being handled / dealt with (/ as if one had before himself the cubist(ic) (re)presentation, portrayal, depiction of an object).

The inner / internal great variety of space is therefore not supposed to cancel,

terminate, discontinue, abort (/ does not influence) its openness and unity. The building, construction, edifice is and remains a piece of space which is (sub)divided in accordance with functional points of view. The individual parts of space coming into being / created from that ((sub)division) flow inside one another, but simultaneously seem to move in various directions since the surfaces by which they are encompassed / enclosed (/ which encompass / enclose them) can be imagined, visualised, conceived, understood as infinitely extended or extendable / expandable, i.e. in their relation to(wards) / with the infiniteness / infinity / infinitude of cosmic space. That is why the building, construction, edifice can also be defined as the combination of a multitude, multiplicity, variety, number of surfaces with one another (this again makes the level, flat slab, plaque, plate the most important element of construction and consequently promotes, fosters, facilitates, encourages, helps, aids, assists standardisation and series (serial, batch, assembly-line) production) – of surfaces, which effect(uate), cause, bring about, engender, occasion the spatial widening of the building, construction, edifice in / towards all directions. Such a spatial widening is achieved by the flat roof[343], which is supposed to indicate that the building, construction, edifice has no end, conclusion, closure upwards / towards above, that is, it remains open towards all sides and exactly through that / because of that allows the free shaping, moulding, formation of the inner / internal space: the pointed (pitched) roof and the connected-with-that compulsion / pressure / obligation / constraint / necessity towards axiality and toward symmetry stood in the way of / obstructed one such / such a free moulding, shaping, formation. The other / remaining / rest of the protective surfaces, as well as the separating / segregative / separable surfaces / surfaces of separation (i.e. the outer/external and inner/internal walls) are supposed to serve this latter free moulding, formation. The construction of the skeleton (i.e. the

[343] I.e. the ***ZIO-JOO***-SYNAGOGUE OF SATAN / HOUSE OF SATAN / ANTI-CHRIST-***ZIO-JOO-GREAT SATAN*** roof as opposed to the looking-to-heaven/God pointed Christian roof.

use of metal frames with wall fillings) made the walls independent, in fact in part mobile structural / building elements, they (i.e. the walls) did not have to, therefore, any longer support, bear, carry in their massiveness (i.e. with their mass) the building and occupy a fixed place in it, but they (i.e. the walls) were, on the contrary, borne, carried, supported by the skeleton, and they could be built, constructed, structured in such a manner that through / by means of / with their transparency and lightness demonstrate / make obvious the unity of interior spaces as well as the mutual, reciprocal penetration / inter-penetration of interior / inner / inside and exterior / outer / outside space; they (i.e. the walls) are actually not there (/ they do not actually exist) in order to separate parts / sectors of space, but only in order to afford, grant, accord, provide the absolutely necessary protection against bad weather, heat, cold and noise. The structural / building materials of modern architecture, which are in themselves amorphous and first must be watered, i.e. poured into moulds, have the effect, in contrast to natural materials, in many ways of de-materialising, i.e. they give the impression of de-materialising, disembodying the (structural) masses (of (the) building(s)) and of reinforcing the striven-for unity of the inner / interior parts, sectors of space, as well as of the inner, interior and outer, exterior space, with each other / in general. Glass makes transparency self-evident and, by lifting, i.e. abolishing in practice the separation between inside / interior and outside / exterior, it symbolically expresses the fact that it (i.e. the said separation between inside and outside) is now over (belongs to the past without any chance of a return), along with the fundamental bourgeois separation between (the) private (sphere) and (the) public (sphere). Iron and steel relieve, unburden, ease, make lighter, on the other hand, the building volumes significantly, considerably by reducing, decreasing, lessening, diminishing, easing, abating, making smaller the surface which must be occupied by supporting structural, building elements. Furthermore, the new building / structural materials (building stuff(s)) and the new methods of construction make possible / enable the bridging of large spans,

ranges (/ the coupling of large openings) and the creation of huge, enormous, colossal, gigantic, immense spaces (without support(s), struts, supporting frameworks). However, the new feeling and need for / (in respect) of space very often demands, requires asymmetric solutions, whereby / in relation to which the asymmetry is compensated / counterbalanced / equilibrated by the rhythmic intensity, tension, strain, stress and movement, motion of the building masses. Thanks to the new conception and moulding, shaping, formation of space, movement, motion and (a) dynamic(s) can be introduced / brought / carried into the building, construction, edifice (as / like in the modern sculpture too / as well), in order to overcome the rigidity, stiffness of the axial construction once and for all: the building, construction, edifice is set in motion to the extent that space and building, construction, edifice (mutually / reciprocally) (inter-) penetrate / permeate / pervade (each other). The elasticity of the building / structural materials (building stuff(s)) is now transferred as intensity, tension, stress, strain in the building, construction, edifice, which appears as a forever temporary resultant of an unending / never-ending (inter)play of forces in (the) space.

The new primacy, precedence of the factor of “space” could in modern architecture become / be made visible in (the) space itself. In music this was just as little possible as in literature; in the one and in the other, the spatialisation of the world and of the perception of, or feeling for, the world occurred, happened, took place through / by means of the fact that the erstwhile hierarchised synthetic Whole was dissolved, broken up, cut up, segmented into ultimate elements of equal value as between / amongst one another (/ into ultimate and equivalent elements), which were then spread out on an ideational surface and allowed (/ in order) to be combined with one another. The final, end stage of the spatialisation brings, therefore, with it, to a high degree, a formalisation (i.e. the prevailing, predominance of the form-related, formal element) – and the

ascertainment is here interesting (/ and of interest here is the ascertainment) that the evolution, development in music, which, in the end / finally, led to formalisation (i.e. the prevailing, predominance of form-related, formal factors), began, similarly as in literature or in painting, with a softening, smoothing or making fluid of traditional or conventional firm forms, which indeed, first of all, seemed like a sentimental derailment; nonetheless, it (i.e. the said evolution, development in music) essentially, significantly, substantially contributed to bringing into consciousness, awareness the wealth, richness in scattered materials and unexplored possibilities hiding behind the closedness[344] of the bourgeois synthesis (/ the closed bourgeois synthesis). The dissolution, disassembly, dismantling, unhinging of the classical form in music commenced, started when the emotionally charged (/ loaded-with-feelings) (musical) chromatics / chromaticism flooded, overwhelmed, overran and gradually inundated, flooded, overran, deluged, brought down the boundaries, barriers of tonality, in which one main, fundamental, basic tone (the tonic, i.e. the first note of a diatonic scale; the keynote) determined the construction, structure, building, constitution, formation, establishing, composition and the succession, sequence of the chords. This process was carried out / executed in various, different forms and on/via various, different roundabout ways, detours, however, its completion, ending, conclusion brought about a state of affairs in which the spatialisation of the musical perception of (/ musical feeling for) the world was possible. The task, function, purpose of the main, principal, basic,

[344] I.e. obviously meant ideal-typically. In his filmed talk about Prokofiev, (the (very) arguably greatest soloist of the 20th century) Glenn Gould (25 September 1932 – 4 October 1982) (in his typically ***ZIO-JOO***-ZOMBEE-STOOGE-"Western" anti-Soviet tirade of sorts) mentions how the musical artist as an individual is not artistically constrained by the era or the state in or under which he composes his music. This is to a certain extent undoubtedly true, e.g. Beethoven did not in some of his later works "sit well with his times", yet Beethoven, just like Bach or Mozart et al. could never have possibly appeared in the 20th or 21st century (just like a Karlheinz Stockhausen, to whom Gould refers (and who, for me, as a subjective matter of taste, produces noise pollution garbage, and not music), could not have appeared in the 18th century). Hence, the relative "elasticity" between artists, the arts and their era, which also applies to the history of ideas, does not mean that the relationship between "spirit" and social (not just economic) "base" (i.e. Whole) is non-existent. On the contrary, there is not one "(great) artist" or "(great) thinker" who does not have a very great, existential relationship with his times and place(s), and it could never have been or be otherwise.

home (tonic) key (basic tonality) (/ The abandonment of tonality) had the effect / as a consequence the widening of the sound (tone, sonority, note), through which the dissolving, melting away or turning into a formless mass, of notes, sounds, tones and (the) constant, enduring, continuous, abiding, lasting, ceaseless modulating, modulation, conversion became important musical means of expression. The sounds, tones, notes were now regarded first and foremost / for the main part as values in respect of colour / colour (chromatic) values, and to the extent that the basic / main tones were replaced by mere directional (guiding, leading, directing) tones, the sounds became autonomous, independent, self-contained, self-reliant and could or had to (co-)exist (next to one another) in a nuance-rich / rich-in-nuances relationship of tension, stress, strain, intensity. The whole tone scale / scale in accordance with tones / scale of tones put (set) aside the tonal centres of gravity, and in the chord relations / relations between chords, the contrasts and oppositions were no longer emphasised / projected, but rather the affinities. In other cases, detachment / breaking away from (the) main, principal, home (tonic) key (basic tonality) was done by replacing the triad harmony by a six-tone (six-note) chord, which consisted of pure and altered fourths. Through that / In this way, the hierarchical structures of the bourgeois theory of music and bourgeois aesthetic(s) (in respect) of music (/ the bourgeois theory and aesthetic(s) of music) were more or less dismantled, but the onset of the levelling of hierarchies was accompanied by the beginnings of a fragmentation of the synthetically comprehended / conceived (of the synthetic) Whole, which was seen / shown not least of all in the changes in the melody. In (the) place of the endless / unending melody, in whose sign / framework / context (musical) chromatics / chromaticism (first) replaced (the) main, principal, home (tonic) key (basic tonality) (for the first time), quickly / soon enough entered / went closed and short melodies, which in some cases in fact rested and were based on a few notes, or even on parallel melodic lines (lines of melody), which were not shaped, moulded, formed on

the basis of harmonic-sounding / harmonic-tonal laws (/ laws of sonic / acoustic / audio / sound harmony); simultaneously, (the) polymetric(s) and (the) polyrhythmic(s) pushed out / displaced / dispelled / supplanted / sidelined / edged out traditional rhythm.

The levelling and fragmentation, making / rendering fluid and free reconstruction / rebuilding of the organic or else / and hierarchical Whole had, furthermore, as a consequence / result that musical elements, which earlier / previously were regarded as incompatible / inconsistent / irreconcilable with one another or could be connected / combined only as members of an antithesis, now are allowed / may – without further do / anything further – get nearer / closer to one another and function in the framework of the same musical unity. The renunciation / abandonment of / resignation from a tonal centre made possible / enabled / facilitated the coupling of (musical) keys, modes which had / showed a very slight / small degree of kinship / affinity / relationship, whilst the dissonances, which resulted / arose from that, were classified, rated, classed, graded and handled, treated precisely, exactly like the consonances[345]. The victory of (musical) chromatics / chromaticism over (the) main, principal, home (tonic) key (basic tonality) simultaneously widened the area, realm, sector of tonality, since the five tones of the chromatic scale became equal / the equivalent with / were treated equally as the seven diatonic tones / notes. Bitonality and polytonality from now on / henceforth lay / were near / close (to each other) (/ were no longer far away from each other), and they were to / had to be in actual fact looked at / considered as grades (levels, rungs, increments, steps) of development / evolutionary gradations towards atonality, even though they preserved, kept, retained the old major and minor keys. However, atonality presupposed still something else, namely the extreme formalisation (i.e.

[345] Unless I'm mistaken, in these passages (above and below), we are going, inter alia, "from Wagner (22 May 1813 – 13 February 1883) to mature Stravinsky's (17 June [O.S. 5 June] 1882 – 6 April 1971) "teacher/mentor" (13 September 1874 – 13 July 1951) [according to one ridiculous ***ZIO-JOO***-"documentary" about EYE-gor in ***ZIO***-California and ***ZIO***-USA-elsewhere]".

rendering into forms) of the composition (/ the absolute prevailing, predominance of the morphological element in the composition), and indeed in the consciousness/awareness of the necessity of methodically proceeding (in regard to the job, task, work of composition) with the help of the rules of a certain combinatorics (ability to combine things) without consideration for/of other factors. In this consciousness/awareness, the creators of atonal music were opposed / objected to the imitation (copying, emulation, mimicking) of nature or (to) the imitation (copying, emulation, mimicking) of impressions and feelings. Just like the abstract painters had to turn against the Impressionists, although they (the abstract painters) themselves emerged from / out of a development / evolution(,) at whose beginning / commencement / start the Impressionists stood (/ which started with the Impressionists), thus one had to now say goodbye to / take leave of / reject sentimentalism and the theory of imitation, which were emphasised by / came into effect in the precedence, primacy of (musical) chromatics / chromaticism, in order to found modern music on a purely combinatory and spatial(ised) basis[346]. The analytical positioning, i.e. the wish / desire to rediscover – beyond all feelings and dispositions, moods – the fundamental / basic musical elements in their purity, was, in the course of this, ground-breaking, pioneering, trail-blazing, path-breaking, revolutionary (/ showed the way here). In relation to this, one, however, had to remove, detach, release, unhinge, separate these elements from their previous / earlier symmetrical order(ing)s, arrangements. That is why the new priority of the elementary and the irreducible was expressed (more lucidly, perspicuously) in the perception that every musical unity – a sound (note), a tone or a chord – should / ought to be aesthetically judged, evaluated in itself and not on the basis of its each and every respective relation with a harmonic Whole; every such unity represents and constitutes, therefore, an autonomous,

[346] I'm not mistaken in footnote 345, above.

independent, self-contained compression, condensation, thickening of the musical (element) and does not need any putting in order or integration / incorporation in a melodic-temporal context, interrelation in order to signal, indicate, reveal, itself as such (/ state its musical character). Simultaneously, it was viewed, seen, observed, recognised, espied / became perceived that the freeing of the individual elements from their earlier / previous bindings, bonds, ties meant, signified a change / changing of the character, texture and of the aims, objectives, ends of the composer's work. The composition was comprehended, understood all the more / more and more as a game with themes, sounds, notes, rhythms and forms; the form-related/formal-structural aspect increasingly, therefore, gained the upper hand, and concentration on the form served, for its part, as the/a means, in relation to that, of breaking conclusively, definitively with that which was regarded as / held to be sentimentalism or unreliable, undependable, untrustworthy subjectivism.

The shift(ing), displacement of the musical centre of gravity from the harmonic-sound(-related)/sonorous/sonic-tonal (element) to the form-related/formal-structural (element) implied, therefore, a downgrading, degradation, relegation, demotion, depreciation of that which until then was regarded as the spiritual content of music, and a corresponding upgrading, revaluation, appreciation, upvaluation of the technical-handcrafted / artisanal / constructional aspect or factor. It was indeed by no means denied that music is the creation and the expression of the spirit(-intellect-emotions), however, this spirit was no longer the partly humanist(ic), partly romantic / Romantic bourgeois spirit, but the analytical-combinatory spirit, which sought and found its self-understanding and its identity in the / its delimitation, demarcation, entrenchment against bourgeois blurredness, fuzziness, haziness, indistinctness, vagueness (ambiguity and confusion). The higher goal/end of the form was

henceforth / from this time (then) on not seen, located in beauty[347], but form above all, principally, primarily meant precise organisation for the formulation of precise thoughts. Also, in regard to / on the question of tonality, aesthetic(al) criteria in the old sense (of the term) were not (regarded as) decisive, determinative, rather the advantage of atonal music seemed to lie in its capability of achieving (obtaining, reaching, attaining) greater form-related, formal unity and cohesion, unity, solidity. The bourgeois synthesis and the bourgeois aesthetic(al) canon were, nonetheless, not merely destroyed with the help of the instruments of the formalist(ic) and constructivist(ic) spirit. Just like in other areas, sectors of (the) literary-artistic modern(ism), modernity, the spirit of the myth and the spirit of technique (technology) had a joint effect / worked together / acted in combination / collaborated / co-operated in an anti-bourgeois sense, so too in the area, sector of music, when one looks at it (i.e. the said area of music) in its totality, heterogeneous currents and creations entered into an anti-bourgeois alliance. The constructivist(ic) positioning of twelve-tone music came, achieved – not by accident / coincidentally / by chance – its breakthrough / to prevail at the same time in which one began to discover and to celebrate, praise the Dionysian (element) in jazz (music)[348]. Apart from its particular influence on (certain) individual modern composers, jazz (music) in actual fact contributed considerably, significantly, in relation to that, to the overtaking, overhauling, surpassing, overcoming of the old symmetrical sense of rhythm through and by means of a much more complicated, bi- or multi-layered, in other words, poly-rhythmic sense of rhythm. The feeling for rhythm is, however, connected here with the/a lack of respect for (impiety, irreverence as regards) the melodic line; the fragmentary and the repetitive as a constantly broken / breaking / intermittent rhythm steps into the place of / replaces

[347] ***JOOZ*** and their ***ZIO-JOO***-ZOMBEE-STOOGEZ, owing to ***JOOZ*** being incestual in-bred vomit-rat-rodents, are of their very nature **HYPER-SUPER-UGLY**.
[348] Under total ***ZIO-JOO***-DAS-ANTI-CHRIST-***GREAT SATAN*** CONTROL (**KONTROL**).

(seamlessly) flowing (without-a-break) harmony. The composition is open, it can (endlessly) continue (ad infinitum) or suddenly stop, cease; there are no parts which are subordinated to / integrated in a well-tempered Whole, but only pieces which are (arbitrarily) connected with one another (at will); digressions, improvisations and sudden, abrupt, immediate high points / highlights / unexpected (unthought of, unforeseen) climaxes are just as characteristic and essential as (the) rhythmic unities [[are]] too / as well. The synthetic-hierarchical positioning makes room / way for the joy in / of the constant game with unbound (unattached) elements of equal value (/ with unbound and equivalent elements).

Despite all the recognition of the independence, autonomy, sovereignty, self-reliance, reliance on itself, self-efficiency of the twelve-step(ped) / layered / terraced chromatic (musical) scale, which was no longer seen as / considered to be the mere colouration, colouring of the major and minor keys, first of all / initially, all twelve tones (sounds, notes) of this (musical) scale could still be related to (/ remained dependent on) one single tone. The last step towards / in the dismantling, cutback, destruction, abolition, disassembly, breakdown, downsizing, depletion, degradation of the traditional hierarchy and towards / in the spatialisation of the overall, total musical conception, perception took place, occurred, happened, was realised when the absolute equivalence (equal value, parity, equal rights, equality, equal entitlement / legitimacy) of the twelve tones (sounds, notes) was accepted (assumed, adopted) and their harmonic relation towards one another was rejected (denied). The basis, foundation of the musical piece was from now on / henceforth not a harmonic main, basic, fundamental tone and the corresponding main, principal, home (tonic) key (basic tonality), but a twelve-tone/tonal series, row as the sequence, succession of individual, separate tones, which rotate mechanically and remain separated from one another so that an absolute purity of sounds can be achieved (reached, attained).

The regular use of a series, row of twelve tones (sounds, notes) has the effect / result that every tone (sound, note) is projected, comes into effect/fruition, is brought off not more and not less than every other tone (sound, note) (/ equally like all other tones), so / such that none of them / the tones may / can lay claim to / claim / seek a privileged position; the repetition of a tone in the series, row, which provides, emits, generates, gives (off) the theme, is (avoided) (with the exception of immediately, directly subsequent, ensuing repetition and octavation / ottavation / except in the case where/when the tone (sound, note) is repeated directly, immediately or appears in any octave whatsoever of the tonal, sound(-related), sonic/sonorous spectrum) (avoided), so that / whereupon the repeating, repeated, repetitive tone (sound, note) cannot be comprehended as / considered to be the main, fundamental, basic tone (sound, note), and the use of all twelve tones (sounds, notes) inside of the series, row serves, exactly in relation to that, to postpone, defer, delay, shift, displace the repetition of every tone (sound, note) for as long as possible. The leveling, cooptation, phasing, synchronisation, coordination, enforced conformity, forcible coordination of the tones means, however, at the same time / in parallel, a recognition of their independence, autonomy, sovereignty, self-reliance, reliance on itself, self-efficiency, since now they can all exist absolutely next to one another and cannot be interpreted alternately, one after the other, in succession, turn and turn about; as one correctly observed, commented, remarked, we are actually dealing here not with (/ it is a matter here not of) atonality, but with (of) pantonality, i.e. with (of) the parallel and equivalent (/ of equal value (worth)) use of all tones. The analytical positioning becomes obvious, evident, conspicuous, glaring in the fact that the musical elements first of all / initially are separated from one another and then combined with one another, whereby / in relation to which the finding of the possible combinations becomes for the most part a question, problem, issue, matter of the/a calculus, calculation, reckoning in respect of possibility / of possibilities. Musical pieces consist of the strict repetitions and reversals of

themes, which are formed and developed in the basic series, row; the basic series and the reversal or else the crab(-like form) (cancer) and crab(-like) (form of the) (cancerous) reversal are, amongst themselves, equivalent / of the same value / with equal rights, precisely like the tones (sounds, notes). The fundamental intent(ion) / matter (of concern) / disposition, that all musical elements are spread (out) on one single surface and handled / treated / used equally / equivalently, is, however, seen / shown (/ however makes its presence felt) not only in the fact that the series, row and repetition push aside the development and processing (implementation, carrying out) of the theme, or in the fact that contrasting themes are put / placed next to one another / in parallel, but also in the free use of dissonance (partially under / with the full / complete abandonment, renunciation, setting aside of consonance), as well as in the dissolution of the old bond / binding between melody and sound and in the prevailing, predominance of sound-related, sonic, sonorous factors vis-à-vis melodic factors. Precisely the autonomisation (making autonomous) of individual musical elements and the levelling of hierarchies, in which these elements were anchored, grounded, embedded / had a base before / prior to their autonomisation (being made autonomous), unifies (the) space in such a manner that in it (i.e. the said space) there is no absolute down / below and up / above, right or left, forward and backward. There are only relations between sounds and tones, relations which have their place in (the) space and can be thought of and understood spatially. The (categories of space also determine the) overall / whole / total structure of the composition, in which the basic series, the reversal, the crab(-like) form (cancer) and crab(-like) (cancerous) reversal schematically unfold on a flat / level surface (are (also) thought of and understood spatially (too, as well)).

The art of the film (cinematic / film / motion picture art, cinematics, cinematography) could not look back to any tradition (/ did not have behind it

any tradition) and had to, hence, neither in contrast and opposition to one such tradition (the – at that time / in its day[349] – obvious and usual comparisons with / to the theatre aimed at / had as their target, as a rule, the working out of / to locate the radical new character of the art of the film / cinematography), nor make an effort / be diligent / endeavour / try hard / toil / strive to dissolve an already existing artistic synthesis in this area, sector, in order to seek / search for ultimate elements as the material starting position of a combinatory (methodical) procedure / work / task[350]. It (i.e. the art of the film / cinematography, cinematographic art) came into being / was born and flourished, thrived / developed in all self-understanding against the background of the collapse – already being carried out / executed / taking place – of the bourgeois synthesis, and indeed of those aspects of it (i.e. the bourgeois synthesis), which directly concerned the perception of the world[351]. This means: the world image of the art of the film (cinematographic art), as it was shaped on the basis of the technical possibilities of its means of expression / expressive means, rested and was based on a very different positioning / stance towards / vis-à-vis space, time and causality than that which characterised the bourgeois perception, sense of the world. Space and time do not constitute here coherent, cohesive, closed unities or uniform continua / continuums inside of which things are ordered, arranged, set out, put in order and are acted out, take place, as causality determines it; on the contrary, they are cut up into smaller or larger pieces, which, for their part, are strung together or put next to one another not, or not necessarily, in compliance with / with due regard for (the) strict principles of the causal / causality (/ causal principles). The dismemberment, segmentation, fragmentation, morcellation, carving up of space and of time into

[349] I.e. (from the 1900s to) when cinema was "really taking off" in the (mid-1910s,) 1920s and 1930s.
[350] As seen above in relation to music, architecture, sculpture, painting and literature, including poetry, (but not dance – leaving out dancing is not important, and P.K. was probably not much of a dancer anyway (HAHA!!!)).
[351] Today, it's more than likely pointless trying to explain to a full-spectrum ***ZIO-JOO***-lobotomised-ZOMBEE-STOOGE with all the ***ZIO***-crap-***JOO***-DAS- ANTI-CHRIST-Satanism it's subjected to day-in, day-out through the ***ZIO***-controlled (**KONTROL**) mass media of all kinds what P.K. is talking about here.

unities of different ranges, scopes, extents, magnitudes, sizes accompanies, therefore, the abolition or relativisation of causality, whereby / in relation to which, from now on / henceforth, continuity consists in such a succession, which more or less remains open(,) and correspondingly allows, gives birth to, generates an endless, infinite number of possibilities. That, which after the cessation, discontinuance, abolition of causality having an effect in space and time, gives, confers, bestows coherence and closure to / on mere succession, is the activity of an intelligence[352], which organises the available material in pieces of reality, or else in images, pictures according to the assumed mode of functioning or the (cap)abilities of the human spirit, and, in the course of this, appeals to the strength, force of association (/ the/an associative force), attention, phantasy or the memory of the viewer / the viewer's memory. As (the cinematographic) film / the motion picture jumps, leaps over, overrides the spatial and causal order of everyday, daily experience and can make out of (convert) the image, picture of reality (into) a work of the/a freely combining intelligence[353], it draws / comes nearer to, approaches, (in respect) of its structure, texture, like no other work of art / artwork, the dream. Certainly / Of course, modern lyric poetry works no less than the art of the film / cinematographic art with associative connections etc., however, in film, images, pictures are associated with one another directly and as such (and not for instance words which stand for / represent images, pictures); in modern painting, especially (in) surrealistic painting, dream(-like) images/pictures, again / also, very often appear / crop up; these, however, can show only immovable, as it were, frozen, petrified, congealed dreams, whereas in film, that, the constant motion / movement and that, the flowing transition from picture, image to picture, image can be reproduced, which make up, constitute

[352] Especially ***JOO***-DAS – ***AAAA-HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA !!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!***
[353] ***AAAA-HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA !!***

an essential feature of the dream. That is the reason why (the) film not only shows, has itself the structure of a dream / a dream(-like) structure, but also is the sole art in a position to / which can (re)construct dreams as dreams. The film and the dream are equally capable of / amenable to endless, infinite metamorphoses, variations and combinations, and although the film, for obvious reasons, only to a limited extent or only relatively seldom is shaped, structured, moulded as a pure dream(-like structure) (structure of the/a dream) or exclusively works with free associations, nevertheless, for it (i.e. the film) as a genre the possibility remains essential of presenting, depicting, portraying interrelations, connections, functions of things, spaces and times which do not appear, occur, come to the fore / are not found in everyday, daily experience.

One could summarise, sum up, synopsise the double essential feature / trait / characteristic of the art of the film / cinematographic art in the formulation that it makes out of reality something unreal (i.e. non-real) (/ it converts reality into something non-real / unreal), however, it simultaneously gives to / confers upon this unreal (i.e. non-real) [thing] substance, essence and reality. The projection of things on a flat, shallow screen (canvas) seems to preserve (keep, retain) for them (i.e. the things) the dimension of depth, and, nevertheless, they are, accordingly / through that, at least partially, undressed, disrobed of their materiality (/ they at least partially lose their materiality), they become more mobile and fluid, as if they were gliding, sliding, slipping on, across, over the surface of the screen / canvas. The images, pictures possess their own reality, they are beings amongst other beings or elements of a self-contained, self-reliant, independent, autonomous world. In their artistically demanding, ambitious and successful form (/ When they have artistic claims and are successful), they are supposed to convey what the mere, bare, naked eye and stale, trivial viewing, visual habit(s) do not apprehend. Because they do not primarily contain “reality”, but rather an ideational way of looking at /

consideration of the same (“reality”) – and exactly this ideational aspect grants, affords, accords, provides them (i.e. the said images, pictures) their powers, force of persuasion, persuasiveness. Through / With the images/pictures, things are, as it were, sieved / passed through a sieve, selectively handled/treated and at the same time are enclosed, locked up in certain limits, bound(arie)s, i.e. in a certain framework or context, even though in some cases a continuation of the image, picture beyond that shown on the screen, canvas is precisely suggested (/ the impression is suggested that the image continues beyond all that is shown on the screen). Reality is consequently not (partially) reproduced, rendered, conveyed by images, pictures, but is summarised, summed up, synopsised in its interesting or essential aspects and is presented, shown, visualised in this compression, compaction, condensation, consolidation, concentration of it, the chosen things are transformed from / out of elements of the world into elements of a(n) assertion, dictum, ruling, statement about / regarding the world. By means of its inclusion, involvement in the image, picture, an object is put in order, integrated, incorporated in a certain milieu, environment or spatio-temporal / space-time continuum, it, accordingly / through that, comes, steps into new relations with other objects and becomes a part of a just created new reality, or more precisely, the (piece of) evidence, (evidentiary) exhibit of a subjective consideration of / way of looking at the precisely interesting reality (/ reality (which is interesting on each and every respective occasion)). Already the image composition / composition of the image, picture expresses, therefore, either through / by means of the arrangement of the content (grouping or distribution of people or objects), or through / by way of other means (distribution of light and dark (shadow, shade), sharpness or unsharpness (fuzziness, haziness, blurredness, indistinctness) (full, intense, clear or dull outlines), rest (repose, tranquility, calm, quiet) or motion, movement), a certain way of looking at things. It is always a matter of a certain optics (look, visual effect)(,) (or) of a certain perspective – and the radically new, inexhaustible

potential of the art of the film / cinematographic art consists exactly in the fact that it can / is able to constantly and at will change optics and perspective, whereby / in relation to which the mobility of the viewing (visual) angle, angle of view, viewpoint increases without limit(s) / restriction(s), limitlessly, unboundedly the combinability of the objects with one another, regardless of whether the combinations are shown in actual fact or are left to the (cap)ability of association / associative (cap)ability, capacity and the phantasy of the spectator. The (great) variety, diversity of perspectives encompasses not only shifts, displacements, transfers, translocations of/in the centre of the image, picture according to the needs of the narrative, narration, story, and not only various, different views, opinions and aspects of the same object according to the meaning attached/ascribed/attributed on each and every respective occasion, but also the parallel unfolding as well as the – with that – intersection, taking place simultaneously, of many subjective ways of looking at things, which refer, relate to both objects as well as persons. The search for this (great) variety of perspectives as well as for the objects which can emerge, arise, turn / crop / pop up, surface in each and every respective perspective, generates, engenders, begets the multi-dimensional movement, motion, from which the film lives[354].

In a technical respect, the variety and simultaneity of perspectives arises, results from the movement, motion of the camera in/towards different directions

[354] With the centralising of economic, state and cultural power, especially from circa ***ZIO***-1900 and thereafter, increasing astronomically in conditions of massification-atomisation-increasing social mobility-the further refinement of the division of labour etc., the ***ZIO-JOO-GREAT SATAN***-ANTI-CHRIST SATANIC PROGRAMME of mixing up to everything with up to everything, in all the confusion and commotion, no group resistance, at least in the "West", with a distinctive ethnic basis, could be able to ever resist ***ZIO***-ANGLO-ET AL.-***JOO*** imperialistic hegemony and Satanism, and ***ZIO***-cinema *as a whole* played a huge role in all of this, leading the way to ***ZIO***-television (and later ***ZIO***-PCs etc. and the ***ZIO***-internet) in ***ORGIES UPON ORGIES*** OF FULL-SPECTRUM-***ZIO-***LOBOTOMISATION-***ZIO***-PSYCHO-OP-***ZIO-JOO***-DAS-ANTI-CHRIST-***GREAT SATAN*** ***ZIO-JOO***-PAVLOV'S DOG STIMULUS-REACTION-***ZIO-JOO***-BRAIN-WASHING-***ZIO-JOO***-ADVERTISING-***ZIO-JOO***-CREATION OF "NEEDS" AND ***ZIO-JOO***-ZOMBEE-STOOGE-CONTROL (**KONTROL**) under ***ZIO***-USA. Today all the Homo-Lezzo-Tranz-Freak Show-Sterile Contraceptive-Abort Fuck-Slut-PORN-DRUGS-PILLS-APE-MONKEY-ANOMIE consequences, leading within "the West" to **ETHNIC CLEANSING** and **GENOCIDE**, are apparent to everyone with half a brain and at least one eye. OVER. DEAD. ***ZIO.*** The extra-West or non-West, however, has crystallised in some of its key parts effective resistance and anti-bodies to the ***ZIO-JOO***-excrement, and ***that*** will determine the course of History.

with a different speed and at a different distance from the object. Strictly speaking, the history of the art of the film / cinematographic art as an art with a characteristic perception of the world and its own aesthetics began with the introduction and use of the mobile, mov(e)able camera[355]. The at first / initially used immovable camera could reproduce merely the happenings, events in a certain space and for a certain time without being able to change the perspective in(side of) which these happenings, events had to be seen / viewed. Movement, motion belonged, indeed, already since then, to the essence / essential texture of the film, movie, since, in any case, only in(side) the film could movement, motion as such and in its course, and not merely in its crystallisation during a certain moment, be shown, yet the statics / static nature / stationariness of the framework and of the perspective did not permit the borders, boundaries, limits of the simple realistic depiction to be forced open, overcome, blown up, burst. Also after the introduction of the mobile camera, the movement, motion of the object did not in the least cease / stop constituting an essential factor of the economy of the film; it continued to remain one of both great sources from which motion, movement flows, and only the successful intersection, crossing of the movement, motion of the object with the movement, motion of the

[355] This below from the ***ZIO-JOO***-DAS-INTERNET is of some help here :
"The thing to keep in mind is that camera movement throughout cinematic history did not develop in a straight line. It moved back and forth due to trends, technological advancements and such: you might see an era with lots of movement followed by an era with very little.
Probably the starkest example occurred at the end of the silent era. The 1920s saw a set of huge advancements in what Murnau called the "unchained camera", a term he coined in relation to his 1924 film THE LAST LAUGH: more and more silent films featured elaborate dolly moves (WINGS, THE GENERAL), crane moves (SUNRISE), and even handheld (NAPOLEON)!
Then, with the advent of sound, popular cinema briefly became significantly more locked down due to the limitations of sound recording technology: loud dollies and jibs were out, cameras got *huge* due to the sound blimps, and immobile microphones greatly hindered movement. By 1932 certain directors had drastically loosened up their style (check out Ernst Lubitsch's 1929 film THE LOVE PARADE and his 1932 film TROUBLE IN PARADISE for a great comparison in this); movement had become much more widespread, and this culminated in the early 1940s when long, roving master takes as popularised by films like CITIZEN KANE became the trend.
The early 1960s similarly saw a revolution in camera movement with the widespread availability of smaller cameras that could be operated with much smaller apparatuses. The 1970s saw the introduction of the Steadicam (BOUND FOR GLORY being the first), and 3-axis stabilised remote heads as popularised in the 2010s are probably the most recent major innovation in camera movement tools.
Patrick Keating's "THE DYNAMIC FRAME" is a great book on the subject."

camera could, as a rule, achieve the wished-for, desired effect. Nonetheless, the latter (movement of the camera), for various reasons, obtained a superior, higher, superordinate, greater meaning. First, the camera cannot only change location, site, position (/ be shifted / displaced / translocated), but also swing, swivel, rotate, pan in the horizontal or vertical sense (/ horizontally or vertically), and additionally vary the focal length (distance) in order to encompass, cover greater, larger or smaller spaces; the movement, motion of the object, on the other hand, has obvious physical boundaries, limits, and moreover, when it is directed up, down, right or left, it runs and bumps into the boundaries, limits of the screen, canvas – only the movement, motion towards or away from the camera is in principle unlimited, unrestricted and awakens the illusion of depth on a level, shallow surface. Secondly, the movement, motion of the camera remains independent of/from the movement, motion of the object, at least in the case in which the camera moves, whilst the object rests, reposes, stands idle. The composition of the image, picture is then determined alone by the movement, motion of the camera, which sets as its aim, objective to investigate (/ which takes on the task of investigating) the object, to bring to light its prima vista unobtrusive, inconspicuous, unseen, invisible, but essential features, traits, attributes, or else to look at it as a whole from a new point of view / viewpoint or in a new interrelation, context. Wide / Overall / Total shots and close-ups alternate, whereby / in relation to which those / the former (wide shots) show, bespeak the synthetic force of the camera, these / the latter (close-ups)(,) (show, bespeak) the analytical force of the camera by demonstrating, presenting the intensity, tension, stress, strain or the dynamics which can even be inherent / reside, live in what from a distance / far appears to be static or expressionless, inexpressive, blank, and by the analysis / breaking down of the object into individual parts / in-part sectors, they (i.e. the close-ups) reveal / bring to the outside a dimension of depth (depth dimension), which allows inferring, concluding microscopically (/ microscopic conclusions) at a/the

microscopic level. Thirdly, the movement of the camera can relativise the movement of the object through the fact that it proceeds in parallel with this (movement of the object), or else through its greater speed, it seemingly reverses the direction of the movement of the object. The same relativisation can be achieved through the influencing of the velocity (speed, pace, celerity) (of the course, sequence or order of events) of the film (strip) during the recording (fast motion, slow motion (/ a quick and slow recording / take with the corresponding / analogous acceleration / speeding-up or deceleration / slowing-down of time)). Important in / during all these cases is that the (great) variety, diversity of the perspectives coming about / emerging / resulting / arising from the (great) variety, diversity of movement, motion, puts/places/posits on a new basis the relation of / between the spectator with (towards) / and the (things) / what is depicted. The action / plot / drama ((and) comedy) in the theatre / Theatrical action (was) played/performed, was acted, took place in the same space and was looked at, viewed, considered by the spectator always from the same distance (remoteness) and from the same angle (of view) / viewpoint / point of view / viewing angle / vantage point; incidentally, the distance (remoteness) and the fixed, stable location, position were deemed necessary in order for the / what was depicted to be perceived as an in themselves / in itself resting, reposing, idle, dormant, self-contained, self-sufficient and awe-inspiring, respectable, commanding-respect/reverence totality. In (the cinematographic) film, things are entirely different / otherwise: the space of the action, the distance (remoteness), from which the action is followed (tracked, watched, spied on, traced), and the positioning of the spectator constantly change, even though his (i.e. the spectator's) position vis-à-vis the screen, canvas changes just as little as that (position) vis-à-vis the stage. The spectator can follow (track, watch, spy on, trace) the happenings, events from the outside, but also from the inside and from a changing, alternating, varying, switching perspective – and he has the additional possibility of

identifying himself with the gaze, vista, view of the camera and simultaneously of keeping, maintaining a critical distance from it (i.e. the gaze of the camera); accordingly, he becomes an observer of an object and at the same time an observer of a certain way of looking at this same object.

The (cinematographic) film lives, therefore, as we must repeat, from movement, motion, especially since many and characteristic kinds of movement, motion can be reproduced, rendered only through its (i.e. film's) specific means of expression / expressive means (and not, for instance, through the art of (the) dance, which likewise lives from/on movement, motion). Movement, motion, as the visible movement, motion of the object and as the invisible movement, motion of the camera, already comes decisively into play in (/ significantly influences) the composition of the image, picture, however, it has an even more decisive effect (/ a still (an even) greater influence) already in (on) the combination of the images, pictures with one another for / towards the fabrication, production, manufacture, restoration, co-constitution of filmic unity / the unity of the film. Because this combination determines the manner (as to) how the film conveys, provides, creates the overall, total impression of movement, motion, and furthermore, it (i.e. the said combination) is movement, motion itself, i.e. in it and through/with it, it becomes obvious, unmistakable to what extent the art of the film / cinematographic art depends on the alternating, alternate fragmentation, segmentation, dismemberment, disintegration, breaking up and unification of reality under (/ which takes place with) the constant or frequent transgression, exceedance, transcendence of spatio-temporal, space-time and causal limits on, barriers / bounds in respect of daily, everyday experience. The change, moving, displacement of the lines of vision, gaze, which permits an always new way of looking at individual, in-part things, is intensified, exacerbated, heightened, increased, enhanced here really, literally for the building, construction of a whole multi-dimensional and self-sufficient,

self-contained world with the help of already prepared, finished, completed building (structural) materials, components, component parts, i.e. of the images, pictures[356]. These images, pictures were / have (had) been, nevertheless, conceived and prepared, made, drawn up in view of their combination with other images, pictures; they are, therefore, both compositions with (a) self-contained, self-reliant, independent artistic claim(s) as well as links of/in a chain, which contain their full meaning, sense only inside of the/a Whole. One could also say that they represent and constitute individual phases of the one and only / One great movement, motion, which the (cinematographic) film makes up / constitutes. If movement, motion is the essence and inner / internal law of the film, thus it cannot conclusively stop at any individual object and at any image, picture, but it must continue up to / until the point at which the series, row of objects and of images, pictures reaches its natural end(ing), completion, conclusion. Movement, motion, however, comes to this end(ing), completion, conclusion not in a straight line / (recti)linearly, but via constant fragmentations and temporary, provisional, transitory, transient unifications, which relate to the ending, concluding, completing unification similarly to / like the various fragments as to / towards / in relation to the temporary, provisional, transitory, transient unifications themselves[357]. Shots (the smallest unities of film in the technical sense of the uninterrupted camera take / recording) and scenes or else sequences (of scenes) (the smallest unities of film in the dramaturgic sense of the/a coherent (interrelated, connected) series or sequence of shots) are totalities, entireties and at the same time fragments – something which / what entirely, completely, absolutely, perfectly, thoroughly corresponds

[356] So instead of the "Western" mind being filled with images of Christ, the Virgin, the Holy Spirit, Angels, Holy men and women, Martyrs of the Faith, et al. of the pre-electric era / pre(-post-)modern epoch, it is now filled with ***ZIO-JOO***-ANTI-CHRIST-***GREAT SATAN*** BRAIN-WASHING : WHORES, PORN, CRIME, DRUGS, FREAK SHOWS and later HOMOZ, LEZZOZ, TRANZ-FREAKS, APE-ANOMY, THE ***TOTAL FILTH*** OF THE ***ZIO-JOO***-SHIT-SKATA-EXCEMENT-FREAK SHOW-KOST etc. …

[357] The film, which always refers to reality (like all human endeavours), ends for itself as its own reality, but it never ends as reality, which – for as long as there are humans – continues as reality known to humans way beyond the film (and language and other symbolic means / symbols, signs etc.).

with/to the character of the combination of the image / picture, images or (/, that is, / to wit,) to editing (montage): editing (montage) is simultaneously separation and connection, something is separated, therefore, here with regard to a connection (/ separation here occurs, therefore, for the purpose of a connection), in respect of which, however, it is always known to rest and be (/ it is never forgotten that it rests and is) based on separations and fragmentations. This connection of the connection with the separation makes/renders more understandable the twofold, dual, binary character of the image, picture, as we described it above[358]. The composition of the image, picture remains a (separate) work, labour, task and a(n) (self-contained) artwork (for itself), however, only the editing (montage) provides, gives the conclusive, definitive interpretation of the individual / every image, picture, because only (its) (the) coupling or confrontation (contradistinction, juxtaposition, face-off, comparison) (of the image) with other images inside (the frame) of the scene or of the sequence, succession of scenes reveals, discloses, brings to light, shows which elements in/of the image are essential for the action and for the film as a whole. According to its position inside of the series, row of images, the individual / every image brings forth, begets, brings about different effects, impressions and has different consequences, reverberations, repercussions, impacts, implications, ramifications, which, again, means that the editing conveys (communicates, announces, declares, proclaims) something more than that which the individual (in-part) images, pictures contain. The mere lining up, stringing together of images and or / and occurrences, events, facts is hence widened for the construction of situations; the duration, length (of) (time) of the shots or of the sequences, their internal, inner rhythm and the transition from one to another are shaped, moulded, formed, in the course of this, by the editing (montage) and determine the character of these situations. Editing (montage)

[358] This sentence is only in the Greek text, and not in the German text.

does not therefore consist merely in the simple cut(ting), incision, section and splicing, collation, which is supposed to make the action understandable, nor does it serve also (as parallel editing or synchronous editing (montage)) merely, in relation to that, to present the simultaneity of two actions spatially separated from each other, or (as accelerated or accelerating editing / montage) in relation to that, to increase, raise, build up, heighten, escalate the tempo of the narrative, narration through the multiplication of shots becoming ever shorter / shorter and shorter. Over and above all that, it (i.e. editing) works associatively / it has an associative effect by letting or allowing something to be guessed, divined(,) which in the images themselves is not shown, or it directly shows associations, i.e. the transition of the thought of a person from one (re)presentation to another ((re)presentation) ((the) flash(-)back (or retrospective digression)); above all, it can, however, (as the editing, montage (in respect) of attraction / associative editing) graphically, picturesquely (re)present, illustrate, exemplify, demonstrate, depict, enact thoughts or logical interrelations, functions, connections, at times reinforcing, at other times elucidating or commenting upon the meaning of an image through the (its) comparison, juxtaposition and contrast with another image, different as to (its) content and independent of the (film's, movie's) action.

The technique of tracking (moving, mobile) and pan(ning) shots made possible the building, construction, constitution, composition of the film on the basis / foundation of whole sequences of shots, i.e. of long shots which can include, subsume, incorporate, absorb a whole sequence of scenes in itself: the camera could in fact now panoramically cover either the whole scenery or be adjusted to capture, cover, include, record the depth of the (field or) focus and cover, capture the ~~[[playing]]~~ field[359] from foreground to background / the front to the back. The fragmentary takes, recordings, the quick, fast, rapid and

[359] As what is being shot / filmed.

contrasting (alternations of the) images (screen changes) were thus eliminated / consequently became absent, the composition of the image gained (in) importance, significance, weight, gravity, gravitas, and correspondingly the significance, meaning of the editing, montage was reduced, demoted, downgraded. On the basis of these stylistic possibilities, one / some wanted to found / base an aesthetic theory about / regarding the essence of the art of the film (/ the texture of cinematographic art), whereby and in relation to which it was denied, disputed, contested, challenged, doubted that (the) film / movie has to cut, carve, break up, dismember, divide, fragment fundamentally, at bottom, essentially (the) reality (coming into question on each and every respective occasion) in order to build, construct, constitute, compose through the combination of the building, structural elements coming into being from that (cutting/carving/breaking up) a new fictive reality. It is true that in distinction to the classical use of editing, montage, which aimed at the rapid, quick, fast changing of perspective and the showing, demonstrating, presenting of always newer / newer and newer (aspects of (the)) objects, the tracking (moving, mobile) shot wants to merely, simply accompany (the) objects, that is, to respect their self-containment, autonomy, independence, self-reliance and let / allow them (to) speak their own language (speech). Nonetheless, this difference cannot put / set aside, cancel, nullify, eliminate either movement, motion as an essential feature of (the) film or make, render editing, montage superfluous. The tracking (mobile, moving) shot, recording can merely partially replace editing, montage, i.e. put, posit a long shot in (the) place of more, a number of, several separate images or through/with constant, continual adding/addition, avoid, evade dividing, division up to a certain point. Abrupt transitions, however, can hardly be circumvented, gotten around, obviated, even when the long or in fact the very long / longest shot or else the sequence, succession of scenes is declared the smallest film(-related), cinematographic unity, especially in cases in which the centre of gravity / focal point of attention has shifted / been moved,

displaced from the action to the actors, to their facial expressions and their gestures or their silence(s) and their inner/internal monologues. Already the (unavoidable) transition from one static image to another static image, that is, the simple stringing together, lining up of images, as well as the manner of their alternation ((ex)change), brings forth/about, produces, generates, begets movement, motion. The fundamental question is not therefore whether this or that / a or b director is concerned with / interested in the depth of the field or of the focus (/ more in widening the depth of the field of vision / the visual field) and to exhaust the possibilities of a shot until the end / last shot, in order to accordingly / through that, limit, restrict or play down, understate, put at a lower level movement, motion and editing (montage), but rather whether the art of the film / cinematographic art as such permits, allows and legitimises to do something totally, completely different than this, or in fact the opposite of that (this) / its opposite. It ought not, incidentally, be forgotten that the art of the film / cinematographic art precisely through / by means of the rapid, quick, fast and spectacular achievements of editing (montage) was constituted as a(n) self-contained, autonomous, independent, self-reliant art and that only on this basis was a critical discussion of the aesthetical position and value of editing, montage itself possible.

The aesthetical relegation, demotion, downgrading, lowering, debasement of editing, montage often accompanied the programmatic intention of imposing a realistic style on the art of the film / cinema / cinematic art, which supposedly, allegedly (, as is said,) corresponds with the essence of this art. Nonetheless, films, whose aesthetic conception by no means rests and is based on montage-effects (impressions caused by editing), can be of surrealistic inspiration and remind us of slow-moving dreams, whereas, contrariwise / the other way around, there are realistically adjusted / oriented films (/ films with realistic intent) which (make) use (of) editing, montage as the main aesthetical means of

expression. In any event/case, movement, motion in itself has nothing to do with such preferences, which, as (we have) said, in (the/a) film appears of necessity as the fragmentation (segmentation, dismemberment, disintegration, breaking up) and reconstruction of reality – and indeed that reality which inside of (the) bourgeois synthesis represented and constituted a well-ordered, that is spatially, temporally and causally clear (concise) and explainable, explicable, understood Whole. The manner / way (as to) how space and time in film is handled, treated, provides the best evidence of that/this (/ The manner of negotiation of space and time inside the cinematographic film proves this wonderfully, splendidly). We have already explained that the fragmentation (segmentation, dismemberment, disintegration, breaking up) of the prior / earlier / previous / anterior continuum of space and of time in film has or at least can have as a consequence the abolition, cancellation of causality, whereby and in relation to which a new perception of / feeling for the world comes into being. In actual fact, the fragmentation, segmentation of space does not mean merely, simply the division of the same space into pieces, which otherwise and in themselves remain the same as previously. Rather, the separation, segregation, seclusion, disconnection of the pieces, sectors of space from one another in relation to that is used to take a closer look at (to investigate more precisely) all their dimensions and content(s) whereby the space deepens and at the same time (it/the space) is shown in (/ shows) its inner / internal heterogeneity. The united film(-related) / cinematographic space does not constitute, again, in the least any mere sum of disparate pieces, sectors of space, but arises, results from a unification of individual elements of space / spatial elements, which in themselves stem, come from various, different (physical) spaces, however, in their totality, entirety and in their going into one another, merging, interpenetration, they bring about, create an independent, standalone, self-contained, self-reliant, autonomous poly-prismatic structure of space / spatial structure. That is why it happens that the feeling for or sense of space in

the film must/necessarily remain(s) more or less unclear or uncertain; every spatial arrangement appears to be / is perceived as temporary and can change at any moment. In a similar manner / Similarly, from the segmentation, fragmentation of the temporal continuum, not a simple, mere series, row of separated (detached) pieces (segments) of time, but a multi-dimensional and infinitely, unendingly plastic time emerges, comes about. Time in film is not filled (up) / does not fill, but is precisely made, created, and indeed through the constant going over, transition from natural to film(-related), cinematographic time, as well as the other way around / vice versa / conversely; the time of the film / film time shortens (reduces), speeds up (accelerates), slows down (decelerates) or switches (shuts) off, deactivates, eliminates, abolishes, disconnects natural time, whereby / in relation to which in it (i.e. film(-related), cinematographic time) the fragments or the manipulations of this latter natural time are fused in such a manner that from that a particular and specific, characteristic experience of time comes into being. The analysis or manipulation (deliberate modification) of time can already take place (be carried out) in the individual image when time through time lapse (fast motion) and slow motion (/ the speeding up (acceleration) or the slowing down (deceleration) of the recording, shot), is, as it were, materialised, i.e. turned into matter / material, and by means of the/its deviation from the isomorphism (symmetry, uniformity, regularity, evenness, (harmonious) proportion) of its natural course (of time), it is shown in its characteristic flow on each and every respective occasion. There is a regular course of time only inside of the individual, isolated scene, but also this individual, isolated scene can be modified by the interpolation, insertion, putting/fitting in of another scene or a whole sequence of scenes; furthermore / apart from that, it (i.e. the regular course of time) does not necessarily coincide with the (f)actual course of time of the action depicted in the scene, since the latter scene can be reconstructed as the summary, synopsis of its significant moments or high points, climaxes. Between various (different) scenes, which

are acted, performed, take place in various locations (/ taking place in different places), there is no necessary course of time / time (temporal) sequence (succession of/in time); the deformation, distortion of natural time occurs here already because of the unclarity (/ it is not clear) how much time passed, elapsed between two takes, shots or sequences of scenes. In any case, film(-related), cinematographic time encompasses only the duration, length of these takes, shots or sequences, and it can either be objective in the sense that it contains the events one after the other, successively, in succession, in turn, that is, in their (f)actual series, order, sequence regardless of the time intervals / intervals of time lying in between them, or else subjective, when it reproduces, renders the happenings, occurrences from the perspective of time of a subject without consideration for their (recti)linear sequence (succession) in natural time; the tempo, i.e. the shortness or length (/ the smaller or larger duration) of the scenes underlines exactly their subjective meaning or the subjective experience of time connected with their content. Anticipations and flashbacks (/ The anticipatory or retrospective digressions) make possible, enable the interpolation, insertion of (the) subjective time of the film / cinematographic time into (the) objective time of the film / cinematographic time and, by ipso facto mutilating, dissecting and reorganising (the) natural time, they constantly make out of the present, the past or the future (/ they continually convert the present into the past or into the future), that is, they relativise the present and they put it in order (/ integrate it) as a mere point in a comprehensive time-space, on whose surface all points of/in time lie / are found in interchangeable, exchangeable positions. Seen thus/in this way (/ From this point of view), here a similar spatialisation of time takes place like that which we (have) encountered in some modern novels. Time spreads out like space, since it does not move (recti)linearly forwards, but before the spectator’s eyes, events take place simultaneously, and consequently can exist next to one another / in parallel, which in themselves lay / were temporally far apart from one another (were far

apart in time) (/ from a temporal point of view were at a great distance from one another). When the simultaneity of various, different points in time / temporal points is accompanied by the being next to one another / co-existence of various, different spaces, and when, moreover, a connection of any points in time whatsoever with any points in space whatsoever is restored, made, produced, fabricated, manufactured, thus/then a spatio-temporal continuum comes into being / is created, in which being next to one another (co-existence) and following one another (succession, sequence) are mixed.

The particular sociological meaning of the art of the film / cinematographic art in(side) the spectrum of the literary-artistic modern(ism), modernity consisted in that it made familiar to / familiarised broad masses (with) the programmatic and well-aimed, targeted, deliberate segmentation, fragmentation and reconstruction of daily, everyday experience – and indeed, it taught them to find joy therein / enjoy (like) it[360]. The art of the film / Cinematographic art can be called / characterised the mass-democratic art par excellence in a double, dual, twin sense, because it is directed to a mass public and because it does this by representing and spreading, disseminating the mass-democratic perception of the world in which time is absorbed by space and everything can be in principle combined with everything. Certainly, the absolute dream of the combination of everything with everything, as it was e.g. painted / announced already in the early times / period of (the) literary-artistic modern(ism), modernity and then / a little thereafter in the so-called multi-line / multilinear (poly(-)linear) lyricism of the Futurists, could neither be articulated, formulated in a convincing manner in terms of theory, nor be realised to a socially relevant extent; colours, tones, smells and sounds remained, despite all the attempts at the creation of (the) integral, universal aesthetic(s) and (the) integral, universal perception, more or

[360] This, and what follows, is how FULL-SPECTRUM-***ZIO-JOO***-DAS-LOBOTOMISATION-***ZIO-JOO-***BALL-ANTI-CHRIST-***GREAT SATAN***-BRAIN-WASHING-***ZIO-JOO***-PAVLOV'S DOG-STIMULUS / REACTION-***ZIO-JOO***-ZOMBIE-***ZIO-JOO***-PSYCHO-FICATION is described scientifically.

less separated from one another (separate things), as they were (also) previously, beforehand (too, as well). However, the setting up and formulation of such a programme indicated in itself in which direction the zeitgeist (spirit of the times) was moving. In any case, the art of the film / cinematographic art sufficiently practiced, exercised the combination of everything with everything in order to help, aid, assist the (predominance of the) mass-democratic thought style (to a breakthrough (of imposition and predominance)). In the course of this, it created a genuinely mass-democratic public, i.e. one such public which left behind / detached itself from (the) bourgeois mode of conduct / behaviour, demarcations, delimitations, barriers and gradations, and formed in parvo a social melting pot (crucible). The cinema no longer had its own public like the bourgeois theatre or the bourgeois opera (had) (it); its public extends, reaches, ranges right through / across all classes and strata, and is not held together by any characteristic (peculiar and exclusive) ties, bonds, it (i.e. the cinema's public) does not partake of, take part/participate in (has no part in) either the same education or the same social way (mode) of life. Precisely this public, which in its amorphousness (amorphism) and anonymity does not know either the commonality (common ground) of (the) one (One) with the other (Other) or the distance of (the) one (One) from the other (Other), could / was in the position to eliminate, put aside the previous, earlier devout, reverent(ial), pious[361] distance between (the) spectator and (the) work of art / artwork. That anonymity and this elimination belong together (/ are organically connected (between themselves)); the making (rendering) fluid (flowing, liquid) of the spatio-temporal and aesthetic(al) contour(s) of that which is shown (presented) on the screen (canvas) corresponds to/with the blurring (obliteration, erasure, effacement, elimination, deletion) of the social contour (outline) of the public.

[361] In the "polytheism" of the bourgeois era, great figures of Art (you all know who they are) and their works were not only Classics, but like (demi-)gods.

Finally, the art of the film / cinematographic art made a central feature of post-bourgeois culture generally visible, namely the (pre)dominance (rule, holding sway) of the image, picture. It (i.e. the image) could become the art of the masses / mass art par excellence because the image appeals (speaks) to the masses much more directly than for instance the written word, (a)round which bourgeois culture – despite / notwithstanding (its) painting, architecture and music – primarily, chiefly, mainly revolved. The age/epoch which starts, begins with the invention of photography feels, senses a regular thirst for images and for sequences (successions, the following of one another) of images, so that a great part of bourgeois culture, which had found (its) expression in the written word, henceforth / (from) now (on) had to be translated into the language (speech) of the image in order to survive and over and above that / furthermore / in addition be able to reach, touch, attain a new public, which in the meantime / meanwhile had developed another perception of the world. Through / By means of / With their translation into a new language, which was based / had as a base another perception of the world, (the) bourgeois cultural goods (assets, wealth, riches, heritage) of course stopped / ceased being that which they were / it was previously, earlier, even though through that it seemed they / it secured / protected / made safe the extension of their life (their / its continued existence, perpetuation, continuation). The appearance (advent, emergence) and the spreading / dissemination of the art of the film / cinema was from the beginning, outset, and rightly (so)/justly/justifiably, perceived as the defeat of bourgeois culture. It is of little help / It helps us very little / minimally to convert this ascertainment into a complaint (lament(ation), denunciation, denouncement) and to interpret it under/in accordance with the spirit of a pessimistic philosophy of culture[362]. Much more important appears to be the insight / understanding /

[362] Scientific observation, which is strictly (i.e. non-normatively) descriptive and explanatory, does not engage in (a) normative cultural criticism / critique of culture. And Soviet and other "left-wing" interest in cinema, especially in regard to cinema's first decades, is very well known.

awareness of the fact that the visual character of post-bourgeois culture (functionally) interrelates / correlates with the precedence of space vis-à-vis time as the framework of orientation or fundamental mode of the perception of the world. The arts of the image, picture are simultaneously the arts of space; the visual arts are, accordingly, in an eminent sense / principally the modern arts – because in them the question (issue) of succession (the sequence) inside (of) a linearly conceived / understood time is not primarily, mainly, chiefly posed, but the question / issue of the being next to one another / co-existence in space is primarily posed. No means was in such a way more suitable in relation to that for the linear succession, sequence of time to be captured, recorded, illustrated, imprinted, held onto as the written word. That is why it (i.e. the written word or written discourse) necessarily lost / had to lose its former, earlier, previous position and value at the moment at which the perception of the world was oriented towards space and, correspondingly, conceded, gave, granted precedence and priority (primacy, antecedence) to the image, picture.[363]

2. Philosophy and sciences

"Bourgeois" philosophy appeared in a (chemically) pure form just as little as "socialist(ic)" or "conservative" philosophy. This means: the bourgeoisie / bourgeois class as a whole did not recognise itself in any individual philosophical theory; no individual philosophy ever formulated and codified all its (i.e. the bourgeoisie's) opinions (views) of the world and normative

[363] We've all noticed, inter alia, how in the "education system" in the "West", reading and writing (and arithmetic) have been downgraded and picture-related nonsense has come to the fore over recent decades.

aspirations in the form / shape of a closed, coherent, cohesive corpus. “The” bourgeoisie / bourgeois class was in fact itself a(n) most highly / exceptionally heterogeneous stratum whose limits, boundaries up(wardly) and down(wardly) always remain definable with difficulty, to say absolutely / completely nothing of / remain absolutely / completely / totally silent (keep absolutely / completely / totally quiet) about the national or even local peculiarities of its social character and its ideology. That is why it would be a limine inappropriate, incorrect to want to determine for sure / tangibly locate bourgeois philosophy in the work of one and only individual philosopher or of one and only individual philosophical school. Because apart from the fact that not all aspects of the bourgeois world view could or had to be articulated in the language of philosophy, the philosophers, who had more or less contributed to the formation and development of this world view, as a rule did not understand themselves as the ideological apologist(s) of a certain social class, but they argued in the name of universal truths and ideals[364], which, for their part, were formulated in such a manner as the concrete situation commanded (it) in the relatively self-contained, self-reliant, independent field, sector of the history of ideas and the likewise relatively autonomous technical requirements, demands of philosophical discourse on that side or on this side of (the) topical social references[365]. Notwithstanding this jointly having an effect, collaboration, cooperation of a number of / mostly heterogeneous factors in an almost inextricable (inescapable, inseparable, impossible-to-unravel) plexus (mesh, nexus, grid, network), we may legitimately talk of bourgeois philosophy precisely as we also cannot be without / deprived of the term “bourgeoisie / bourgeois class”, despite the inner / internal variety, in fact contradictoriness of its sociological content[366].

[364] And the influence of ***ZIO***-ANTI-CHRIST-DEVIL-EVIL-***ZIO-JOO***-DAS-MAMMON-***GREAT SATAN***-1789 as a social-political fact is apparent.
[365] Which sits perfectly well ***as a matter of practice*** with footnote 364 above.
[366] And that’s because ideal-typically, and in terms of identity, the (not fully ***ZIO***-ed and ***JOO***-ed) bourgeoisie is ***grosso modo*** distinguishable from the Christian feudal landowners et al., who at least in part pre-date them, and

This bourgeois philosophy was moulded, shaped and formed rudimentarily, to some extent, as a tendency and partially already in the age, epoch, times of humanism, above all, however, in the 17th and 18th century under the influence of (the) victorious mathematical natural science and of the knowledge, cognitive problems (questions of knowledge) which were raised in this context. It (i.e. bourgeois philosophy) found in many philosophical directions, schools of thought its expression, which combatted / fought against one another, since every one of them paraded / stressed / highlighted a partial aspect of the bourgeois world-theoretical complex, which in its exclusivity or one-sidedness necessarily came into conflict with the rest; conflict could, however, come into being from the fact that the aforementioned complex was handled, treated indeed (theoretically) as a Whole, nevertheless, it was seen in the light of – on each and every respective occasion – different cognitive interests (interests in respect of knowledge) and polemical considerations, concerns and was moulded, shaped, formed correspondingly, accordingly, analogously. Despite all conflicts, there were, nonetheless, certain leading, guiding ideas which constituted / made up the common foundation, basis in the common struggle against Church / ecclesiastical theology and traditional metaphysics. We are dealing here with the detachment from the question of Is / Being or of the Transcendental and the simultaneous turn towards nature, which was now ontologically revalued (as having a much greater value), and towards man, who stepped out of the shadow of God[367]. This double turn meant, thematically, two things: on the one hand, (the) systematic (pre)occupation with epistemological issues, matters, problem formulations, and not least of all, with the problem or question of method, and on the other hand / secondly, the putting first of the theory of knowledge and of ethics in an anthropological context, whereby / in

---

the mass-democratic ***JOOZ*** and their-***ZIO-JOO***-ZOMBEE-STOOGEZ, who at least in part come after them, notwithstanding all the up to very great temporal overlapping of at least two of these three types of people.

[367] This ***ZIO-JOO***-DAS-DEVIL-EVIL-***GREAT ANTI-CHRIST SATAN***-double turn marked the first major step on the path, as it is written, of the End of humans.

relation to which, of course, the connection of the theory of knowledge with epistemology was plausible, obvious or / and unavoidable[368]. In terms of content, these great themes, topics, subjects could be handled, treated, worked on in the empiricist or in the intellectualist sense so that a broad spectrum of extreme, moderate (middle-of-the-road, mainstream) or vacillating (wavering, fluctuating, swaying) and vague positions came about both on the one as well as the other side[369]. The unity of bourgeois philosophy did not lie / was not found, nevertheless, so much in the answers to the individual questions, but rather in the fixing, establishing, determining of the framework inside of which the philosopher had to seek/search for answers, as well as in the determination of the central magnitudes, which in/during the working out, processing of these answers, were allowed to come into play (/ be used). From this point of view, it was not primary / of primary importance (as to) how one e.g. class(ifi)ed, rated, graded or connected with each other the intellect and sense in terms of the theory of knowledge, or, Reason and drives, urges, impulses in terms of moral philosophy, in order to come to / arrive at the wished-for/desired or else polemically expedient (end/goal-oriented, purposeful) intellectualist(ic) or empiricist result, finding, outcome; decisive (deciding) remained/was the fact that every time one, either way / one way or another, a weighted/structured synthesis of *these* magnitudes on an immanent basis and against the background of an anthropological way of looking at things (/ and starting with an anthropological consideration) and an ultimately humanistic concern (care) was undertaken[370].

[368] Knowledge only as "method / science" could "set aside", in the new intellectual climate being formed for elite thinkers / "philosophers", God, without openly and blatantly "letting in" the anti-God, i.e. Satan and his ***JOOZ*** and ***ZIO-JOO***-ZOMBEE-STOOGEZ.

[369] One does notice the anthropological-social ontological IRON LAW (in relation to humans) of binaries : God / Anti-God, Man/Woman, Friend/Foe, Empiricism/Intellectualism, Left/Right etc., no matter what the ***JOOZ*** and their ***ZIO-JOO***-ZOMBEE-STOOGEZ do in trying to mix up and confuse everyone.

[370] Which means God is out (and the anti-God, Satan is in (i.e. ***JOOZ*** are in)), or if He is not out, only lip-service is given to Him.

The various currents of bourgeois philosophy, which predominated in the 19th century, go back and are reduced, conceptually and in terms of content, to Enlightenment ideas, and can be reconstructed with the help of Enlightenment material of thought (thought/intellectual material). Positivism, utilitarianism, criticism posed about, roughly, approximately the same questions, and exactly because of that, had to go into battle against one another with, on each and every respective occasion, a different intensity. Simultaneously, they shared certain fundamental assumptions, perceptions, in which the bourgeois wish was articulated of, indeed in a practical sense, eliminating, wiping / shutting out the Transcendental, but for/out of ethical considerations, not totally, completely annihilated[371], of replacing substances[372] indeed with functions[373], yet, on the other hand, let them (i.e. the substances) continue to eke out their existence (being there) (/ to vegetate, exist without joy/vitality) somewhere in the background, since the substantiality of normatively loaded/charged ontological magnitudes, (such) as/like Nature and Man (were (it/that)), could not be renounced, foregone, relinquished without alarming, disturbing, serious, questionable, dubious ideological consequences; a – one way or another – nuanced agnosticism was represented by all sides (/ all sides represented an agnosticism of this or that shade, shading, hue, tint), which philosophically made possible this typically bourgeois ambivalence. This same ambivalence, which in accordance with the bourgeois feeling (sentiment, perception) could be

[371] I.e. the ***JOOZ*** and their ***ZIO-JOO***-ZOMBEE-STOOGEZ couldn't before the 20th century, and on a mass-scale, before ***ZIO***-WW2, bring about the ethical CAVE of darkness (sterile whores, homoz, drugeez, pornographerz, monkey-ape anomy, tranz-freaks, ***ZIO***-KOST-TOTAL FILTH-SHIT-SKATA-***JOO***-ANTI-CHRIST-***GREAT SATAN***-worship etc.) of ***JOO***-DAS, leading to the End of all Humans, as it is written.

[372] I.e. all those transcendental phenomena (of the mind/spirit) which have as their peak God, in the history of ideas of the "West" starting primarily with Aristotle (see below and of course, P.K.'s two great histories of philosophy : 1981, ***Die Aufklärung im Rahmen des neuzeitlichen Rationalismus***. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta. 725 S. (als dtv-TB 1986; Neuauflage bei Felix Meiner 2002), AND, 1990, ***Die neuzeitliche Metaphysikkritik***. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta. 614 S.).

[373] Relations tangibly and or visually or otherwise extant in a material sense, which at some level, can be controlled and guided in this life/world by humans. Interestingly, when one analyses in detail the difference between "substances" and "functions", one finds that their observation involves both the use of the mind and the senses, and more important-fundamental to scientific observation are the social ontological and or anthropological magnitudes/constants of rationality, meaning, understanding, ideology, the social relation, the friend / foe spectrum, role-play, Man as Culture partially (never fully) coming out of Nature, etc..

abolished inside of a broadly laid out / set up / based world-theoretical synthesis, and could in fact have a positive effect, constituted in the eyes of the opponents of such philosophising / a philosophy a logically unbridgeable opposition, contrast, antithesis, which could be remedied, rectified, put right, solved only through/by the/a decision in favour of one or another of both of its limbs. Thus, the thought, idea of function was thought about (led, driven) consistently to its end (/ to its consistent end) and was summoned against the assumption (idea) of substance in all its forms, variants, variations and in all its areas of knowledge / cognitive sectors, whereby / in relation to which the dissolution of substance equally revolutionised (/ signified a revolution in) the world image and (the) image of Man, as well as (in) (the) (epistemo)logical problem formulation. Here we encounter a phenomenon, which in accordance with our ascertainments (kinds of knowledge) (see sec. 1a in this chapter) was likewise made noticeable, visible during the formation of (the) literary-artistic modern(ism), modernity: the bourgeois synthesis was, accordingly / through that, shattered, smashed, destroyed in that one of its component parts was detached, absolutised and was directed (/ and turned) against all others (other component parts)(,) as well as against (the) synthesis as a Whole[374]. Between the development/evolution in the field, sector of philosophy and that (development) in that / the field of literature and art there is, however, another conspicuous, striking, prominent, noticeable, impressive and characteristic parallelism too. The bourgeois synthesis was simultaneously attacked / hit by two completely, entirely opposed (contrasting, opposing, conflicting) sides: the one side stood / was found in the vicinity of / near to natural science, mathematics and logic, as these were remodelled, reshaped, remoulded, reorganised, rearranged, transformed around the turn of the century (i.e. circa

[374] So that the ***JOOZ*** and their ***ZIO-JOO***-ZOMBEE-STOOGEZ could up to totally rule up to everything, Man had to turn away from God and the Other, Next World and live only in This World according to the values of ***JOOZ***, the anti-Christ, ***JOO***-DAS, the ***ZIO-JOO***-CAVE OF DARKNESS, money, hedonism, consumption, decadence, degeneracy, SELF-ETHNIC CLEANSING, SELF-GENOCIDE (apart from ***JOOZ***) etc..

1900), and developed that conceptual set of instruments / those conceptual tools which seemed to be necessary, required, essential for the dealing with, solution or reformulation of philosophical questions, problems, matters, issues after the complete, full putting / setting aside of substance; the other side was fed, nourished, nurtured by the great philosophical or even non-philosophical myths, it disavowed or demoted, downgraded, belittled, debased (the) positive science(s) and it contrasted / set against / counterposed to (the) scientific (way / mode of) knowledge(,) higher intuitions or speculative ways of thought / thinking, which were supposed to discover truths in respect of the essence, substance of things. Both these directions, schools of thought, however, despite all their irreconcilable opposition/contrast towards/between each other, made / came to a conclusive, final, definitive end, conclusion, closure with (regard to) the anthropologically founded theory of knowledge and ethics as was common, familiar, prevalent, known in the framework, context of bourgeois philosophy since the 17th century, whereby / in relation to which, the former (direction of remodelled natural science, mathematics and logic without reference to substance) completely, totally put / set aside the subject pertaining to the theory of knowledge and the ethical subject, whereas the latter (direction of higher intuitions or speculative ways of thought) placed, posited man (humans) under the aegis of powers not apprehensible, comprehensible rationally, and hence could no longer handle, treat, negotiate the question, problem, issue of knowledge and of morality, morals, ethics from the perspective of bourgeois anthropocentrism.

The complete, total, full dissolution of substance constitutes the central event, fact in, during the (/ of that) turn pertaining to the history of ideas, out of which the former (direction of remodelled natural science, mathematics and logic without reference to substance) of both these directions arose, resulted – that event, fact, namely, in whose light the change of some, certain philosophical

disciplines and the advent, appearance of some other philosophical disciplines become(s) understood, understandable, irrespective of whether the philosophers concerned were aware, conscious of that (event, fact) or whether they started, commenced, began more or less without reflection from the dissolution of substance as a concluded fact and without saying, dedicating hardly, barely a word regarding, about, to the problem, question of substance. Little prevented, in terms of pure theory / from a purely theoretical point of view, the complete, total, full dissolution of substance once mathematical natural science worked on, processed the concept of function and through the functional perception of the law of nature shattered, smashed, destroyed, wrecked the Scholastic-Aristotelian hierarchy of substances, as well as the (secundae) substantiae themselves; in actual fact, in the age, epoch, times of the Enlightenment, consistent steps were taken, made in order to definitively, conclusively, finally, once and for all shelve / archive the concept of substance[375]. Decisive, Determinative in terms of the history of ideas and at the same time instructive are, however, two other facts: on the one hand, the refusal of most of the representatives of bourgeois philosophy to follow these steps and to (completely) put/set aside (without a trace) substance, although / even though they declared it (i.e. substance) to be unrecognisable and considerably, significantly limited, reduced, narrowed down its philosophical status; and on the other hand, the speed, rapidity, quickness and self-understanding / ease, with which, since both of the final decades of the 19th century and thereafter, the idea / thought / notion of substance was abandoned, given up, surrendered, sacrificed or else (completely) ousted, edged out, supplanted, displaced, superseded (all down the line) by consistent and comprehensive elaborations, formulations, workings-out of the idea, thought, notion of function. That/This was in itself an

[375] And once that is done at the "philosophical level", and once overall social changes were also put into effect on a mass scale on the basis of the ***ZIO-***Industrial Revolution and later ***ZIO-***mass democracy, it was OVER. DEAD. ***ZIO***..

eloquent sign/indication of the breadth and depth of the transition precisely carried out, executed, enforced, implemented, performed to a new world-theoretical positioning, which broke with fundamental assumptions, perceptions of the bourgeois positioning. Because the dissolution of substance meant, signified not simply the replacement of certain systems or syntheses by other substances, but the radical questioning, doubting of every philosophical systematic(s) / kind of system and every possibility of a synthesis[376]. First of all, this questioning, doubting, of course, turned primarily, chiefly, principally, mainly against idealistic monistic constructions; but on the basis / account of its inner, internal logic, it necessarily thereafter / from then on struck every philosophy which strove for a coherent general, overall image of reality and at the same time objective knowledge of/in this or that version[377]. Just as the dissolution of the object in the field, sector of painting accompanied an overturning / turning upside down / radical change / revolution of/in the whole, entire image of reality in this art, so too the destruction of substance or of the individual, isolated thing in the field, sector of philosophy accompanied the putting, setting aside of the traditional, conventional concept of reality. To the extent a functional system came out of substance (/ substance was converted into a functional system), the individual, isolated thing was also converted into a system of events, occurrences, and this again made plausible, clear, obvious / suggested the search for ultimate constituent parts/elements or atoms[378]. Only simple elements can in fact constantly change places and enter into purely functional relations with one another[379]; on the contrary, the necessary connections of elements cannot be comprehended as mere changing, changeable

[376] This is the fundamental approach of the ***JOO*** (and his ***ZIO-JOO***-ZOMBEE-STOOGE) : destroy everything we can destroy, and turn our Rule into a "Beyond Doubt" Synagogue of Satan.
[377] Of reality.
[378] At the end of the day, he who destroys "everything" wants to still Rule and preserve himself, so basically, he is destroying up to the point of rearranging the Correlation of Forces until he oversteps the mark and destroys everything, including himself. And that' s exactly what is happening today under ***ZIO***-USA-***JOO***-DAS.
[379] This eventually became the Norm for many in the ***ZIO***-controlled-(**KONTROL**)-"West" even with respect to personal and intimate relations ! especially from circa ***ZIO-***1960/1980 "I want to break free" and thereafter.

functions, they must appear as fixed substances. Whether now the ultimate elements are sensory perceptions / sensorial impressions, physical or logical atoms – the Whole and every idea of the Whole is smashed, shattered, destroyed, wrecked; the world becomes a loose, lax, slack sum of contingent and discontinuous events, occurrences or experiences, which are held together by constructions at the level of theory. The collapse, breakdown, crash of the hierarchy of substances and the destruction of substance itself made, for its part, frail, untenable, invalid, baseless the distinction between thing in itself and phenomenon, appearance, or, between Is, Being, To be and Appearance, which (distinction) indeed was of a metaphysical origin, yet continued to represent and constitute a usual and beloved, popular, much liked refuge of bourgeois agnosticism. Now there is no up and down, (no) in front and behind any longer; the simple ultimate elements of knowledge, of Is/Being/To be or of logic are found all on the same shallow level and await the great transformer and combiner. If substance is put/set aside, thus no fixed properties, characteristics, qualities or fixed magnitudes are available / exist which could by themselves put, place, set boundaries, limits on combinatory activity, since they are of their own constitution, composition and texture only suitable, beneficial for certain (combinations), [[and]] not capable for/of all combinations; what now is regarded as / considered to be a property, quality, characteristic is determined not by the inner/internal essence, texture of the thing, but by transient, temporary and constantly changing relations or / and functions.

The philosophical belief in the ontological fixedness of substance and in the hierarchy of substances corresponded to the social and political ideology of societas civilis, in which the reason for the social [dimension] (/ where the genetic reason for the social order of things) went back and was reduced to the God-given (order of things) or else nature-given order of things (the order of things given by nature); the philosophical belief that indeed (perhaps)

substances (can) exist / there can be substances, but these (substances) are unrecognisable, unknowable, undiagnosed goes with, accompanies the social and political ideology of the bourgeoisie, according to which social differences indeed in practice / at a practical level have an effect of substance (/ substantial repercussions) (operate in terms of substance), nonetheless, in terms of theory, they cannot be founded on any ontology or anthropology, and hence can – on each and every respective occasion – benefit, favour other individuals too; the (prospective, budding) democratic mass society (taking shape), in which social mobility and the interchangeability, exchangeability of social roles is in principle unlimited, unrestricted, was articulated philosophically in the belief that there are no substances, but only accidents (accidental occurrences (happenings, incidents, events)), which enter into temporary combinations, connections with one another (/ temporarily connected to one another)[380]. The direct correspondences between the dominant, ruling teaching in respect of substance and the ideological notions, perceptions regarding human things, affairs, are not only noticeable, however, in social theory (the theory of society). The dissolution of substance just as much influenced the field of anthropology, so that some philosophers in the course / context of their polemic(s) against the traditional concept of substance, outlined, sketched a concept of man (humans) which hardly, barely differed from that (concept of man/humans) of/in the modern novel[381]: man appeared as the/a mere bundle (package, bunch, sheaf, cluster, pack(et), wad, parcel, bale) of sensory perceptions (sensorial impressions, sensations, feelings), impressions or associations, without a fixed

[380] Notice how all three major social formations / ideal types pertaining to developments in "the West" (societas civilis, bourgeois oligarchic liberalism, mass democracy / democratic mass society) start with belief, and thus entail their own metaphysics, so that democracy as understood by Tocqueville is sociologically close to P.K.'s concept, in contrast to "di-mok-rasi" under ***ZIO-JOO***-ANTI-CHRIST-SATANOCRACY, where ***JOOZ grossly disproportionately and vastly asymmetrically*** control (**KONTROL**) the economy, the state and culture, and because of the Shallow Surface of universal suffrage, "the rule of law", "free speech" etc. seek to (hitherto successfully) disguise their ideological metaphysics with "free world democracy" etc. rhetoric, on the basis of the ***ZIO***-USA imperium, inter alia, overcoming in such a mass way the scarcity of goods during the 20th century until today.

[381] ***ZIO-JOO***-FREAK SHOW-Proust and "I SUCK ***JOO***-BLOOM KOK"-Joyce are two famous examples among many. Modern here is interchangeable with "post-modern".

substance-related core, nucleus and without a permanent, lasting, abiding, enduring, stable, solid identity guided by superior intellectual forces. From the moment the external, outer world was analysed, dismantled, decomposed, broken down, dissected into impressions or sensory perceptions, man was necessarily / had to be analysed, dismantled, decomposed, broken down, dissected in a similar sense, manner, fashion, way, until he was no longer recognised as / considered to be a substance-related unity. The dissolution of the human substance was, in other words, the necessary consequence of the dissolution of all substances – also of those which the bourgeois world view had created as the replacement for God and used as tiers of jurisdiction / kinds of authority in order to draw from them ethical-normative imperatives. Nature, History and Man had to, as such hypostases or substances, jointly collapse, perish, whereby / in relation to which, in particular, the destruction, collapse of Man had serious consequences for the physiognomy of post-bourgeois philosophising, philosophy. Now schools of thought could appear which dared / were allowed to distance from philosophy everything that was until then interrelated, connected with its bourgeois, that is, anthropocentric and humanistic orientation. In terms of content and technically (/ From the point of view of the content as well as the internal arrangement, assembly, structure of philosophy), this meant/signified that the theory of knowledge and ethics were partially directly expelled (cast out, banished, ostracised), partly radically remodelled. Bourgeois philosophical ethics put, placed at the centre of attention / epicentre the rational, reasonable individual, and even when it accepted that the psyche of this individual was, in the final analysis, driven, impelled, prodded, pushed, propelled, urged by feelings of pleasure (lust, desire, joy, delight) and pain, yet/again it acknowledged, recognised in him the (cap)ability of channelling these feelings in the/an ethical sense / accordance with ethical commands. This whole problem examination becomes irrelevant from the moment (in, at) which, on account / because of the consistent destruction of the

concept of substance, there can no longer be any talk of the individual and his inner / internal organisation. As a philosophical discipline, ethics no longer directly handles, treats moral behaviour, the moral virtues and duties, obligations, but the statements, dicta thereon / on them, their meaning, their structure and their motivation; it (i.e. ethics) is converted, therefore, into meta-ethical investigation. But the theory of knowledge presupposed a certain inner, internal organisation as well, and consequently the (cap)ability anchored, vested in substance of the cognitive, knowing subject of attaining, achieving, gaining, reaching knowledge through, by means of intellectual operations, regardless of whether he supposed, presumed the origin(s) of the same (intellectual operations) to be in the senses or not (/ considered or not that the acts of the intellect come/stem, descend from the senses); extreme sensualism[382], sensationalism, sensorialism never, in any case, dominated, ruled in the bourgeois theory of knowledge. A dissolved and substance-less I (Ego) (/ An I (Ego) which is dissolved and deprived of substance) could just as little be a subject pertaining to the theory of knowledge as it could be an ethical subject, it could only be(come) an object, not the sovereign organiser of knowledge[383]. That is why after the elimination of the organised and organising subject of knowledge (cognitive subject), logic, in (regard to) which the question, problem of the subject of knowledge (cognitive subject) was not made a theme, topic at all, took (stepped into) the place of the discipline of the theory of knowledge – predominant since the 17th century[384] in philosophy (/, which was predominant

[382] Obviously not pertaining as such to sex as in ***ZIO-JOO***-PORN, but to Humans as sense-based beings without a spiritual aspect. Both, however, are always (at least potentially and or previously) active in a living human – i.e. the senses, and, the mind, intellect, emotions etc. as "the spirit".

[383] Because ***JOO***-DAS wants his ***ZIO-JOO***-ZOMBEE-STOOGEZ as his objects under his ***ZIO-JOO***-GREAT SATAN-ANTI-CHRIST-DEVIL-EVIL-RULE, and not subjects capable of organising themselves into an ***anti-ZIO-JOO***-***anti-GREAT SATAN***-***anti-***ANTI-CHRIST-***anti-***DEVIL-***anti-***EVIL group.

[384] The two dominant 17th century figures in terms of the mainstream in the history of ideas and the theory of knowledge were the "intellectualist" René Descartes, né le 31 mars 1596 à La Haye-en-Tourainen 1 et mort le 11 février 1650 à Stockholm, and the "sensorialist/empiricist" John Locke (29 August 1632 – 28 October 1704). But there is much more to "the story", so study at least P.K. : 1981, ***Die Aufklärung im Rahmen des neuzeitlichen Rationalismus***. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta. 725 S. (als dtv-TB 1986; Neuauflage bei Felix Meiner 2002).

already from the 17th century in philosophy).

Modern logic outlined, sketched its own programme by delimiting, demarcating itself against the claim of the Aristotelian programme to convey, provide knowledge of substances. (Modern) Logic has nothing to do with such (Aristotelian) knowledge (of substances), and exactly because of that, its (i.e. modern logic's) propositions (theorems, sentences) are tautological or analytical; the (empirically given) Is / Being / To Be is apprehended only by synthetic judgements a posteriori, (there cannot be) synthetic judgements a priori (cannot exist), that is why mathematics must also be founded on an analytical, i.e. logical basis[385]. If it is now not a question of a knowledge of substance (/ If now the knowledge of substance is not posed as a problem), thus, logic must be exclusively concerned with the description of functions and relations, and in the course of this, put / set aside as far as possible the traditionally understood distinction between subject and predicate in(side) the judgement, inside of which both these terms had a different logical status[386]. Logic oriented to the subject is replaced by another logic, in which the predicate stands in the foreground, because the predicate shows the function, i.e. the totality, entirety of relations in which the subject can be found; the subject sinks, goes under, perishes, therefore, in actual fact, in the totality, entirety of its relations or predicates. It may indeed, of course seem, appear as if the subject here would accept in itself all its predicates, however, that wants to merely mean (/ simply means) that it (i.e. the subject) represents and constitutes nothing

[385] Be that as it may, from the point of view of scientific observation, the absence of inherent nature-given meaning and values has as its consequence that all normative positions begin with a decision "irrationally", and then can (but not necessarily) proceed rationally (and or polemically) in terms of logical (in)consistency. And given that humans ***must*** act (at some point at least) normatively, there ***must*** be belief (to e.g. choose one path of action rather than another).

[386] So, it does not surprise us at all that some 50-100(+) years later, the ***JOOZ*** and their ***ZIO-JOO***-ZOMBEE-STOOGEZ are promoting on a mass scale "I can be anything I want to be from one moment to the next (not just the opposite sex, but any inanimate object or non-human animal or plant too !!! etc.) ***according to my feelings***!!! as long as I don't identify the ***JOOZ*** as my Foe and want to kill ***all of the JOOZ*** as the Representatives of the Anti-Christ DEVIL-EVIL-MAMMON-***GREAT SATAN*** from the Synagogue of Satan, possessing ***GROSSLY DISPROPORTIONATELY AND VASTLY ASYMMETRICALLY*** (including through hyper-conspiratorial / hyper organised-MAFIA-criminal methods) various forms of economic-state-cultural power".

other and nothing more than the sum of its possible predicates. That is why concepts or else subjects should be formed first in the judgement and through, by means of the judgement; modern logic starts – in contrast, opposition to Aristotelian logic – from the/a judgement and not from concepts, which are defined with the help (/ on the basis) of the procedure of abstraction (/ abstract(ive), abstracting process). The leveling of substance-related differences by / thanks to the absorption of the subject in(to)/by its relations and functions or of the substance in(to)/by its accidents (accidental occurrences (happenings, incidents, events)), inwardly, internally homogenises (the) judgement and spreads its constituent elements on a united logical space. And since the destruction of the subject had to go with, accompany (necessarily went with / accompanied) the collapse of the hierarchy of substances, thus all logical propositions, theorems, sentences, clauses now find themselves on the same level, they are, therefore, (in respect) of their truth value[387] in principle of equal value, equivalent and do not stand in any relation of dependence towards/with one another (/ no relation of dependence exists between them)(,) which would go back and be reduced to differences of ontological status. To the atomised world (/ the world segmented, fragmented into atoms, individuals), atomic, individual propositions correspond, which are connected in accordance with form-related rules amongst / in relation to one another in order to constitute, form molecular propositions, whereby / in relation to which the criteria, with whose help / on whose basis the truth of these propositions is judged, are of / have a logical and formal (form-related), not (an) ontological character. The, as it now seems, pernicious, disastrous, ruinous, catastrophic, fateful, calamitous, baneful, noxious interweaving of traditional logic and traditional ontology is ascribed, attributed to the misleading effect(s), impact(s), influence of language, whose grammar and syntax, as it is said, suggest inadmissible, improper,

[387] The attribute assigned to a proposition in respect of its truth or falsehood, which in classical logic has only two possible values (true or false).

illegitimate, excessive, undue, unauthorised hypostatisations and substantialisations and/as well as a corresponding understanding of the world and of Is / Being / To Be[388]. The systematic dealing with language, which constitutes a characteristic of philosophy since the turn of the century (i.e. circa 1900), stems, therefore, in the final analysis, from (/ constitutes a consequence of) the endeavour, striving to found a new logic which was supposed to take into account the fact of the dissolution of substance. From the attempts of this logic to elude, evade, avoid / escape from the illusions, deceptions and traps of language, its character as symbolic logic (again) resulted, arose.

Detachment / Breaking away from ontological problem examination, which followed the destruction of substance, was (has) not only (been) trend-setting (did not point the way ahead only) for (/ did not leave its mark only on the future course of) logic. Logic as talk about propositions largely / to a great extent / extensively replaced (the) talk about things, but also where furthermore / on top of that the talk was supposed to be about things themselves, this happened, took place in the awareness, consciousness / with the innermost, secret conviction that things could not be / are not apprehended in (regard to) / as to their essence, but only (still) in accordance with conventional criteria. The formation of modern logic and the rise of conventionalism are parallel and kindred, related phenomena, although it must be noted, observed that modern logic had to break from the beginning with the idea, notion, thought of substance, whereas conventionalism came into being in the context of bourgeois agnosticism and allied itself only gradually with logically-analytically oriented philosophical currents. Here too there is (/ And here we have) a case in which a(n) (constituent) element of the bourgeois synthesis became autonomous /

[388] All this ***ZIO-JOO*** and ***ZIO-JOO***-ZOMBEE-STOOGE **TOTAL *ZIO-JOO*-BALL BULLSHIT** of torking total shit about something TOTALLY IRRELEVANT had as its "great philosopher", inter alia, the ***ZIO-JOO-*** INCESTUAL-CRIMINAL-RAT TUNNEL FREAK ***ZIO-JOO***-DAS ***ZIO-JOO***-TTGEN-***ZIO-JOO***-BALL-STEIN (26 April 1889 – 29 April 1951), ***GREAT FUCKING ZIO-JOO-BALL SATAN***.

made itself/became independent and finally turned against synthesis as a Whole. The assumption, perception of the unknowability, unrecognisability of the substance or of the thing in itself had to / necessarily encourage(d), embolden(ed) conventionalist(ic) approaches, tendencies, because the admitted, conceded, confessed, professed in(cap)ability of the (person) knowing to advance, venture, push forward to (the) ontological ground, terrain (depth of things) was reinterpreted (there) that knowledge of the object comes / amounts (is) factually, in practical terms, (equal) to its moulding, shaping, formation or even / and/or its creation by the (person) knowing (subject) and his, its way, mode, manner of knowledge (cognitive way); when the metaphysical question, problem in accordance with/of the objective composition, constitution, texture of Is/Being/To Be is excluded, put/left aside, ignored a limine with regard to the limits, boundaries of our capacity for knowledge (cognitive powers), thus knowledge can, is able to always only be convention or fiction[389]. In its connection with modern (mathematical) logic, conventionalism reaches its anti-metaphysical high point by, namely everything which lies beyond the limits, boundaries of conventional knowledge, being declared as meaningless, that is, in practical terms, non-existent; reality coincides with the conventionally knowable and sayable[390]. The pragmatist(ic) positions, which indeed originally appeared as the further development / meta-evolution of bourgeois empiricist and positivist(ic) commonplaces in their sharp, acute delimitation, demarcation against/from monistic idealisms, but soon, in relation to that, reached, got to accepting, adopting an extreme ontological pluralism, and, correspondingly, rejecting, declining, turning down every synthetic interpretation of the world, flowed into, resulted in, for the most part, the same context of thought/thought

[389] But knowledge about FACTS regarding ***JOOZ*** is not allowed !!!

[390] But even an illiterate peasant knows he cannot control everything, i.e. there are forces (call them God, Fate, Facts, Mother Nature, the Heterogony of Ends etc.) more powerful than him and his village/group. And no human, who must at some point act normatively based on necessarily made-up, constructed values, thinks in a fashion which is not metaphysical/ideological.

context (/ ended up in the same gross findings). To the extent pragmatists continued to defend bourgeois social and ethical values, they did this for reasons which were just as conventionalistically conceived as the pragmatist ideal of knowledge itself (/ which had as their source, like the pragmatic cognitive ideal itself, a conventionalistic positioning). The decoupling of truth and utility from each other in the area, sector of values corresponded to the opposition, contrast between knowledge of essence and convention in the area, sector of knowledge, and it brought pragmatism into the vicinity of / near, close to relativistic sociology, which, for its part, as we shall immediately see, undermined, subverted, undercut, sapped, corroded, decomposed the bourgeois understanding of man, humans and history.

The analytical direction (tendency, school of thought) in philosophy knew itself to be (/ believed it was) in agreement with the exact (positive) sciences, and understood itself as scientific philosophy in the sense of the ideal of knowledge (cognitive ideal) of these latter exact, positive sciences. The revolution, which took place around the turn of the century (i.e. circa 1900) in the area of (the) natural science(s), meant, signified for it, partly a confirmation, partly a new source of inspiration – its beginnings lay in fact temporally before the aforementioned revolution and were interwoven in many ways, many times with it. The second great anti-bourgeois direction (tendency, school of thought) in(side) philosophy appeared and understood itself essentially, very differently. Here the great philosophical myths of Is, Being, To Be, of Transcendence / the Transcendent, of the (material or spiritual-intellectual) Primordial (Primeval, Primitive, Primary) Source etc. were further spun, i.e. developed, and indeed often in the framework of attempts at the revival, resurrection, resuscitation, regeneration of metaphysics. Nonetheless, this metaphysics did not pay homage to, embrace, indulge in, follow either the old metaphysics of substance or (also) bourgeois dualism, which behind a deterministically functioning or else

hypostatised and sublimated, idealised nature (/ a hypostatised and sublimated, idealised nature functioning in terms of law bindedness (determinism, law(rule)-based necessity)) allowed a quite, rather, pretty, fairly harmless God to eke out his (His) existence (being there) (/ to vegetate, exist without joy/vitality/power). It was, on the contrary, monistically oriented, (and) although it openly, expressly confessed to (its faith in), professed spiritualism or (to, in) materialism only in the/a fewest (of) cases, it (yet) ignored, jumped/leaped over, shrugged off, overrode, defied the traditional separations between spirit and matter, Is (Being, To Be) and Appearance, Transcendence and Immanence, Substance and Accidents (Accidental Occurrences (Happenings, Incidents, Events)) – separations(,) which bourgeois philosophising / philosophy took seriously and exactly because of that wanted to handle, confront, manipulate, manage them thus / in such a manner that both their members, limbs (components, elements, parts) could peacefully co-exist as much as possible inside (in the framework) of a synthesis. This ideal of the multi-dimensional synthesis of heterogenous magnitudes was now driven out, displaced, ousted by the idea of an ontologically united Whole, theism and deism were put in the shade / overshadowed / eclipsed / outshined / exceeded by (newly issued, published) (new publications, editions, versions of) monistic and emanatistic constructions or theories regarding the derivation (emanation) of everything (the universe) from the One (source) (God), but since it / all of that, in any case, did not appear to be attractive (/ able to move (the) many (people)), thus / so the polemics of the new metaphysicians was directed / turned mainly, principally against science or more precisely against that which was considered to be the narrow-mindedness, short-sightedness of the scientific way of thought/thinking. One counterposed to scientific rationality and the profane promises of science and technique (technology), higher intuitions and a perception about, regarding the essence and destination of man (humans), which starts from (/ was based on) the acceptance, assumption of his / their taking root in the/a(n) Is (Being, To Be)

beyond all cognitive or practical aims, kinds of aiming/targeting, purposes, objectives. In this sense / To that extent, man is no longer looked at as an animal rationale, however his (man's) irrationality, on the other hand, is not interpreted as the disturbing, worrying, unsettling, alarming, disconcerting symptom of the unalterable, immutable, unchangeable prevalence, dominance, rule of the impulsive(/compulsive/libidinous/instinctive)-animal (animal drives, urges, impulses) in him, but on the contrary is connected with his (cap)ability, capacity to rise to things and truths which go (are found) over/above the mental, intellectual, cognitive capacity, scope of science. In mythological philosophising / philosophy, man does not vanish, disappear or fade, wane, go pale, as this widely, to a great extent occurs in the analytical direction of philosophy, but the image of man changes drastically in comparison to the bourgeois image of man. The centres of gravity (focal points) are correspondingly shifted, displaced, transposed in the philosophical disciplines, since the theory of knowledge and ethics, which presupposed a certain image of man, and starting from it (i.e. the said image of man), handled, treated in this or that form (/ in any case) the relations between intellect and senses or Reason and drives, urges, impulses, can no longer stand at the centre of attention (/ are no longer found at the epicentre). Above all, ethics ceases to be / stops being, directly or indirectly, a teaching of/about virtue(s), and talk about, regarding the practical behaviour of man concerns his dilemmas, dilemmata in the existential situations into which he is fatefully (disastrously, unfortunately) thrown. The personal decision[391] becomes more important exactly because the stable bourgeois points of orientation are lacking, missing, and cannot easily be replaced by the assumed, supposed ontological reference to an – in terms of content – vague

[391] This (with a tendency towards hedonism of the Flesh) is exactly what ***JOO***-DAS wants in massified-atomised social conditions of a refined division of labour and heightened social mobility : the inability to be able to organise an effective anti-***ZIO-JOO***-collectivity, group, whilst the ***ZIO-JOO***-SATANIST-ANTI-CHRIST-***JOOZ*** control (**KONTROL**), along with all their ***ZIO-JOO***-ZOMBEE-STOOGEZ, up to everything in "Western" society (economy, state, culture).

Transcendence / Transcendent or a nebulous Is (Being, To Be). That is why some prefer to take this decision without any such reference, as (an) atheist(s) or even as (a) nihilist(s) posed (placed, situated) to themselves alone, i.e. standing on their own (/ relying, dependent on themselves). In this case, activist models are projected, which we have already encountered in the modern novel[392].

In the area of the humanities (sciences of the spirit(-intellect) or of the sciences of man), the decisive turn occurred, passed, existed in the displacement, driving out, ousting of history by sociology or of the historical way of looking at things by the sociological way of looking at things already during the final decades of the 19th century. And in this case, it was a matter of the separation, segregation, coming (falling) apart of originally, initially entangled, interwoven magnitudes and the subsequent, following, ensuing questioning, calling into question of one by (from the point of view of) the other. The bourgeoisie (bourgeois class) represented society, which indeed demarcated, delimited itself as far as possible from, against the state, but in alliance with this same (new-times, modern) state, it had carried off / won a victory over societas civilis. History and sociology constituted exactly the sciences of that society whose leader the bourgeoisie (bourgeois class) felt itself to be / it was. It (i.e. the bourgeoisie) summoned / mobilised / called upon history in its pre-revolutionary ideological struggles, on the one hand in order to defend, champion the worldly, mundane, on-this-side, of-this-world activity and mission, destination of man (humans) against his one-sided, unilateral claim, demands on / resort, recourse, subjection, submission, subservience to Transcendence, the Transcendent, and on the other hand, in order to found the idea of progress, which was supposed to show to everyone / bring before the eyes of the whole world the unavoidability, inevitability of its (i.e. the

[392] In other words, be a ***ZIO-JOO***-ZOMBEE-STOOGE “left/right” etc. puppet.

bourgeoisie's) own victory[393]. However, already during the (age, epoch of the) Enlightenment, certain historiographical works contained, included a(n) strong, intense sociological impact, hue, tinge, tint, tone, or works came into being, arose in which sociological reconstructions of the historical material (also in the form of periodisations) were undertaken, written[394]. The polemical aim, objective of this orientation to the sociological / sociological orientation was (the) proof / proving that man (i.e. humans) takes root all-round, on all sides, generally, universally in geographical, economic and other(wise) material factors, that is why only against the background of such factors, and not for instance on the basis of spiritualistic-theological presuppositions, can his essence, texture and action be best made understandable, understood. The double and almost simultaneous discovery of history and sociology satisfied in this way, manner several ideological needs interrelated with one another; nevertheless, in it (i.e. the said discovery) lay the germ, seed of a logical contradiction (dichotomy, discord, discrepancy, split, dispute). Because the sociological way of looking at things stressed, as was natural / naturally, supra / hyper-personal and impersonal driving (motive, motor, actuating, locomotive, motile) or moulding, shaping, formative forces in(side) the Is (Being, To Be) and Becoming of human societies; (whereas contrariwise,) (the) dealing with / preoccupation with history, which in its separation from sociology was above all political history, suggested(, on the other hand,) the idea, thought, notion of converting, transforming bourgeois individualism from a normative demand into a principle of interpretation and of comprehending the historical course, sequence of events as the result of the kinds of acting, actions, acts of more or less great individuals; if / whenever, on the contrary, this course / sequence of events was not looked at / considered as the succession of individual, isolated

[393] And Progress as Banner of the bourgeoisie, in the (second half of the) 19th century increasingly became the Banner of "the (radical-democratic, socialist, communist etc.) Left".
[394] Two of the most famous examples are: Montesquieu (18 January 1689 – 10 February 1755) and Adam Ferguson (1 July / 20 June 1723 – 22 February 1816).

events, which can/could also turn out differently (/ could have also had a different outcome), but as a cohesive, coherent, closed development, evolution, to which a great aim, objective counteracted (/ which moves/moved towards a great aim, objective), thus, so, the (great) individuals were seen as conscious, aware or unconscious, unaware bearers of, in history, driving (compelling, motive, propulsive, tractive) forces (secretly) having an effect (in secret) (/ the hidden driving, propulsive forces of history). The internal/inner tension, stress, strain, intensity between the sociological and historical way of looking at things was, despite its early coming into being, clearly perceived only when sociology began to overshadow (political) history and contest, challenge, dispute, fight back against bourgeois individualism, not merely at the level of the interpretation of history, but also through / because of the fact that it often allied (itself) with the socialist(ic) movement as its(, as it were,) (quasi-)official science[395].

As the increasing epistemological imposition, predominance of a sociology largely, to a great extent detached from political history made bourgeois perceptions about, regarding the role of the individual in history (to) fade, at the same time it set in motion a regular revision of the bourgeois image, picture of man (humans). The bourgeois subject wanted to neither deny, renounce, gainsay nor uproot, eradicate, wipe out its irrational proclivities, inclinations, propensities, tendencies, nonetheless, it believed by itself / in respect of itself it could convert, transform blind selfishness, egoism, self-seeking behaviour,

[395] Vulgar sociology, from circa ***ZIO***-1900 until "post-modern theory" took over up to completely in the mid-***ZIO***-1970s (up to the 1990s at the latest) with all its ***ZIO-JOO***-DAS-TOTAL BULLSHIT reducing and "deconstructing" "everything" (apart from ***grossly disproportionate and vastly asymmetrical ZIO-JOO***-ANTI-CHRIST-***GREAT SATAN***-DEVIL-EVIL-economic and state and cultural power !!!) (down) to "language" !!! and other such ***ZIO-JOO***-ZOMBIE-STOOGE-MEAT-HEAD-LOONY TUNES-nonsense), tended to reduce everything to matter in its polemics against the spirit and religion, when everything human always at least potentially touches upon mind and matter, body and soul, the tangible and the intangible (intellect, emotions, sentiments) etc.. Likewise, "class war" (feminism, colourism, religious-ism, sexuality-ism etc.) was/is only ever one form of many forms of group/collective interaction, and every situation always needs to be examined for its specific, concrete characteristics and not starting from ***The Marx Brothers and The Three Stooges told us so***.

egomania, self-obsession through / by means of / with Reason into enlightened self-love, self-importance, narcissism and finally bring into harmony (line) / harmonise its ethical behaviour with universal and eternal values; moreover, it thought / opined that, despite all the limits on / boundaries as regards its capacity for / (cap)ability at knowledge (cognitive powers), and notwithstanding the unknowability of the thing in itself[396], it could construct a clear world image which possesses / with objective and permanent validity[397]. Sociology brought down / crushed precisely this belief, that the animal rationale could overcome (surmount, get over) at the ethical level(,) the relativity of values, and at the cognitive level(,) the barriers, limits of subjective perspectives, if one judges, assesses, evaluates its effect, impact overall, on the whole, in toto, in total, as a whole[398]. In general, it (i.e. sociology) established, solidified, consolidated the impression that world images are not products of Reason and reflected (mentally processed) experience, but ideologem(e)s which project claims of dominance (dominant authority) and social interests in the constitution, composition, texture of the Is (Being / To Be), that is they are determined in principle by an (individual or collective) subjective perspective. However, not only world images, but values were also classified as (considered to be) ideologem(e)s, which were seen, viewed / interpreted as functions of soci(et)al needs or of power claims, not, for instance, as attempts to (gradually) approach, draw near to(, stepwise, step by step,) absolute ideals; values are tied / bound to feelings and wishes or to institutions and mechanisms of dominance / dominant authority, they provide, care for / take care of / aid the smooth, frictionless,

[396] This, of course, is not a "problem", given that human rationality is per definitionem a collective endeavour which relates everything humans know to other things humans know through the means of language in respect of individuals being of their very nature social/political beings.

[397] That's because what was said in footnote 396 can only happen on a normative basis as regards social action with a goal beyond mere description and explanation (i.e. science), which means the inestimably greatest part of action.

[398] Of course, sociology as science brings down and crushes, in theory, all normative world views, including the post-bourgeois, mass-democratic "post-modern" ones, which "de-construct" "everything" except for ***GROSSLY DISPROPORTIONATE AND VASTLY ASYMMETRICAL ZIO-JOO***-POWER.

trouble-free course of soci(et)al life and (for/of) the coherence of the social system[399]. Between philosophical conventionalism or pragmatism[400] and sociological relativism[401], there is an obvious commonality (in respect) of approach, direction, which, despite all the variety, diversity of nuance(s), shades and of the subjective intentions of the thinkers concerned, had an effect, impact in a similar sense (/ was translated into a commonality of influence): morals, ethics, morality and truth do not exist in themselves and in pure form, there are only conventions, which come into being, are created out of / from a synergy, collusion, collaboration, cooperation, coaction of social and anthropological factors and can vary infinitely. It must, of course, be recollected in relation to that (/ We must, of course, remind ourselves)(,) that this relativism was already summoned, mobilised during the Enlightenment against theological unhistorical / ahistorical universalism(s); however, the bourgeois mainstream of the Enlightenment had simultaneously distanced itself from its/the extreme nihilistic versions (of relativism) and watered (toned) it/them down / moderated (mitigated, abated, tempered) it/them with (the help of) its own normative universalism(s). Modern sociological relativism, for its part, questioned / called into questioned / doubted all universalisms without exception and to that extent (/ as far as that is concerned, in relation to this) it did something which we also encountered in other realms, areas of intellectual(-spiritual) production, it, namely, directed/turned one aspect of the original bourgeois synthesis against the other (such) aspect (of the original bourgeois synthesis)(,) and consequently

[399] A hypothetical macro-historical observer would find it of great interest to see how long a society run by ***JOOZ*** and their ***ZIO-JOO***-ZOMBEE-STOOGEZ in which, inter alia, mass homosexuality, drug use, promiscuity, pornography and monkey-ape-***ZIO***-KOST-worship can co-exist with the remnants of family-based patriarchy on the basis of the overcoming of the scarcity of goods as the fundamental point of societal consensus, as occurred in the ***ZIO***-USA-controlled (**KONTROL**) "West" post-***ZIO***-WW2. If we take 1980 as the starting point, as of 2024, it 's been "going on" for less than half a century. And if circa 2000/2010 is viewed as the starting point with all the homo-marriage legalisation, not that long at all.

[400] Well-known "pragmatists" are Charles Sanders Peirce (1839–1914), William James (1842–1910) and John Dewey (1859–1952).

[401] Obviously, Max Weber (21 April 1864 – 14 June 1920) and Karl Mannheim (27 March 1893 – 9 January 1947) are the first points of reference which come to mind, as well as "doods" like Vilfredo Pareto (15 July 1848 – 19 August 1923).

(it) destroyed the synthesis as (in regard to) a (its) whole, whereby / in relation to which it simultaneously hinted at (/ allowed it to be understood) that its anthropological premises did not hold water, were wrong/not right (/ were mistaken, erroneous): if world images and values are ideologem(e)s with a socially determined function, then obviously the relationship of Reason and drive(s), urge(s), impulse(s) in(side) man (humans) must be judged, assessed, evaluated differently, otherwise than from the perspective of the perception of the animal rationale; Reason is accordingly no sovereign lawmaker, legislator, no normative authority (tier of jurisdiction) with a general claim in respect of / to validity (/ universal power claims), but an instrument in the service of individual or collective self-preservation – in the service of power in the widest sense[402] of the word. Its (i.e. Reason's) argumentative instruments and its ethical or even theoretical conclusions depend on the bearer, the place and time from / out of which an unending, infinite (great) variety of interpretations of the world and values, which cannot be reconciled with one another (/ forever irreconcilable between themselves), comes into being. The arbitrariness / arbitrary character of the Ought makes, for its part, the chasm (trench, ditch, moat) between Is and Ought deeper and deeper, i.e. nature and man divest (rid, undress) themselves of / lose their inborn, innate, inherent normative dimensions, they become normatively mute, silent, dumb, and norms (normative principles), despite all practical indispensability/necessity, arise from / out of an ontological vacuum as products of subjective decisions. Precisely the conviction of the relativity of values drives, impels sociology, in relation to that, to claim and to practise, apply value freedom[403] for itself.

[402] I.e. all forms of ideational, ideological and physical power. At the beginning, dawn of – and or just before – "modernity", Machiavelli (3 May 1469 – 21 June 1527), as "the man of Livy and Rome", and Hobbes (5 April 1588 – 4 December 1679), as the translator of Thucydides into the barbarian idiom, are the greatest representatives of this factual observation.

[403] I.e. free in respect of normative values (for smart arses who say "but claiming value freedom is in itself a value", when in fact it's a position of description and explanation (to the extent possible) without a normative stance as a call to specific action other than description and explanation (to the extent possible)).

The displacement, ousting, driving (crowding) out of history by sociology meant that on/in a neuralgic (i.e. highly sensitive and very important) field, sector of the humanities (the sciences of man), the things, affairs of the human universe from now on / henceforth became / were perceived mainly, principally, chiefly from the perspective of space and not of time. If we think about / reflect upon the stylistic and structural analogies between the beginnings of the bourgeois novel and the beginnings of (the) bourgeois historiography (spelling of history) in the 18th century, then the ascertainment will never surprise (us) / seem strange (to us) that sociology replaced history in the same sense and with the same consequences with reference to the perception of the world as the modern novel replaced the Bildungsroman[404]; in both cases the being next to one another / co-existence in space prevailed, predominated over / vis-à-vis the one after the other / (being in) succession in time. The in time flowing stream of events / flow of facts, as history was accustomed to describing / usually described it, makes way for fixed types or stable structures in which the isolated events have either a new, i.e. typical position (value, significance) or have absolutely no position (value, significance) at all. Inside the types which sociology has to draw (set, make) up, establish, put forward (in respect) of its constitution as a science, events or / and phenomena from completely different times are condensed and formalised / given form, i.e. whatever events and phenomena are (what is) scattered in time is now gathered in one single (a one and only) space. Time is therefore lifted (i.e. abolished) because of the fact that things temporally (spaced) apart (/ which are temporally at a distance as between themselves / from one another) are comparatively or contrastingly placed next to one another, and are investigated and are put in order, not on the basis of their temporal aspect, but from the point of view of structural features / criteria which are diachronic and, in this respect / to this extent / therefore,

[404] See footnote 299 above.

supra/hyper-temporal or even a kind, species of timeless constants[405]. Of course, genetic-temporal and form-related/formal-structural analysis can complement, supplement, complete each other in various ways, alternate or keep a balance, but when we keep an eye on / in mind, survey the overall, total, whole development, evolution of sociology, then it must turn/stand out / be noticed / is evident that its historical content increasingly became diluted. The first great sociological syntheses[406] saw the light of day / appeared in an epoch in which history and historical evolutionism had not yet exceeded, transcended, overstepped their high point (/ got to know the highest, supreme point of their peak), and they tried, attempted exactly through / by means of periodisations of historical evolution (development) to draw up, sketch, plan, devise, contrive, design types which followed one another in time. Historically saturated sociology, which somehow stood (found itself) (in the middle) between evolutionism and typology, went under, sunk, declined, perished, vanished, foundered, came to an end, was destroyed to the extent that the belief, faith in progress of the bourgeoisie and the with it/that (belief, faith) connected normative positionings dwindled/faded/wasted/pined (away), were shaken in order to be replaced either by still historically oriented socio-cultural typologies in (regard to) which the types were equated with (closed) historical circles, or else, and above all, by strongly formalised, typified concept(ual plan)s, conceptions, in which the categories worked upon / processed / used raised, made, projected (the) claim(s) of universal, that is, diachronic or supra/hyper-

[405] This "diachronic constant thing" of classical modern sociology circa 1900 (e.g. ***ZIO-JOO***-INCESTUAL-KRIMINAL-CONSPIRATORIAL-***ZIO-JOO***-MAFIA-RAT-TUNNEL-FREAK SHOW-***JOO*** Georg Simmel (1 March 1858 – 26 September 1918) and Leopold von Wiese (2 December 1876 – 11 January 1969)) is part of the basis for a (potentially) complete and universally applicable social ontology as expounded by P.K. in his *The Political and Man* and associated posthumously published notes. Not paradoxically, however, when one thinks about it and in accordance with P.K. himself, historical observation is always closer to social ontology than (relatively) synchronic observation, because, obviously, the diachronic constants are not ascertainable without taking into consideration all known historical evidence.

[406] Auguste Comte (19 January 1798 – 5 September 1857), Karl Marx (5 May 1818 – 14 March 1883) and Herbert Spencer (27 April 1820 – 8 December 1903), and extending in the "classical" (but overall, especially in regard to the first two of the following three, up to far less "historical") sense to : Ferdinand Tönnies (26 July 1855 – 9 April 1936), Émile Durkheim (15 April 1858 – 15 November 1917) and Max Weber (21 April 1864 – 14 June 1920).

historical applicability[407]. This tendency was coupled, accompanied, for obvious reasons, by the attempt to analyse, dismember, dissect, parse the social (element) in(to) ultimate elements, whose different combination or different complexity, from place to place and from time to time, (was supposed to have) yielded, created, resulted in, produced, made(, as it is said,) the variety, diversity of historically witnessed, attested (to), vouched for, documented societal/social formations (formations of society).

(The) Modern linguistics (philology, science of language) exercised in this sense / towards this direction a great methodical / methodological influence on the development, evolution of sociology and ethnology since/because it was the first science of man (humans) (branch of the humanities) which openly and programmatically disputed, doubted the primacy of history and the historical way of looking at things. It was formed precisely in the age, epoch, time(s) in which the general transition from the synthetic-harmonising to the analytical-combinatory thought figure was (being) carried out / executed in many fields, sectors at the same time, and obtained an extraordinary epistemological significance, meaning, exactly because it conducted, pursued, carried on, operated with noteworthy, striking, remarkable clarity and consistency the putting (setting) aside of the historical-temporal factor, the spatialisation of perception, the atomisation (segmentation) of totalities, entireties (into atoms) and the game of (the) combination(s) (the combinatory game). Already in the fundamental distinction between diachrony and synchrony (expresses) the decision (resolution) (was made (announced)) of breaking conclusively with historically, psychologically or anthropologically oriented / aligned / adjusted ways of thought and of work. These were thrown overboard / rejected with / through / by means of the declared absolute primacy of the synchronic way of looking at things, which was supposed to mean / meant / said that the essence,

[407] Such sociologists have been referred to in footnotes 405 and 406, above.

nature, texture of language could be apprehended without any consideration for (recourse to) historical factors (in the wide/broad sense of the word), whereas conversely, from the diachronic standpoint, not this essence, nature, texture, but only a series, row of often/many times imponderable and incoherent, disjointed events are / can be detected, determined, ascertained, established, which have an effect upon language in a modificatory, modifying way. To the extent attention is paid to diachrony at all (/ diachrony becomes an object of investigation, research), this does not mean any maintenance, retention (conservation, preservation) or even resuscitation, revival of (the) historical method(ology), but ends up in / comes, boils down to an investigation of the diachronic (element) with the help / on the basis of the same system(atology) / systematics which is applied to the study of the synchronic. The diachronic / Diachronic analysis consists, therefore, accordingly, in the comparison of two or more synchronicities (with one another) and not in a genetic discussion pertaining to the evolution of history / history of evolution (/ in a genetic and evolutionary investigation) (in respect) of the transition from one (synchronicity) to another (synchronicity). Because it becomes accepted that a system is inherent in every evolutionary process, which (system) can be found when the process concerned is dismantled, broken down, analysed, taken apart, decomposed, dissected in its ultimate components / constituent elements and whose possible combinations are (subsequently) reconstructed and inventoried (recorded); the individual, in-part modifications of the system do not result in / produce / yield any partial deformations of the same system, which always would lie outside of the system as such, but (in) an – on each and every respective occasion – new system, out of which another system emerges etc. / and so on. A historical way of looking at things / consideration, which misrecognises, misjudges, misconceives the system latent / hiding in the evolutionary process and registers only events in the/its [[historical]] flow, sees, regards things, in accordance with this perception, as something individual and singular, unique; that is why it cannot

bring about, achieve, create a rationally and methodically exact science[408].

Precedence, priority is, therefore, given to synchrony because only in it (i.e. synchrony) does the system dominate, rule, exist; because only it (i.e. synchrony) can be systematically apprehended and presented, depicted, portrayed, described. By casting out / expelling / eliminating the temporal-historical factor, modern linguistics considers / looks at language as / to be a self-sufficient and – on the basis of its own specific, distinctive laws – structured Whole; only through that / in this way is it constituted as a strict discipline / science. The concentration of scientific attention on the development, evolution of language in historical time (supposedly) hinders, obstructs precisely in regard to that(, as it is said,) the unity, cohesion, coherence of the system from being clearly known / recognised, which rests and is based on the synchronic interrelation, correlation (mutual and reciprocal relation, interplay) of its constituent parts in their momentary state (/ as they are at any given moment), i.e. irrespective of their history. The complexity of this interrelation, correlation (mutual and reciprocal relation, interplay) as well as the narrow, tight, close (inter)dependence of the constituent parts of the system as between one another makes the simultaneous investigation of the relations inside of the system and the relations in(side) time impossible. The analysis of the system is just as little influenced by the historical origin(s) and constitution, composition, texture of its constituent parts as for instance the rules of chess (are influenced) by the material, stuff out of / from which the chess pieces are made. Not the talk (speech, discourse) in its multiformity, diversity and heterogeneity, i.e. in its concrete historical taking root (/ to wit, in its concrete, specific historical roots), in its individuality and contingency, is of interest here, but (the) language beyond all these aspects and settings of the question / problem formulations – (the) language as supra/hyper-individual and

[408] In accordance with linguistics as the "science" of language.

impersonal structure, which bears, carries the laws of its own moulding, shaping, formation. The sharp conceptual contradistinction of talk (speech, discourse) and language completes (restores, complements) that between/of diachrony and synchrony and seals the (saying) farewell / severance from history in the form pertaining to the theory of knowledge of a rejection of experience and of a corresponding plea(ding), advocacy, defence in favour of (the right to) a pure theory. Just as modern painting sought pure colours and pure forms in an ideational realm beyond the experienceable world (/ the world of experience), so too did modern linguistics start from the notion, conception, perception that there is a deeper level of language, at which the colourful (multi-coloured, dapple, motley, piebald) (great) variety, diversity of experience fades (goes pale, wanes) and the plain (simple, austere, unpretentious) pure elements or structures appear. That is why the formulation (setting up, establishment) of a general theory of speech does not constitute, or does not constitute mainly, chiefly, principally, a task, work which is to be dealt (coped) with / handled / managed / realised with empirical means, but it is a matter here basically of a task, job, work of estimation (reckoning, balancing, calculation), of a calculus (calculation), which can overcome the limits, boundaries and gaps (spaces, holes, blanks) of experience and can offer an exhaustive description of language in its pure form free from contradictions; in extreme cases, (the) complete independence from experience and the deductive method (methodical process) is (are) indeed, in fact, even postulated (/ become axiomatically accepted). Apart from the – on each and every respective occasion – use / usage and the – on each and every respective occasion – epistemological evaluation (assessment, judgement, appraisal) of experience, the meaning of the general propensity (tendency, inclination, proclivity) of (the) linguists to ahistorical theoretical constructions (therein) was that through that / in this way a set of combinations on a surface cleaned (purified, cleansed, expurgated, refined) of all historical unevenness, irregularities, anomalies, abnormalities could be set in motion /

train. The freeing / Being freed from the bond(s), tie(s), commitment to empirical and historical given facts enormously increases the possibilities of the combination of elements, whose simplicity, independence and mobility, movability, manoeuvrability, –thanks to the aforementioned freeing / being freed–, could likewise be discovered or asserted / pronounced / invented, fabricated, devised, contrived, concocted[409].

The concept of the structure, which not least of all through/by means of modern linguistics, became the characteristic keyword (catchword, headword, term, cue) of post-bourgeois culture, presupposes in actual fact the notion, conception, perception of the existence of ultimate constituent parts or elements, from/out of whose assembly structure results, arises[410]. Structure is the manner of this assembly, which, nonetheless, can change, since the elements are in principle of the same value/worth, equivalent, i.e. they are not bound, tied to any unchangeable hierarchical order. Therein consists the decisive difference of the modern concept of structure from the traditional concept of the Whole, whose parts have inner (internal) relations towards one another which go back and are reduced to substance-related properties, qualities, characteristics, on the basis of which the individual part must occupy a fixed place inside of the Whole. The relations of the elements towards/with one another inside of the structure are, for their part, of a constitutive, fundamental meaning, significance for the structure; that is why they may, should not be confused with the inner relations of the parts of the Whole, since they are not carried, borne, held,

[409] Which ideologically suits the ***JOOZ*** and their ***ZIO-JOO***-ANTI-CHRIST-ZOMBEE STOOGEZ in their ***ZIO-*** programme of mixing up to everything and everyone with up to everything and everyone in massified-atomised circumstances of increased social mobility and a refined division of labour under ***ZIO-JOO***-DAS-ANTI-CHRIST-***GREAT SATAN*** CONTROL (**KONTROL**) towards ***ZIO-JOO***-WORLD DOMINATION UNDER THE ***ZIO-JOO***-SYNAGOGUE OF SATAN (***ZIO***-USA), which will certainly fail, and very likely bring about the end of everyone, as it is written, before 2100.

[410] Anyone who went to a "Western" university and studied Humanities in the 1960s / 1970s to 1990s and beyond will recollect all the "structure this" and "structure that", which, inter alia, related to "de-construction", which ***OH WHAT A ZIO-JOO-DAS-ANTI-CHRIST-GREAT SATAN-ZIO-JOO-BALL-MIRACLE*** !!! related to "everything" and "everyone", except to ***JOOZ*** !!!

sustained and determined, fixed by any substances (essences), but are in principle open[411]. The logic of the structure remains, indeed, binding for the individual elements, but it does not have, -in view of the independence and equal value/worth, equivalence of these latter (individual elements)-, the same position and value as/like the Whole with reference to its parts. The structure constitutes only the sum of its elements when these come to certain relations towards/with one another, and exactly because of that, its description should, ought to begin with the finding of its ultimate constituent parts, whose (mutual, reciprocal) relations (towards/with one another) must then, subsequently be reconstructed retrospectively or in advance, anticipation / anticipatorily. The method(olog)ical ideal of modern linguistics was / had (has) been to analytically push forward/ahead, advance, venture until (reach) a smallest possible number of elementary unit(ie)s, which are decisively, determinatively present at all gradations, levels, tiers, stages, steps, phases, degrees of the reconstruction of the language and, as it were, make up, constitute the axes of the becoming-always-more-complex (/ all the more complex) constructs of language. The ontological ambition is, in the course of this, to avoid every emanatism (emanationism, / theory of emanation, running off) and every archetypal mode of thought / way of thinking[412], i.e. to let language emerge, come (/ for language to be produced) not from, out of a primary, primeval source to be defined in more detail (/ some abstract primordial source), but from, out of functions, i.e. from, out of the/a combination of simple elements, behind which nothing more stands, is (found). Hence the striving, effort, endeavour, aspiration (in respect) of finding the truly, really ultimate, therefore, truly, really irreducible elements

[411] Which relates, of course, to all the ***ZIO-JOO***-BULLSHIT about "open societies", when all societies are at least potentially open and closed in accordance with the perspective of analysis and the object(s) under examination, i.e. the specific, concrete relativity as to both perspective and thing(s), phenomena, people, individuals, groups, social facts etc. being observed.

[412] Apart from the "fact" that ***JOOZ*** are "chosen, special, exceptional, master race, rule da world" humans, when in actual fact they are sick-fucking-crazy-psycho-path-rat-rodent-snake-serpent-lizzard-vomit-inducing-incestual-criminal-conspiratorial-RAT TUNNEL-freak show-excrement-dung-heap-SYNAGOGUE OF SATAN-ANTI-CHRIST-***GREAT SATAN***-freaks.

and of putting, placing, positing them (i.e. the said irreducible elements) at the beginning, start, whereby the beginning, start is thought (conceived) of, understood logically, no longer historically. The definition of the ultimate, original, primordial unity of language as a sign was by some linguists found to be unsatisfactory, insufficient, exactly because they / one thought, believed, opined that the distinction between signans and signatum (i.e. the signifier, signifying and the signified) accompanying / going with the concept of the sign would take away, withdraw, extract, revoke, deprive from the sign the wished-for, desired simplicity and irreducibility, and furthermore, smuggle back in rejected, expelled, left out historical factors in (the) linguistic analysis(,) since the signatum represents and constitutes a historical and cultural magnitude. If signs are determined by the relations of language towards/with extra-linguistic factors and not exclusively by the inner/internal functions of (the) language, if they (i.e. signs) are split, cloved, divided, broken up inwardly, internally, inside of themselves, and between their form and their content(,) an unbridgeable gulf, gap, chasm yawns, opens up, then language cannot, -(should it be) considered / looked at as a structure-, represent and constitute a system of signs; its (i.e. language's) system must(, therefore,) rather arise, emerge result from / out of the combination of those ultimate, primordial, original unities, from / out of which the signs themselves are composed, made (put together, assembled) and to which one can, by the way, apart from that, ascribe the name of the sign, if one wants to unconditionally, necessarily keep, retain, use it (i.e. the term "signs"). Under the compulsion, pressure of the analytical-combinatory thought style, one managed, therefore, in relation to that, to expel semantics from linguistics, or else to largely, to a great extent equate it (linguistics) with phonetics. Accordingly, one could radically put/set aside historical factors by trying, attempting to determine the inner, internal linguistic properties, qualities, characteristics of the speech (consonant) sounds or their character as

signantia[413]. The variety of the empirically registerable, given speech (consonant) sounds was, for its part, reduced to fundamental, basic phonemes, which are supposed to / (, as it is said,) take root in an invariable and universal psychological system and as such, first of all, constitute abstract or form-related, formal unities, whose actualisation then takes place, ensues, results in concrete empirical phenomena of speech (speech/linguistic phenomena). This way of looking at / consideration of speech as a system of primordial, primeval phonetic elements or phonemes corresponded to/with the rediscovery of the word, even, indeed of the meaningless word / the word deprived of meaning, as the autonomous sound (unit) and phonetic (consonant, noise, lute, sound) unit through / by means of / in the context, framework of modern, and indeed, particularly avantgarde lyric poetry; that which (whatever) in this (lyric poetry) appeared as bruitisme[414], amounts in linguistics to the absolutisation of the phonetic element. The question as to whether through that a meaningful, significant, fundamental, substantive win, gain was achieved for the understanding of speech, language, can here remain undecided[415]; the ascertainment of the urge, drive, impulse of the new thought style to rapidly, quickly and absolutely take control (possession), as far as possible, of all fields, sectors of intellectual(-spiritual) production is important, crucial[416].

Whether now the primordial, primeval, primary linguistic unities are comprehended as signs or as phonemes, they, in any case, constitute concepts of the function (functional concepts), i.e. they exist only inside of a system and are determined on the basis of their positive or negative relations to the rest of

[413] Nominative/accusative/vocative neuter plural of signāns / signifier (signifying).
[414] See footnote 291, above.
[415] Obviously, all this ***ZIO-JOO***-mumbo-jumbo BULLSHIT (ignoring the social relation as a whole) is of no gain whatsoever, but P.K. is here being polite and or funny.
[416] So, ***JOO***-DAS and his ***ZIO-JOO***-ZOMBEE STOOGES want the historical peoples of the world without ROOTS, without RELIGION, without DESCENT, without ANCESTORS, without HISTORY, without MYTHOLOGY, without IDENTITY, but atomised-massified ***ZIO-JOO***-ZOMBEE-STOOGEZ under the ***ZIO-JOO***-ANTI-CHRIST-***GREAT SATAN***-SYNAGOGUE OF SATAN, ***GREAT FUCKING ZIO-JOO-BALL SATAN***.

constituent parts of this same system. The state (of affairs) / situation rests and is based entirely on relations, the linguistic relation puts the linguistic fact completely in the shade (/ overshadows the language fact absolutely). In the more self-conscious, self-aware and consistent tendencies of modern linguistics it is stressed that in a language/speech totality, in a scientific regard / from a scientific point of view, no substances whatsoever would exist (/ a or b substances do not exist), but only internal, inner and external, outer relations exist. The wish (desire) for the dissolution of substance[417] can dominate, command the spirit/intellect and the method(ic procedure) of linguists so much that on occasions they do not want to found their science either on semantics or on phonetics, but want to convert it (i.e. their science) into an algebra, which would operate on the basis of (/ have done its deeds, acts by starting from) arbitrarily, randomly defined magnitudes without consideration for natural designations (terms, titles, appellations). These algebraic magnitudes, for which different numerical designations can be used in arithmetic (/ which in arithmetic can be replaced by various numbers), constitute, are the elements which make up / constitute the system of language by occupying therein / inside of it (i.e. the said system) certain places and by entering into certain connections, combinations with one another (/ being connected between themselves in a certain way). Both the number as well as the possibilities of the connection of these elements are set, given once and for all, and through this setting, establishing, determining, fixing of theirs, they yield, produce, make, constitute the language, linguistic structure which precedes, lies before/ahead of language, linguistic use (i.e. the realisation of this or that possibility contained in the language, linguistic structure). Language seems to be / is like a chess (game) or card game in/during which the elements represent the chess pieces or else the

[417] Don't forget, no matter how (much) the "dissolution of substance" is or seems to have been achieved, no human state of affairs as society as a whole can get around metaphysics, ideology, false consciousness in the sense of creating, constructing absolutely unavoidable normative positionings (and an attendant axiological scale) out of nothing, i.e. given that such normative stances and values do not inherently exist in man or nature.

cards, and the language, linguistic structure is represented by the rules of the game, whereas / whilst the language, linguistic use corresponds with/to the factual and on each and every respective occasion different course, evolution of the game, in/during which with the help of the chess pieces or else cards, (as many) combinations are realised (as) (which) are possible on the basis of the rules of the game. Obviously, the elements in themselves or as substances mean nothing if they do not enter into any, certain relations with one another, so that out of / from that certain rules of the game or functions develop, unfold, arise, emerge. That is why the science of language / linguistics sees its task, mission in the description of functions, regardless of whether it proceeds analytically, i.e. whether it cuts (carves) (up) (dissects) language in(to) parts or whether it rebuilds, reconstructs (the) language as an overall, total structure. The primacy, precedence, priority of functions vis-à-vis substances inside of structure goes back / is reduced to the fact that its elements are exchangeable, interchangeable, that, therefore, structures just as little as their elements may, can, are allowed (to) be comprehended as substance-related entities.

The endeavour to make out of / from linguistics an algebra, or attempts to use the operations of symbolic logic in linguistics (/ the acts of symbolic logic for linguistic purposes), are (have been) symptomatic, indicative of the increasing tendency, trend of completely, fully detaching language from its historical and psychological content, with which it was connected in its bourgeois understanding, perception, and of remoulding, reshaping, reforming it (language) in the sense of development, evolution and of needs in other areas, in which the analytical-combinatory thought style was seen, shown, projected in a pure form. The reduction of language to signs or ultimate elements, which have no history, or whose history is irrelevant, and the combinatory game (game of the combination) with the same ultimate elements on a united, uniform flat surface, plane, in part anticipated, and in part accompanied, methodical

procedures and techniques which were disseminated, spread by / with cybernetics and the computer (computing machine), deeply influencing the everyday, daily life and the thought / intellectual habits of highly technicised mass democracy. The analysis and the processing of language through, by means of, with the methods of modern linguistics played an important role in this development because language, of its nature/essence/texture, is bound, tied to signs, which is/constitutes the most usual, common system of signs (sign system) or even the system of signs (sign system) par excellence, irrespective of how one wants to define signs on each and every respective occasion. That is why every theory about, regarding linguistic signs (the signs of language) must directly or indirectly be widened, broadened into a general semiotics with far-reaching implications, applications. The decisive turn, in the course of this, occurs, happens when the qualitative is converted, transformed into the quantitative, substance (is converted, transformed) into function, and on the basis of this conversion (transformation) a combinatory game / game of combination without limits (any limit), boud(arie)s, restrictions, borders begins. The reduction of the linguistic, language variety to ultimate elements assists, aids, promotes, furthers, fosters, boosts, facilitates, encourages the quantification of the qualitative and allows, permits the combinations, which come into question / are possible with the help / on the basis of the available elements, to be worked out, calculated in advance. The conversion of things or else signs into quantities, which are exchangeable and combinable with one another, characterises modern linguistics just as much as the computer (computing machine); this also/besides/after all made possible the cooperation of both in problems like that (problem) of translation, e.g.. Against this background, modern linguistics found contact points, ports of call, connections, in / with the newest, latest advances of technique (technology) in an increasingly mathematising life world (world of life) (/ a world which mathematises itself ceaselessly). Of course, technique (technology) did not

develop because / on account of the changes in the field, area of the humanities (sciences of man), but in parallel with them and in (a) narrow, tight, close interrelation with (the) changes, variations in (the) natural science(s). Modern natural science was not, nevertheless, for its part, a mere theoretical reservoir for (use by) technique (technology). It brought into being / forth, produced, created a whole / an entire world image, in which the crushing, shattering, destruction, disintegration, smashing, wrecking of the erstwhile harmonic Whole into ultimate constituent parts, and the new, principally, mainly, chiefly spatial perception of the world, had a determinative effect, impact (/ played a decisive role).

It was noticeable (/ made an impression) from the beginning that the great changes in the field of art and in that/the field of natural science took place, happened at the same historical moment. That is why it was obvious, reasonable to search for content-related parallels (/ parallels as to the content of thought), however it was not particularly productive, fertile (/ this investigation, research did not yield much) because it / one wanted to (really, whatever the cost) discover points of contact(, in fact personal influences,) in individual questions / in-part issues, matters(, and) in the (narrower) technical sense. Nonetheless, already chronological, as well as other real/factual reasons make investigations, (kinds of) research in such a direction unfruitful, infertile, unproductive. Much more important appears to be the ascertainment of certain structural commonalities, which has to lead / necessarily leads to the conclusion that also the transition from classical to modern physics can be easily (without anything more), and completely, entirely independent(ly) of its "strictly scientific" necessity, put in(to) order, classified, included in the great process which we are describing here[418]. Entirely, Completely generally seen, these commonalities

[418] Thus, ***ZIO-JOO***-LBERT ***ZIO-JOO***-N-STEIN was not some kind of ***ZIO-JOO***-"genius", but just another ***ZIO-JOO***-FREAK SHOW-ANTI-CHRIST-***GREAT SATAN***-SATANIST, working for the ANTI-CHRIST-GREAT SATAN-DEVIL-EVIL-EVIL-DEVIL-***JOO*** as a ***JOO*** himself.

consist in the following points: (the) dynamisation or even (the) dissolution of the thing and of matter or else substance (essence); (the) calling into question, questioning, doubting of the everyday experience of space, time and causality[419]; recourse to / refuge in abstraction(s) during the search for pure forms or pure relations on that side / beyond (the) dynamised or dissolved matter; finally, the tendency of the world being looked at not as a well-ordered Whole with fixed constituent parts and a fixed place for every one of them (those parts), but rather as a fluid, flowing, and at the same time, united field(,) in which things and spatio-temporal relationships must, necessarily only come into being. These commonalities did not come about, arise either through the direct influence of modern art by modern physics, or because of the fact that the creators, originators, fathers of modern physics were inspired by the artwork of (the) modern(ism), modernity, but they arose from / out of the embedding of both activities (common origins) of the spirit (intellect) ((both) spiritual / intellectual activities) in the same thought style, which sharply demarcated, delimited itself (/ intensely differed) from the bourgeois thought style. In the (intermediate) area between modern art and modern physics there were indeed certain ideas / certain perceptions of course floated, dangled(,) which seemed to build a direct bridge between both (modern art and modern physics), but these had an – on each and every respective occasion – different content and meaning; nonetheless, they bore witness / attested to the common endeavour, effort to replace the conventional, traditional perception of the world with a new one / perception of the world, as well as with a consciousness that a radical upheaval in this area is/was already on the horizon (/ and also they revealed the consciousness that in this area, sector a radical overturning (overthrow, reversal)

[419] ***JOOZ*** and their ***ZIO-JOO***-ZOMBEE-STOOGEZ will "call into question" "everything", except for, ***OH SURPRISE, FUCKING ZIO-JOO-BALL-ZIO-JOO-DAS-SURPRISE !!!***, ***grossly disproportionate and vastly asymmetrical ZIO-JOO***-POWER / CONTROL (**KONTROL**).

is/was immanent)[420]. Thus, the formulation (setting up, establishment) of non-Euclidean geometries encouraged the artists not less than the physicists, in relation to that, of saying goodbye / farewell to the self-understanding of the conventional / traditional (/ of not viewing, considering as self-evident the prevailing) world image, even though the artists, of course, were hardly in the position of being able to understand such theories in detail and to be stimulated, excited, prompted, animated, spurred, impelled, egged on by them in a way other than the most general(ly) atmospheric way. The much-discussed speculation over / regarding / about (the theory of) the "fourth dimension" exercised / had a similar effect, impact at that time on the artistic, and indeed / especially Cubist circles, which offered (several, some, not a few) arguments for / in favour of the combatting of the classical teaching of perspective, and in general strengthened belief in abstract art unfolding, developing precisely then, that beyond the illusory world of senses, a true four-dimensional world is found / exists; certainly, mind you, when / after the theory of relativity declared, defined time as the fourth dimension inside of the spatio-temporal continuum, (the) speculations, theories concerning, regarding this fell silent / weakened / wasted away, not, however, without making / having made their contribution to the destruction of (the) old habits of thought (intellectual habits). In this way, the atmospheric interaction (as mutual influence) (interplay, alternating (changing) effect) between modern art and modern physics was acted out to a great extent (/ generally took place), whereby / in relation to which / albeit it must be remarked, observed that modern artists have invoked the (howsoever interpreted (on every occasion)) findings of modern physicists much more often than the other way around / vice versa. (The) Developments in the field of philosophy have had a much more direct effect on the formation of modern

[420] Social changes with long-term consequences happen throughout society as a whole, and "all this stuff or all dis jazz" is indicative of how significant the **nova** of the Industrial Revolution and mass democracy were from circa 1800 and circa 1900 respectively (the latter could not have occurred without the former).

physics, and indeed through / by means of the/a massive / frontal attack against the concept of substance, which accompanied the programmatic rise / appearance of conventionalism: because a world without (fixed) substances and otherwise fixed points of reference can be held together only through / by means of / with cognitive conventions; however, this same ascertainment suggests the thought/idea of looking at / considering (the) precisely / today's dominant, ruling world image not as a/the necessary outflow, discharge, outcome, corollary, aftereffect of (the/a) healthy understanding of man (humans), human understanding, common sense, but as a fiction / fictional construct, which under certain circumstances, conditions can be replaced by a another and better fiction / fictional construct[421].

The great change, which led to modern physics and its world image, was characterised by the moving, displacement, transfer of (the main, chief) scientific interest from the field, sector of macrophysics to that (field, sector) of microphysics – a step which was prepared by the displacement, ousting of mechanics by electrodynamics several, a few, some decades earlier. The new precedence, primacy, priority of microphysics implied / entailed a content-related pre-decision (a(n) preliminary, in advance decision pertaining to content), when here it was a matter of a field upon which (/ since in the framework, context of microphysics(,)) the classical perception of matter and of substance could be directly thematised / made into a topic and be more easily called into question / doubted[422]. In actual fact, the new epistemological status of microphysics went (together) with / accompanied a dynamisation of the concept of matter, which literally meant, signified a coup de grace / knock out against the concept of substance (essence). A particle indeed has mass, but from

[421] Which in practice means ***SICK-FUCKING-KRAZY-PSYCHO-PATH JOOZ*** and their ***ZIO-JOO***-ZOMBEE-STOOGEZ deciding that only a construct which does not tell FACTS / THE TRUTH about ***DA JOO*** is allowed!!!

[422] In other words, it didn't have to be that way, but ***JOO***-DAS, ***ZIO-JOO***-N-STEIN DA "***JOO***-NIES", and their many ***ZIO-JOO***-ZOMBEE-STOOGEZ, made it "that way".

that it cannot follow (/ we cannot conclude) that it possesses (has) a fixed substance (essence). Namely, if it (the said particle) dissolves into radiation, thus it continues to exist / endures as energy, it, however, cannot be recognised again as this (specific) particle, nor does it become anew this same particle in the case of / should the radiation (supposedly) turn(ing) / be(ing) converted, transformed into a particle again. One can here talk of a mere structure in the sense that no fixed nucleus, core exists / is available, but only qualities are present, whose every respective assembly, conjunction yields, produces, results exactly (in) the – on each and every respective occasion – present, existent structure. The microphysical matter is, therefore, replaced by relations and forms. However, the de-substantialisation of matter (/ the emptying, depletion of matter of every substance) must / necessarily end(s) – during the in principle convertibility of matter – in energy. Now substance-related dualism vanishes, disappears, from which classical physics started (/ which classical physics accepted)(,) when it differentiated / by differentiating between weighable matter and weightless energy; energy has mass, and the mass can be converted / transformed into energy; therefore / consequently, two separate(d) laws of conservation (conservation laws), one for mass and one for energy, are no longer needed / need not be accepted any longer. The relativisation of the concept of matter, which had to / necessarily follow(ed) (/ was the necessary aftermath, aftereffect, resultant of) the total, complete setting, putting aside of substance, entailed / had another far-reaching, serious consequence too, as well. Physics had to, next to the concept of matter, introduce, establish, bring in, accept the concept of the field as a second kind of physical reality, which cares (caters) for (/ thanks to which) the connection of the particles of matter / material particles with one another (is (successfully) achieved, attained). In view of (/ Starting from) the intrinsic, essential identity of mass and energy, and on the basis of (the) already formulated laws of electricity, magnetism and gravity (gravitation), now a pure physics of the field appears to be thinkable,

conceivable, possible, even though (the) scientific praxis, practice has to most of the time, on many occasions, hold onto / cling / fast to, insist upon the duality of matter and (the) field. The concept(ual plan), idea of a field, in which in themselves formless forces have an effect and always bring about, create only temporary (transient, transitory, passing, momentary) crystallisations and constellations (arrangements, correlations), means, signifies the/a conclusive, definitive farewell to, severance/breaking from the bourgeois (re)presentation, conception, notion, perception of harmony, i.e. the (re)presentation, conception, notion, perception of a(n) (well-)ordered, orderly world of tangible forms and things, which are indeed found in a becoming, but in their dynamic movement, motion(,) (they) obey, follow certain laws, which hinder, obstruct a degeneration of becoming into formlessness. On the contrary, the forces or forms of energy, which are at work, unfold in(side) the field, cannot guarantee, vouch for the coming into being of any form which would satisfy, fulfill, suffice / be sufficient for, correspond to/with the bourgeois sense, perception of form (/ morphological, form-related demands, requirements). The unity of the field is not caused by / due to the harmonic interrelation of forms and things, but by / to a law bindedness (determinism, law(rule)-based necessity) which, for its part, is conceived, understood more mathematically than ontologically: it expresses, namely, not a strictly causally determined and always predictable behaviour of things fixed in terms of substance (/ with fixed substance (essence)), but it consists in mathematical formulae, which apprehend, capture, record, grasp, express, (im)print relations, which are supposed to underlie (/ found at the base of) macro-physical and micro-physical phenomena (appearances, occurrences), and in this regard / sense, have a purely intellectual or transcendental character. This mathematical law bindedness (determinism, law(rule)-based necessity) corresponds in its abstractness and ideality (i.e. existence only as an idea) with / to the realm of pure colours and forms, which (/ whose existence) some modern painters scented, smelt, got wind of, sensed, divined, guessed at behind the

phenomenal (apparent) world (world of appearance)[423].

The dissolution of substance, as it was carried out, undertaken by micro-physics, raised / threw up epistemological questions, problems also pertaining to the theory of knowledge, whose solution brought about, caused, effect(uat)ed, induced a wider, broader, greater vibration, shock, convulsion, disruption, shaking up of the coherent and clearly outlined bourgeois world image. In the course of this / the process, it was a matter of (/ These problems were especially) the analysability or non-analysability of (the) elementary processes, of the lucidity, clarity, vividness of physical explanations, explications, interpretations and of the meaning and limits, boundaries of the principle of causality. One can easily guess why the analysability of physical processes after the putting, setting aside of substance necessarily, must appear(s) to be problematic. Only substances can at any time be defined in regard to all their aspects (designations, provisions, determinations, points of view, viewpoints), however the elementary particles represent and constitute structures or ensembles (aggregates, totals, summations) of relations, they are wave fields / fields of waves with certain potentialities. The relations of blurredness, fuzziness, haziness, unsharpness, indistinctness, indeterminacy express the non-analysability of the elementary processes in the general form that we cannot simultaneously and sharply, i.e. accurately measure two magnitudes interrelating with each other like for instance location (locus, place, position) and speed (velocity, rate, pace), but only one of them on each and every respective occasion. A further logical consequence of the dissolution of substance is finally also the principle of complementarity, with whose help modern physics tries, attempts to jointly think about / connect things which are in themselves opposed; because only under complementary points of view can

[423] In other words, one (and or his collectivity) decides upon through which world view or world theory or way of looking at the world one chooses to view the world and calls it “science” or “genius” or “inspiration” or “God” or whatever.

something be apprehended which in regard to certain (of its) properties, qualities, characteristics is (might be) a corpuscle i.e. particle, and in regard to certain other points of view is (might be) a wave. The (fact of the) impossibility, after the putting, setting aside of substance, that the texture, nature, essence of physical phenomena (appearances, occurrences) could be made understood with the help (at least in accordance with the usual criteria) of clear concepts and (re)presentations, notions, meant, signified the end of lucidity, clarity, vividness[424]. For the description of the micro-physical world, thought (intellectual) categories had to be used which ran counter to not merely the thought (intellectual) world / world of thoughts of classical physics, but also age-old, primordial, primeval thought (intellectual) habits (habits of thought). In this respect / To this extent, the transition from classical to modern physics may / is allowed to be described as the transition from the self-evidence, obviousness of the vivid, graphic, visual, clear, lucid to the necessity of the abstract (/ from self-evident clarity to inevitable abstraction). The loss of lucidity, clarity, vividness became again / in (its) turn even / still more noticeable, perceptible through / by means of / with the calling into question, doubting, loosening (slackening) or reinterpretation of the principle of causality. Lucidity, clarity, vividness and causality belonged together / were closely, tightly connected in the(ir) bourgeois (re)presentation, conception, notion, perception – (besides,) an early and most highly, exceptionally influential, effective version of the thought / notion / idea of harmony in the history of ideas was(, in fact,) the strictly causally conceived mechanistic world image itself. The acceptance of causality and of law bindedness (determinism, law(rule)-based necessity) laid the basis for / supported that (re)presentation, conception, notion, idea of order which was summoned, mobilised, called upon for hundreds of years against (the) feudal “chaos” in nature and history, and that is why it belonged to the firm,

[424] Just what ***JOO***-DAS of CHAOS, RUBBISH, GARBAGE, FLUIDITY, AMBIGUITY, FUZZINESS, UGLINESS, NOISE, DISHARMONY, POLLUTION AND ***KOPROS*** (EXCREMENT) called and calls for !!!

steady, stable, fixed stock, inventory, consignment, legacy and to the tried and tested (proven) arsenal of bourgeois ideology, although / even though on some occasions, a few times with regard to the atheist and materialist determinists, limits, boundaries had to be drawn in regard to / placed on its (order's (causality's and law bindedness's)) validity and stringency, strictness. Precisely the – at that moment pertaining to the history of ideas – understandable impression that the relativisation or denial, renunciation, rejection of the classical principle of causality would deal a hard blow to threatening / the threat of materialism and (of) determinism, moved, pushed, propelled, drove certain, some pioneers of modern physics(, in relation to that,) to unhinge, disassemble fundamental presuppositions of the bourgeois understanding of nature and to aid, assist, help the prevailing, prevalence, predominance of a thought figure which corresponded with/to the given facts of the post-bourgeois age, epoch, since the causally bound (causal) order and the foreseeability of the processes vis-à-vis open possibility, unlimited/unrestricted mobility and the suddenness, abruptness of the individual (in-part) event[425] stepped back/down, withdrew, resigned, backed out, receded, conceded ground. Also, with reference / in relation to the question, issue of causality, the turn towards micro-physics was decisive. Here, the constant, uninterrupted and continuous becoming of nature is hindered, obstructed by the intervention, interpolation of elementary acts, which cannot / are not able to be observed, looked at, regarded themselves, nonetheless, they shatter, scatter, burst (open) the causal interrelation between (successive, consecutive) observations (following / coming after one another). Under these circumstances, causal law (legitimacy, determinism, bindedness), causality (cause and effect) is necessarily replaced by a mere statistical law (legitimacy, determinism, bindedness), which enlightens us about what happens in nature in general, but not about what happens in the (every) concrete case.

[425] I.e. ***JOOZ*** and their ***ZIO***-CHAOS-Satanism.

Finally, the complete, total, whole dissolution of substance (essence) was accompanied by a profound, far-reaching change, about-turn in respect of the spatio-temporal perception of the world. That dissolution amounted (boiled down) to / resulted in, as we (have) already said, to an identification of mass and matter, energy and motion (movement), (something) which made the universe indeed formless, but simultaneously united to an extent (hitherto) unknown (until then). This unity was achieved, reached, became possible exactly because of the fact that the fundamental (physical) magnitudes (of physics) were dispossessed / deprived of the(ir) substance-related character (/ ceasing to be substances (essences)), that is, the(ir) absoluteness (/ lost their absolute character), and in their place the in principle convertibility, transformability of one (magnitude) into the other (another magnitude) was put. The absoluteness (absolute character) of space and time could not, in the course of this, remain/be exempt, spared, because it was connected with the assumption of fixed things, which could move in space and time without the/a loss or change of ((a part of) their) substance. In classical physics, every thing took (up), occupied, captured a certain volume (inside) of space, which inherently, essentially belonged together / was inextricably connected, linked with the thing, and was independent of each and every respective observer; that is why the observations were undertaken, carried out without consideration for / taking into account the magnitude "time"[426], and it was regarded as self-evident that observations or events can take place absolutely simultaneously. The (substance-related) fixedness of the thing (as a substance) and the separate(d) measurement of space and time were, therefore, the two sides of the same coin (medal); because of that, the assumption of a spatio-temporal continuum necessarily, had to go hand in hand, accompany, be born with the conversion, transformation of bodies into events or into (substance-less) structures (without

[426] I.e. the observation / measurement of space and of time were two different, separate things (not one united continuum) in classical physics.

(a) substance). If during the observation of volumes of/in space / spatial volumes there is no longer abstraction from time, if, that is, the point in time is given (specified) in which this or that volume of/in space (spatial volume) is found in this or that state (of affairs), situation, thus, the latter volume in space must be looked at as an event, i.e. as something which – on way or another / in this way and not otherwise – is acted out, take place and unfolds in time. It is no longer a matter of the mere determination of the place of a body in space, but of the three components of the measurement of space (spatial measurement), together with the component of the measurement of time (temporal measurement), determining the place of an event inside of the spatio-temporal continuum. The four-dimensional world line / line of the universe constitutes an unbroken sequence (succession, consequence) of events, whereby / in relation to which the unity of space and of time represents and shows the structure of the relations between the events. As soon as space and time cease to be / stop being regarded as absolute and hence separate(d) from each other magnitudes, matter also becomes a sequence of events – as well as the other way around / conversely. The new perception of matter, as it necessarily arose / had to arise out of / from the complete, total dissolution of substance, and the fusion, amalgamation of space and time inside of the spatio-temporal continuum mutually, reciprocally determine / depend on each other. Still more / Furthermore: the structure of matter and the structure of space(-)time inseparably correlate, interrelate / are inseparably linked, since the latter (space(-)time) is shaped, moulded, formed by (means of) (through) the distribution of the masses and energies in(side) it, and hence / that is why it exhibits, shows, displays a great topological variety, diversity.

Since the unity of space and time inside of the spatio-temporal continuum ipso facto implies the unity of this same continuum with the events being acted out and taking place in it, thus, no space and no time can exist (/ space or time

cannot exist) without events, that is, outside of the universe. Space and time come into being (are created) and exist where something occurs, in their unity they represent and constitute the framework in which the events are put into order, classified, incorporated, integrated – or more precisely: the order of the events coincides with the spatio-temporal order. Now it is indeed conceivable, imaginable, thinkable that on the basis of a (single) one and only equation, which would contain time as the fourth variable, infinitely, endlessly many different descriptions of one and the same event could be undertaken, carried out, made, attempted and that out of an infinite, endless series, row of such equations, an overall description of the spatio-temporal continuum would arise. However, reality, which must be reckoned (with) / counted / calculated (/ which we must confront specifically, concretely), is that of the concrete (each and every respective) observer, who can (is in a position to) perceive and describe the events only in accordance / correspondence with his relative position. This means a regular segmentation, dismemberment, fragmentation of time into different, various (periods) of time(s) existing independent of one another, which, as it were, swim next to one another in the spatio-temporal continuum(,) without ever meeting, encountering one another. From his point of view, of course, every observer(, in relation to that,) is inclined to transfer his time to the whole / all of the space (and accordingly / through that stays, remains with the separation of (/ he continues to separate) time and space from each other, which (in every system of reference) must be precipitated, turn out (/ albeit this separation happens) differently (in every system of reference)), but he would have (had) the right / been allowed to do that only if there were no upper limit for the speed, velocity of signals. The / That is why the discovery of the/a constant, finite and unsurpassable speed, velocity of light (had to hence) be (was) interpreted as the decisive argument against the possibility of an absolute simultaneity of events spatially distanced from one another, or else against the

absoluteness / absolute character of time in general[427]. Thus, the temporal succession (sequence) of events depends upon the relative position of the observer, i.e. it does not constitute a(ny) objective relation between the events themselves[428]. The simultaneity of events is determined by / depends upon the choice of a certain system of reference (referential system), i.e. it exists only inside of the same system of reference (referential system) and it may not / cannot be accepted in regard to systems which are not related / do not refer to one another[429]. An absolute system of reference (referential system) does not exist; because of that, even / also movements can be described only in (a) relation(ship) to(wards), with one another. In the course of this, it is ultimately a matter of / What is sought in this case is for the fragments, pieces of the once united and absolute time being / to be compared with one another.

This segmentation, dismemberment, fragmentation of time brings with it / entails two things, which for our question formulation / setting of the question are (most) important. First, time is spatialised by being connected with the coordinates of space. Every system of time / temporal system has its own time, which depends on its own place / location / locus and / or else on the speed, velocity of its movement, motion; the clocks go, run otherwise, differently according to each and every respective field of gravity, gravitation, and all the slower, the more their speed, velocity nears, approaches the speed of light. What serves on each and every respective occasion as the measure of time (temporal measure) can, therefore, go back/be reduced in general to a spatial measure (degree, extent, amount). Secondly, time can – exactly because of its spatialisation – expand or contract (extend, stretch or pull (draw) together).

---

[427] "All this jazz" only means something at a practical level if it can be applied to some aspect of human / social life, otherwise it is knowledge of no practical relevance to people as social/political beings, who lived and achieved tremendous things for millennia without such knowledge / "science".
[428] This does not run counter to the observation that all observations are made from a particular, concrete, specific perspective; though, given that, one could, based upon **power and decision**, bind others to the view that there is or isn't an objective relation between the events themselves.
[429] A clear case of "**power and decision**".

Firstly, the present expands on account of the discontinuation (omission, cessation, ending, removal, cancellation, loss, absence) of the absolute simultaneity of events spatially distanced from one another: (whereas) against the background of the linear perception of time, it (i.e. the present) is regarded as a(n) vanishingly, insignificantly small moment between the past and the future, thus now it acquires a temporal expansion, extension which corresponds with/to the spatial distance between the observer and the observed event. The past and the future can, for their part / in (their) turn, be imagined, understood as the present because they are not found on the straight line of an objective course (journey, way, route, trip) of time / temporal course (journey, way, route, trip), but, precisely like the present, represent and constitute different, various points in the spatio-temporal continuum, and as such, co-exist[430]. It depends on the direction and the speed, velocity of the movement, motion in the continuum on whether one meets, encounters (/ The direction and the speed of movement inside of the spatio-temporal continuum determines if one will meet) the present, the past or the future. Were it otherwise / not so, thus one would have to understand the becoming of nature / natural becoming dynamically, i.e. as movement, motion in a three-dimensional space. The theory of relativity (declaredly) holds, considers, however(, as it itself declared, proclaimed), that the "static" way of looking at (the) natural becoming / becoming of nature as a four-dimensional space-time-continuum as "more objective"[431] than the "dynamic" way of looking at the becoming of nature, and to this extent, in this

[430] This is "very convenient" for ***ZIO-JOO***-SATANISTS and their ***ZIO-JOO***-ZOMBEE-STOOGE ideologues who want to deny both historical continuity (you are a construct even though the facts say everyone is a construct of facts and or mythology!!!) and historical difference (ruling ***ZIO***-values of today also applied to the past, even though the facts say that that is not entirely up to not even a little bit so!!!) in line with their "arguments" about the "non-existence" of historical peoples, whom they want to **ethnically cleanse** and **genocide** out of existence because "it's good for them coz ***JOO***-DAS says so" because ***DA JOOZ*** via ***ZIO***-USA are "born to MASTER RACE, ROOL DA WORLD" as ***sick-fucking-crazy-psycho-path***-incestual-rat-lizzard-rodent-rat tunnel-parasitical-organised and conspiratorially-criminal freak-show vomit-pieces of excrement-KOST-***TOTAL FILTH***-shit.

[431] As we said in footnotes 427 to 429 above, none of this knowledge / theory / "science" is socially necessary, i.e. necessary for humans living with humans in society, and its relevance for a human society -(for a non-human society of animals, it's totally irrelevant)- depends upon how it is used / interpreted, if it is used, interpreted, as a matter of **Power and Decision, Macht und Entscheidung, Ἰσχὺς καὶ Ἀπόφαση**.

regard, it suggests precisely the (re)presentation, notion, conception, idea of an Eleatic[432] Is/Being/To Be in which scattered fragments of time move in different directions, intersecting with one another or distancing themselves from one another – without, however, through that / accordingly, changing something in regard to the fact that everything which can be / exist, already is (there) / exists, and that in this sense, the Is/Being/To Be hardly changes / remains unchanged, invariable[433]. Without doubt, Certainly, in the context of the theory of relativity, there can be no talk of any space which, as it were, would devour, gobble (swallow) (up), engulf time; space is here just as little absolute as time is / like time, i.e. it is constituted and split (cleaved, splintered, chopped / broken (up)) in correspondence / accordance with the distribution of mass and energy on each and every respective occasion, like / as (/ to wit, in accordance with the way) time is constituted and split. And nonetheless / notwithstanding all of that, it must be said that a splitting of space appears to be more comprehensible than a reversal of time, which takes place because / on account of its disintegration, decomposition, decay, segmentation, fragmentation into many (periods of) time(s) inside of the spatio-temporal continuum. This imperfect, incomplete, deficient image (picture) may, can perhaps clarify, elucidate, explain, make clear why modern physics itself prepared the change of/in the perception of the world like for instance the modern novel or (the) modern visual art(s)[434].

---

[432] Relating to Elea, an ancient Greek city in south-western Italy, or the school of philosophers that flourished there in about the 5th century BC, including Xenophanes, Parmenides, and Zeno. The Eleatics rejected the epistemological validity of sense experience, and instead took logical standards of clarity and necessity to be the criteria of truth. Of the members, Parmenides and Melissus built arguments starting from sound premises.

[433] In other words, ***ZIO-JOO***-N-STEIN was just as much a HOCUS-POCUS trickster / magician as he was a ***ZIO***-"gee-***JOO***-nioos", because what he did as a ***ZIO***-"gee-***JOO***-nioos" was set aside the fact of the perspectivity of all knowledge and that knowledge is the result of **power and decision**. Everyone will act normatively for as long as they have the faculty to do so, everyone will have faith and believe in the "right / wrong" they subscribe to (since there are no immanent values anywhere in nature or humans apart from self-preservation and the extension of one's own power as the extension of life for as long as it goes on), and everyone has the capacity to make a scientific (empirical) observation of what they describe and explain, no matter how "simple".

[434] There's nothing like "changing the world" by changing the way people see/view/understand the world. And what has happened since circa ***ZIO***-1900 in the way people see the world is **The End of the World** stuff. And we're living it now. OVER. DEAD. ***ZIO***.

IV. The development of mass democracy, the decay (degradation, degeneration, decline) of the bourgeois life form (way (form) of life) and the further development (evolution) (meta/further-development/evolution) of the analytical-combinatory thought figure

1. Reinterpretation and transformation (change, conversion, alteration) of liberalism

The replacement of the synthetic-harmonising thought figure by the analytical-combinatory thought figure took place (occurred, ensued, was effected) in the same period of time (time period) as the displacement, ousting, driving out, putting aside, sidelining of classical bourgeois liberalism by mass democracy[435] – and this displacement, ousting, driving out, putting aside, sidelining was carried out, for its part, most often as the reinterpretation and change/changing of liberalism in the sense (/ accordance with the needs of) mass democracy, and not always as open and programmatic conflict between both. It is a matter, of course(, in the course of this / here), neither of a coincidence, happenstance, nor of two merely temporally parallel processes, but rather of a deep, profound structural correspondence, which we here want to only record, register without posing, setting, putting forward the methodologically delicate, thorny, prickly, touchy and perhaps infertile, unfruitful issue, question, matter of (the) genetic factors and priorities[436]. In the analytical-combinatory thought figure, the mode, way of function(ing)

[435] P.K. is here clearly referring to two historically successive ideal types (classical bourgeois liberalism (which follows (and in practice partially overlaps (circa 1500 to circa 1789/1848/1880) with) (the remnants of) societas civilis) followed by mass democracy (which partially overlaps in practice with classical bourgeois liberalism in the transitional phase from circa (1848/)1880 to circa 1914-1918)), which pertain to the social whole. The only "dee-mok-rasi" as polity within mass democracy is the ideological masking of ***ZIO-JOO***-ANTI-CHRIST-SATANOCRACY as "dee-mok-rasi" to ideologically-rhetorically justify ***GROSSLY DISPROPORTIONATE AND VASTLY ASYMMETRICAL ZIO-JOO***-RULE in economy, state and increasingly in culture, which P.K., for obvious reasons in respect of being published by leading ***ZIO-JOO***-German publishers, could not ever state explicitly, though, there are more than enough indirect references in P.K.'s oeuvre as a whole for the non-***ZIO-JOO***-ZOMBIE-STOOGE reader "to get the picture".

[436] That's P.K. telling his readers that the "***JOO***-ish question" is so complicated, convoluted, intertwined, mixed-up and "***JOO***-DAS-lizzard-fied" with all of the historical peoples of Europe / ***JOO***rope, starting with Anglo-Saxons, Germans, Frogs, but also many others, that there's no point in "going down that path", a) because most people are way too ***ZIO-JOO***-ZOMBEE-STOOGE-brain dead to understand "what's going on", and b) the ***JOOZ*** and their ***ZIO-JOO***-ZOMBEE-STOOGE-slaves have way too much power in the "West", including behind the scenes "I kill you by mishap, accident, sickness etc." power, for it to be worth one's while of "going down that path", even though da ***JOOZ*** got P.K. by his 55th year on this earth via "medical error".

(functional mode) was ideationally expressed, reflected (in respect) of that social formation which gradually covered (over/up) or swallowed (up), devoured, gobbled, absorbed that social formation in which the bourgeoisie / bourgeois class (pre)dominated and in which liberalism was understood and practiced mainly, principally, chiefly in the sense of the bourgeoisie (/ which the bourgeois class gave to it). The guiding notion, idea of in principle (equivalent) ultimate elements or atoms (of equal worth, value), which all together are found at/on a flat, shallow (/ at one) level and can be combined with one another arbitrarily, at will and ceaselessly, incessantly, unremittingly, unceasingly, adequately captured, recorded, grasped, registered, conveyed, in actual fact, a soci(et)al reality(,) in which (politically and socially equal, equivalent) individuals (of/having, bearing equal rights politically and socially) as such[437], i.e. independent/free of any other social prerequisite, precondition, presupposition, can, are able and may, are allowed to undertake on each and every respective occasion various roles without limits, boundaries, restrictions being placed, put in principle on their mobility and on the game of (the) combination(s) / combinatory game (accordingly) enabled, made possible (through that (aforesaid guiding notion, idea (and associated societal reality)))[438]. Such a concept was to bourgeois liberalism, i.e. to (the) liberalism before its mass-democratic reinterpretation, completely, totally foreign, alien, strange; in fact, it was already in its early forms combatted by the liberals of that time. Bourgeois individualism knew (of) barriers which first became visible when they began to fall. Physical individuality as such was neither a sufficient condition for political and social individuality, not even for the legal, juridic(al),

[437] I.e. ideal-typically and legally, formally, nominally, and **definitely NOT** as to the reality / essence of equality in relation to the possession of various forms of economic, state, cultural **power**, which are ***GROSSLY DISPROPORTIONATELY AND VASTLY ASYMMETRICALLY*** in the hands of ***JOOZ*** for reasons explained elsewhere, *passim*, in relation to ***ZIO-JOO*** organised and conspiratorial, rat-tunnel, incestual etc. criminality.
[438] Provided, of course, you are acceptable to and useful for the ***JOOZ*** and their ***ZIO-JOO***-ZOMBEE-STOOGEZ **in actual (not nominal, surface-level) power** as the ruling authoritarian / autocratic / despotic / "totalitarian / dictatorial" oligarchy.

juristic equality / state of having, bearing equal rights of all individuals as between one another. This began, started with the structure of the family, which indeed was no longer the large, great patriarchal family (that is, the "oikos / household") of societas civilis[439], nonetheless, it had a head and (this head) more or less precisely fixed, determined the roles of its members, so that *it* (i.e. *the head of the oikos / household*) – and not every isolated (individual) physical individual – was reckoned to be / could be viewed, regarded, seen, looked at as the cell of the soci(et)al organism. At the political level, this structure of the family / familial structure found its correspondence in the fact that for the most part only heads of families (family chiefs) had political rights, however again, not necessarily all, but mainly, primarily, principally or exclusively those which / who had a certain property ownership at their disposal (/ possessed a certain (amount of) property). Even where the circle of the politically entitled (qualified, enabled) (/ possessors of political rights) was not all too / very narrow (tight), bourgeois liberalism had clear oligarchical features (characteristics, traits, attributes), which in/at the time(s) of the unstoppable, inexorable turn toward(s) mass democracy came to light / were revealed with quite a bit of nonchalance in/during the debates over/regarding/about the right to vote (suffrage / electoral franchise). Here it was a matter, obviously, of differences of substance and (of) the social hierarchisations as the expression of exactly (/ expressed precisely) these differences of substance. The imposition / pushing through / prevailing / prevalence / predominance of the purely functional point of view was possible only on the basis of the in principle, social, political and legal equality of all individuals qua/as individuals[440].

[439] Which is much closer to the families of note in societies were there was democracy as a polity (necessarily authoritarian / autocratic / despotic / "dictatorial / totalitarian" etc. like all polities, otherwise civil war), or the remnants of such democracy, in the Greco-Roman-Italian worlds from antiquity until circa 1500/1800 in Italy (depending on the concrete city / state / region in question) and circa 1900 under Ottoman Rule.

[440] Whilst conveniently leaving economic inequality to run riot, which in practice means ***JOOZ*** controlling (**KONTROL**) up to all of politics / the state and the social / culture as well, both via monetary-economic power, but also FULL-SPECTRUM ***ZIO-JOO***-ANTI-CHRIST-***GREAT SATAN***-LOBOTOMISATION-BRAIN WASHING-PAVLOV'S DOG-STIMULUS-REACTION POWER AND CONTROL (**KONTROL**), as well as the ***ZIO-JOO***-mafia / behind the scenes "arrangement of things" in general.

Because only absolutely equal[441] individuals are exchangeable / interchangeable with one another in various functions, only such individuals can play amongst themselves / with one another alternating (variable, changeable) combinatory games / games of (the) combination(s). Mass democracy had to appear or at least loom / emerge / stand out / become apparent as a real possibility so that a state of affairs / situation could become imaginable, conceivable, thinkable in which the functional point of view gains (functional criteria gain) the upper hand / prevails / predominates and everything can be combined with everything.

Bourgeois liberalism suffered under a fundamental/basic contradiction: it was of its essence/nature oligarchical, and simultaneously it had to unfold politically in ([what was] becoming) a mass society (taking shape)[442], which constituted the conditio sine qua non[443] of its own real existence. However, mass society pushed / pulled towards mass democracy, and this made the contradiction only still, even more crass, blatant, extreme, glaring, intense. To the extent that industrial mass society put/set aside the final remnants (relics, leftovers) of societas civilis[444] and was consolidated, the contours of mass democracy were delineated, outlined all the more clearly, until mass society and mass democracy fused, amalgamated on a highly technicised (/ technologically advanced) economic basis/base. These phases in the development, evolution of mass society (and at the same time of industry and of the economy altogether / overall / in general), one must continually keep an eye on / in mind in order to be able

[441] See footnote 440, immediately above. And of course, given we are talking ideal-typically, concrete and specifically situational practice can diverge up to greatly from the ideal type.
[442] E.g. population of Paris : 290,000 (1350), 500,000 (1650), 547,000 (1801), 2.9 million (1921); London : 8,000 (9th century), 70,000 (1550), 400,000 (1650), 1 million (1800), 5 million (1900). Hence, the start of the bourgeois era and Modernity can be dated (also in light of developments in technology (first printing press in Germany around 1440; widespread gun / cannon use in Europe from the 15th / 16th century), the arts (Renaissance of the 15th / 16th centuries), philosophy (Erasmus, 1466-1536) etc.) roughly circa 1500 / 1600, with the 19th century of the **novum** of the Industrial Revolution being the climax of the bourgeois / mass society fundamental contradiction peak. Mass society, obviously, grew even more mass in the mass-democratic 20th century.
[443] An indispensable and essential action, condition, or ingredient. It was originally a Latin legal term for "[a condition] without which it could not be", "but for...", or "without which [there is] nothing."
[444] In the nineteenth century.

to apprehend, grasp the specific features and the historical course of bourgeois liberalism. The fact that it (i.e. bourgeois liberalism) – via various reinterpretations and all kinds of adaptations, adjustments – was finally absorbed by / in(to) mass democracy, and today is capable of being maintained / affirmed / asserted / rescued / salvaged only in marginalia / marginal matters, does not at all prove the assumption that it of its beginning and on account of its internal proclivities / matters of concern it was predestined for something like that, or else its oligarchic features were mere minor details, trivialities, incidentals, irrelevances or blemishes, flaws, snags, blots (negligible properties, qualities, characteristics or minor imperfections)[445]. However, we can see / have insight into / discern that only when we clearly distinguish, differentiate (between) the concrete social and historical character of bourgeois liberalism from (and) a vague normative concept of liberalism, which served as the theoretical vehicle of the ((just (now)) (afore)mentioned) reinterpretations and adaptations, adjustments (mentioned above). To the extent that liberalism is reinterpreted in the mass-democratic sense, what is left over / remains from the concrete historical meaning of the concept (of liberalism) is apostrophised / characterised as "conservatism" and is condemned with corresponding fervour, ardour, zeal, sharpness, severity by the supporters, proponents, advocates of mass democracy, whereby / in relation to which, of course, the concept of conservatism, for its part, loses every concrete historical reference[446] and

[445] In the final analysis, what played the greatest role in bourgeois liberalism not continuing for many centuries more past circa 1900 was the momentum of the **novum** of the Industrial Revolution from circa 1800 as ***JOO***-JACKED by ***ZIO-JOOZ*** and their ***ZIO-JOO***-ZOMBEE-STOOGEZ within the context of ***ZIO-JOO***-CAPITALISM-IMPERIALISM and all the attendant technological, cultural, economic and other social / political innovations, turbo-boosted by the mass-democratic **novum** from circa 1900.

[446] E.g. the ***ZIO-JOO***-SOW AND DE GASPERI-LIKE "ANNO UNO" "CHRISTIAN DEMOCRAT", WHO LIVES IN A STATE OF "FREIHEIT", ***ZIO-JOO***-DAS-***JOO***-NGELA ***ZIO-JOO***-BALL-ERKEL is so "Christian" and "Conservative" that she supports the FULL PROGRAMME of ***ZIO-JOO***-ANTI-CHRIST-DEVIL-EVIL-"SIN IS A RIGHT" AND "DA ***ZIO-JOO***-DAS-FREAK SHOW ***TOTAL FILTH***-EXCREMENT-SHIT-SKATA-MONKEY-KOST IS SPECIAL" SATANISM of GLOBO-HOMO-HOMO-GLOBO "DA ***JOOZ*** ARE A MASTER RACE AND THEY MUST ROOL DA WORLD" HOMOZ, LEZZOZ, TRANZ-FREAKS, FUCK-ABORT-CONTRACEPTIVE-STERILE-WOMEN AS WHORES-FUCK SLUTS, APE-MONKEY-ANOMIE, DRUG-ZOMBIFICATION, PORNOGRAPHY etc., etc., etc.. Ditto re: ***JOO***-LONI in "Italy" and ***ZIO-JOO***-DAS-VOX in "Spain" etc., etc., etc..

becomes / is turned into a polemical slogan / catchword / keyword. Likewise / Also polemically, albeit this time with positive connotations, the concept of liberalism is used in the mass-democratic sense (/ as it is understood from the perspective of mass democracy); through it (i.e. the reinterpreted concept of "liberalism"), it is supposed, namely, to be suggested (/ the impression is suggested, namely) that only now the "true" meaning of "liberalism" has been at last, finally comprehended and is put into practice / transformed, transmuted, transfigured, sublimated, translated in(to) action[447]. In itself, the choice / selection of terms in a scientific analysis is undoubtedly indifferent if only these terms are not loaded, charged polemically and consequently already occupied, taken, reserved (i.e. biassed and prejudiced in advance) so that their use would be tantamount to a confession of faith. Thanks to / Given the mass-democratic reinterpretation of the concept of liberalism, which nowadays[448] has become widely accepted (/ in large part been imposed), it appears, hence, to be more expedient (end/goal-oriented, purposeful) to make known / state the (objectively) clear(, from an at least pragmatological point of view,) difference between the social-political / socio-political constitution, state, texture of early and late mass society through the use of / using two different concepts, and, in the course of this, cling(ing) / hold(ing) on / stick(ing) / keep(ing) / adhere (adhering) to / persevere (persevering) with the/a clear, perspicuous, lucid and concise, incisive contradistinction between (bourgeois) liberalism and (post-

[447] This kind of ***ZIO-JOO***-BULLSHIT-retarded ideological rhetoric has been going on now for many decades, and still continues today, for it gives cover to ***DA JOOZ*** and their ***ZIO-JOO***-ZOMBEE-STOOGEZ LIKE ***ZIO-JOO***-DAS-OBONGO-KLINTON-BIDEN-CAMEL CHAROS ET AL.. Of course, the other "conservative" side, is in the ***ZIO-JOO***-ANTI-CHRIST-SYNAGOGUE OF SATAN as well, but at their best at least acknowledge that there is no future with too much of HOMOZ, LEZZOZ, TRANZ-FREAKS, STERILE ABORT-CONTRACEPTIVE-FUCK-SLUTS, DRUGGEEZ, PORNOGRAPHERZ, APE-MONKEY-ANOMY AND ***ZIO-JOO***-DAS-KOST-FREAK SHOW WORSHIP AS ***TOTAL FILTH***-SHIT-SKATA-VOMIT-EXCREMENT.

[448] 1991. At the end of 2024, we may not have changed yet into something other than late mass democracy, e.g. complete robotisation/automation and de-humanisation under ***JOOZ***, but the discourse and many ways of life now deemed "normal" has become more reflective of mass democracy as total ***ZIO-JOO***-ANTI-CHRIST-degeneracy and degeneration.

bourgeois) democracy[449]. On the other hand, it must be declared which historical and conceptual presuppositions suggested and enabled (made plausible and possible) the democratic reinterpretation of liberalism so that – even in / also not excluding the case of that recent (new, emergent, young, youthful) equating / equation of democracy and liberalism, which became common / as it prevailed, predominated in the struggle against "totalitarianism"[450] – fundamental content-related contrasts and clashes (antitheses) could be, (either) deliberately, intentionally, diligently or in good conscience / in a light-hearted manner (fashion), overlooked, disregarded.

The guiding thread, guide, leitmotif for this explanation is provided, supplied by the recollection, reminder of the polemical aim which the originators of liberal theory had in mind (/ In order to give this explanation, we must have recourse to the polemical ends, purposes, goals of the creators of liberal theory). They[451] turned against the legal and moral, ethical code(x) of societas civilis, which foresaw the subjugation, subjection, subordination of the individual under / to estate-based (feudal, aristocratic, ancien régime, corporative) ties, bonds, kinds of binding and derived, deduced out of / from estate-based (feudal) belonging / affiliation, hierarchical relations between individuals (/ to as many

[449] Obviously, referring to the ideal type and the social whole of mass democracy, which entails an ideal as ideology (a phantasm) of democracy, with only a very shallow, superficial, hollow and narrow and absolutely ***JOO***-JACKED-distorted relation to democracy as polity of the (ancient) Greek / Roman worlds, which was based on pre-modernity, a still largely agricultural society with strong patriarchal oikoi, a clear appreciation of descent, religion, … without many rights deemed "self-evident" today, and with obligations not part of today's ***ZIO***-controlled (**KONTROL**) world of the "West" with its ***ZIO-JOO***-ANTI-CHRIST-SATANOCRACIES posing as "democracies" etc.. Mass society got going in a big way in the 19th century (with origins and roots before then (cf. footnote 442, above)), i.e. during oligarchic bourgeois liberalism, and is not exclusively a feature of mass democracy. And, obviously, "liberal democracy" is scientifically non-sensical, even though it is ideologically and polemically, -with up to religious "blind faith" fanaticism-, still current in the ***ZIO***-controlled (**KONTROL**) ***ZIO***-USA "West".

[450] Since all states of governance and all polities are despotic, authoritarian, autocratic and oligarchic, "totalitarianism", like "tyranny" and "dictatorship" etc., – apart from referring in the case of the latter two to the Head of government, which must always involve more than one man, including within its leadership, to function as a government, hence, the necessary oligarchy, – is purely rhetorical, ideological and "psychological" / a matter of propaganda, and in this case that of the ***ZIO***-COLD WAR.

[451] The really true liberals mainly from the (16th /) 17th century to the 19th century. See first of all : ***Konservativismus***, in addition to : ***Die Aufklärung im Rahmen des neuzeitlichen Rationalismus***, »**Montesquieu. Naturrecht und Gesetz**« and ***Die neuzeitliche Metaphysikkritik***.

ties which his social class imposed upon him, and which (code of societas civilis) based, rested the hierarchical relations between individuals on the fact that they belonged to different social classes (it is understood that here the term "class" is used with the meaning it had in the ancien régime, that is, it corresponds with / to the état, estate or Stand)). The counter concepts, therefore, had to be / read (/ Consequently, the concepts which one had to counterpose to this (estate-based, societas civilis) code in order to combat it (i.e. the said code) were): individualism *and* equality, i.e. the detachment or liberation/freeing of the individual from estate-based (feudal, aristocratic, ancien régime, corporative) ties, bonds, kinds of binding (/ as many ties and bonds his class imposed upon him) and at the same time the abolition of the ties, bonds, kinds of binding going back to the hierarchical relations between individuals[452]; equality was supposed / had to be restored (made, manufactured, produced, fabricated) amongst individuals as such, just as / like inequality stretched / extended to individuals bound / tied in terms of an estate (to a certain social class). This original inner/internal interrelation of individualism and freedom could be understood in (relation to) / by the fact that the freeing of the individual only could be completed when all individuals are, become equal as between one another / amongst themselves. Since the equality amongst men / humans could not be proved by historical arguments, thus constructions served for its (the equality amongst men's) founding, underpinning, support like that of the state of nature or of the social contract[453], in which exactly that which was placed / deployed / moved / relocated inside the origins / beginnings of society,

[452] All of this, and what follows, of course, is at the level of the ideal type, ideology, ideals and legal changes etc., whereas the real world *in toto* never abolished real differences and real inequalities in the various kinds of individual and group (money/economic, state, cultural) power; the real world just altered the nature and ideology of such differences and inequalities with the ***JOOZ*** (and their ***ZIO-JOO***-ZOMBEE-STOOGEZ) as ***GREAT SATAN*** ANTI-CHRIST ***ZIO-JOO***-DEVIL-EVIL-MAMMON-SATANISTS taking over (eventually) as the ruling authoritarian / autocratic / despotic / totalitarian / dictatorial oligarchy from Christians (this ***ZIO-JOO-*** takeover was largely up to fully ***ZIO-JOO***-completed in the economic sphere by the end of the 19th century, in the political sphere from the end of ***ZIO***-WW2 (***ZIO***-USA) and culturally by circa ***ZIO***-1980/2000 after the ***ZIO-JOO***-cultural revolution of the ***ZIO***-1960s/1970s (***ZIO***-USA)).

[453] Hobbes (all are naturally foes), Locke (all are naturally there/here) (both mainly of the 17th century) and Rousseau (all are naturally friends) (18th century) are the most famous examples here.

and hence sanctified, was a contemporary social-political desideratum (/ contemporary socio-political demands were projected inside of the beginnings of societies and thus sanctified). Against anthropological perceptions, which were supposed to support, prop up, bolster, reinforce the differences of estate (/ social distinctions of societas civilis), it was asserted, stressed, moreover / in addition, in the 17th and 18th century, that natural (pre)dispositions, talents, aptitudes, gifts, tendencies, origins and feelings do not (essentially, substantially, substantively) differ (very much) from (hu)man to (hu)man. In these early and fundamentally polemical delimitations, demarcations, attacks against/from the ideology and praxis of societas civilis, logically seen / from a logical point of view at least, demands, which we, somewhat prematurely / in anticipation of developments, may, can call both liberal as well as democratic[454], were latent / inserted / stuck / put. In any case, out of / from the content-related and language-related/linguistic intensifications, exacerbations, escalations (kinds of worsening, sharpening) of these demarcations, delimitations, attacks, the germs, shoots, sprouts, embryos, seeds, buds of democratic thought resulted. This, nonetheless, came into awareness/consciousness only later, and indeed for the simple reason because/that it seemed to be completely incomprehensible, ungraspable that in the imagination of early liberalism one could take democratic principles at their word / literally or that one could give, ascribe to one's own liberal principles a democratic meaning. It was, of course, self-evident that all men / humans were free and equal[455] – it was, however, no less self-evident as well that the head of the household, landlord, master, householder had rights which (to) the (house) servant (manservant) was (were) not allowed to and could not have (be granted). This can be found to be strange, odd, unusual, curious, paradoxical only by/to someone who regards/considers

[454] Always in terms of the social whole, and never in relation to polity, except as ideology.
[455] When they are, as a matter of praxis, never free and equal in absolute terms, but only relatively, i.e. in comparison/relation to some other state of being.

today's / present-day (thought (intellectual)) habits (of thought) as supra-historical categories and is furthermore little, slightly familiar with the historical use and fate, lot, destiny of concepts[456]. It suffices, concerning / regarding this, to be reminded / remind ourselves that the concept "populus" for centuries exclusively meant the assembled, gathered-together, mustered, convening oikos leaders (heads of (a) household(s), household heads) of societas civilis, and no-one thought in relation to that of characterising the great majority of the population, populace as "the folk (people)".

Even, Still before 1789, liberal warnings of the tyranny[457] of democracy were scattered, dispersed, strewn, spread / thrown around/about loudly / loud and clear (/ Already before 1789, liberals were sporadically heard sounding the alarm in the face of the "tyranny" of democracy), which (warnings) were animated, inspired, excited, made lively, dictated, prescribed, suggested, partly through reminiscences of some phenomena from/out of the English Civil

[456] In other words, mass-democratic ideology is far less realistic in terms of reflecting reality than liberal ideology. The classical reference text for social-political concepts with at least a serious attempt at their scientific analysis, apart from P.K.'s oeuvre, is :
Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe, ***Historisches Lexikon zur politisch-sozialen Sprache in Deutschland***. Hrsg. von Otto Brunner, Werner Conze und Reinhart Koselleck, 1972 - 1997, Bände 1 – 8, all three of whom were up to well-known personally by P.K..

[457] Stricto sensu, "tyranny" or "dictatorship" occurs when the nominal head of state is a "tyrant" or "dictator", i.e. leads an authoritarian / autocratic / despotic oligarchic government ***as all governments are***, no matter what the in front of the curtain and behind the curtain games and freak shows / circuses are, including no matter what the ideological rhetoric is, from the democracy of the demos of the Greco-Roman worlds with their oikoi / great households and household heads, clans (great families), relative racial and religious homogeneity, patriarchy etc. to the ***ZIO-JOO***-ANTI-CHRIST-SATANOCRACIES or DEMONOCRACIES of the mass, atomised, (post-) industrial and technicised worlds (of increased social mobility and a refined division of labour), in which ***JOOZ*** with their ***ZIO-JOO***-ZOMBEE-STOOGES ***grossly disproportionately and vastly asymmetrically*** rule the economy, the state and culture. In rhetoric and ideology, however, "tyranny" etc. is whatever the megaphone says it is.

War[458], partly through the coming into being/appearance of a democratic[459] (pertaining to contract theory and utopian) political literature. The contrast /

[458] 22 Aug 1642 – 3 Sept 1651. Cf. Peace of Westphalia, European settlements of 1648, which brought to an end the Eighty Years' War between Spain and the Dutch and the German phase of the Thirty Years' War. The peace was negotiated, from 1644, in the Westphalian towns of Münster and Osnabrück. The Spanish-Dutch treaty known as "The Treaty of Westphalia" was signed on January 30, 1648. The Treaty of Westphalia granted religious tolerance to Lutherans and Calvinists in the Holy Roman Empire. It recognized Dutch independence, gave to France the provinces of Alsace and Lorraine, and ended the Thirty Years' War. In international law, the concept of Westphalian sovereignty, sometimes known as state sovereignty, refers to the premise that each state possesses exclusive sovereignty over the territory that it controls. The said treaty symbolises the end of the Greco-Roman-Italian world and the notion of "Rome" in the "West" which Eastern orthodoxy sees as residing as The Third Rome in Moscow/Russia "and there'll never be another". At the end of the 15th century (after the Fall of Constantinople in 1453), the emergence of the idea that Moscow is truly a new Rome can be found; the whole idea of Moscow as third Rome could be traced as early as 1492, when Metropolitan of Moscow Zosimus expressed it. Metropolitan Zosima, in a foreword to his work of 1492 Presentation of the Paschalion (Russian: "Изложение пасхалии"), quite clearly expressed it, calling Ivan III "the new Tsar Constantine of the new city of Constantine — Moscow." This idea is best known in the presentation of the monk Philotheus of the early 16th century: "***So know, pious king, that all the Christian kingdoms came to an end and came together in a single kingdom of yours, two Romes have fallen, the third stands, and there will be no fourth. No one shall replace your Christian Tsardom according to the great Theologian*** [cf. Revelation 17:10 = ***οἱ πέντε*** [βασιλεῖς] ***ἔπεσαν, ὁ εἷς ἔστιν, ὁ ἄλλος οὔπω ἦλθεν, καὶ ὅταν ἔλθῃ ὀλίγον αὐτὸν δεῖ μεῖναι*** [+ ***JOOZ*** = ***τὸ θηρίον ... εἰς ἀπώλειαν ὑπάγει*** (17:11)]". The Moscow scholars explained the fall of Constantinople as the divine punishment for the sin of the Union with the Catholic Church, but they did not want to obey the Patriarch of Constantinople, although there were no unionist patriarchs since the Turkish conquest in 1453 and the first Patriarch since then, Gennadius Scholarius, was the leader of the anti-unionists. At the next synod, held in Constantinople in 1484, the Union was finally declared invalid. Having lost its Christian basileus after the Turkish conquest, Constantinople as a center of power lost a significant part of its authority. On the contrary, the Moscow rulers soon began to consider themselves real Tsars (this title was already used by Ivan III (22 January 1440 – 27 October 1505), also known as Ivan the Great was Grand Prince of Moscow and all Russia from 1462 until his death in 1505), and therefore according to them the center of the Eastern Orthodox Church should have been located in Moscow, and thus the bishop of Moscow should become the head of the Orthodoxy. The text of the bishop's oath in Muscovy, edited in 1505–1511, condemned the ordination of metropolitans in Constantinople, calling it "the ordination in the area of godless Turks, by the pagan[a] tsar." Stirrings of this sentiment began during the reign of Ivan III of Russia, who styled himself Czar (cf. Caesar), who had married Sophia Paleologue. Sophia was a niece of Constantine XI, the last Byzantine emperor. By the rules and laws of inheritance followed by most European monarchies of the time, Ivan could claim that he and his offspring were heirs of the fallen empire, but the Roman traditions of the empire had never recognized automatic inheritance of the Imperial office. … Obviously, with the rise to "the most powerful power(s) in the world" of ***ZIO***-ANGLO-ET AL.-***JOO***-***M-C-M***-capitalism/imperialism/Satanism in the (18th,) 19th century and first half of the 20th century, interest in usurping classical Greece and Rome was up to very high, and even today, notwithstanding the totally ludicrous association of ancient Greece and Rome with "whiteness" by ***ZIO***-ANGLO-ET AL.-***JOO***-(NEO)-NAZIS/WHITE NATIONALISTS, there are still e.g. movies of mass appeal about some kind of Anglo-Saxon !!! ***ZIO-***ANGLO-***JOO*** !!! "Gladiator" !!! In other words, notions of "democracy" in the "West" outside of the Greco-Roman-Italian worlds until the 17th century (and 19th century under the Ottomans), had as their reference points for Anglo-Saxons, ***JOOZ*** and the like, the English Civil War, utopia, contract theory, liberalism ("liberty" and the individual, without an ideal of economic equality and legally enshrined equality for everyone), Westphalian Sovereignty, The French Revolution (5 May 1789 – 9 Nov 1799; see P.K.'s text below, as well as fusing with the **novum** of the Industrial Revolution (from circa 1800) and massification, the overcoming of the shortage of goods and a right to participate in the ideal of material equality etc. and legal equality, also cf. Tocqueville's (29 July 1805 – 16 April 1859) "Democracy in America" (*De la démocratie en Amérique*; published in two volumes, the first in 1835 and the second in 1840)), and not the highly classist, legally hierarchical, patriarchal and relatively racially Greek/Roman/Italian (not Anglo-Saxon, German, and certainly not ***JOO***!!!)-religiously homogeneous demos of the Greco-Roman-Italian worlds and or the variations thereof, even though Tocqueville's understanding of democracy as pertaining to the social whole was still much closer to the classical world (notwithstanding its highly transitional relevance from liberalism to mass democracy, incl. increasing social mobility and the further refining of the division of labour), as were the Founding Fathers with their liberal constitutionalism, than the ***ZIO-JOO***-FREAK SHOW which eventuated with the **novum** of hyper-

opposition between the liberal-bourgeois and the democratic positioning took a tangible, palpable form during the French Revolution when democrats demanded, called for (asked from the government) a(n administrative) regulation (regimentation) of economic life (by the government (administration)) for the sake / benefit of the possessionless / dispossessed, but without in all cases or across the board / all along the line demanding the abolition of private property (ownership)[460]. This constituted an indication (of the fact) that the opposing fronts were not still entirely, completely clear. For that to happen, the mighty, powerful, formidable rise or victory of bourgeois liberalism was needed after 1830[461], which from the start, beginning was accompanied by the long shadow of the uprisings of the (becoming) ever more numerous fourth estate / "fourth estate"[462], which was becoming all the (more and) more numerous. The great theoretical confrontation, dispute, altercation, controversy, contention, contest(ation), clash, contradistinction between liberalism and democracy took place in precisely this period of time[463], and

---

technicised mass democracy from circa 1900, where ***JOOZ*** ***grossly disproportionately and vastly asymmetrically*** rule the economy, the state and culture and everyone else is either a ***ZIO-JOO***-ZOMBEE-STOOGE and or "can't do anything about it", even though we all have "a right to vote", "freedom of expression", "the right to private property" etc..

[459] Obviously, in the sense understood at the time of the said literature, pertaining to contract theory and utopia (which has absolutely nothing to do with democracy and its variations in ancient Greece/Rome).

[460] It should be noted that throughout the 19th century "democracy" was often synonymous with "radical / social democracy" or "communism".

[461] The **French Revolution of 1830**, also known as the **July Revolution** (French: *révolution de Juillet*), **Second French Revolution**, or ***Trois Glorieuses*** ("Three Glorious [Days]"), was a second French Revolution after the first in 1789. It led to the overthrow of King Charles X, the French Bourbon monarch, and the ascent of his cousin Louis Philippe, Duke of Orléans. After 18 precarious years on the throne, Louis-Philippe was overthrown in the French Revolution of 1848. The 1830 Revolution marked a shift from one constitutional monarchy, under the restored House of Bourbon, to another, the July Monarchy; the transition of power from the House of Bourbon to its cadet branch, the House of Orléans; and the replacement of the principle of hereditary right by that of popular sovereignty (**CAUTION WITH HOW YOOZ UNDERSTAND THAT TERM !!! (CLOO : POPULAR HERE IS THE "IN DA MONEY" LIBERAL BOURGEOISIE INCLUSIVE OF DA *JOO***). Supporters of the Bourbons would be called Legitimists, and supporters of Louis Philippe were known as Orléanists. In addition, there continued to be Bonapartists supporting the return of Napoleon's descendants.

[462] The pre***ss*** (incl. ***JOOZ***), but the indigenous proletariat / industrial working class was also quite "on the move" in this period, including under ***da JOO*** as the "natural leader" of "the proletarians of the world".

[463] The time when the ***JOOZ*** as THE ANTI-CHRIST SYNAGAGOUE OF SATAN REPRESENTATIVES OF ***GREAT SATAN*** were actively seeking to fuck over all of formerly Christian society of "the West" with all sorts of social change, economic, industrial, way-of-life, intellectual-ideological, legal-state, political, technological etc. change, so that up to everyone could be divided and mixed up with up to everyone, including on a world-wide scale, and so the ***JOOZ*** as a primitive secret society (mafia) and savage tribe of incestual, hyper-conspiratorial, rat-tunnel criminals could "master race, rule the world".

already, still before the end of the 19th century, brought to light all those arguments which since then and until today have been used by both sides in various modifications (variations, adaptations)[464]. In the course of this, it became clear that the liberals by no means wanted to understand and defend individualism in the sense that it would imply a widening of formal (form-related) equality and its conversion, transformation into material equality[465]. For its polemic(s), as well as for the character (physiognomy) of bourgeois liberalism in general, the following double(-sided), two-sided position was characteristic: on the one hand, they (i.e. the liberals) complained of, lamented, bemoaned the growing threat to the individual not by (estate-based) ties, bonds(, which his social class imposed), but rather by the anonymous and amorphous mass; on the other hand, they were outraged, angered, scandalised, incensed by / they were indignant in respect of / they resented the increasing, growing, advancing atomisation of society (/ segmentation, fragmentation, breaking up of society into individuals), from (out of) which individuals obviously emerged,

---

[464] As mentioned previously, during the ***ZIO***-Cold War, "liberalism" and "democracy" became the absolutely non-sensical, from a scientific point of view, "liberal democracy", in order to combat communist (and less so, fascist) "totalitarianism", when all forms of government are one of the many forms of authoritarian, autocratic, despotic oligarchy, "tyranny", "dictatorship", "totalitarianism", with "liberal democracy" equating a ***ZIO-JOO***-in front of the curtain FREAK SHOW of hedonistic and consumerist degeneracy, i.e. individual relative freedoms of up to ultra-loose morals, with freedom in general (which doesn't exist, everyone to some degree at least is restricted by nature and other people), along with still massive wealth disparities, but this time with up to everyone as ***ZIO-JOO***-ZOMBIE-STOOGES UNDER ***ZIO-JOO***-PAVLOV'S DOG STIMULUS-REACTION FULL-SPECTRUM ***ZIO***-LOBOTOMISATION-CREATION OF "NEEDS"-BRAIN WASHING at least sampling hedonistic consumption, as re-interpreted "liberalism", whilst "democracy" became equated with elections, a welfare state of access to hedonistic consumption for up to everyone based on ***ZIO-***USA-imperialism / the ***ZIO***-USA-***JOO***-DAS-petro-dollar and a justice "system" (even though democracy (see footnotes 458, 457, 449, 439, 435 etc., above) has nothing of essence to do with that), whilst ***JOOZ grossly disproportionately and vastly asymmetrically*** control (**KONTROL**) the economy, the state and culture, so the societal results that ***JOOZ*** want eventually come about as "Progress", even with delays because of "Reaction" (one or two steps back, but three steps forward), and hence today people think it is "normal" for ***JOOZ*** to rule them as the ANTI-CHRIST ***GREAT SATAN*** SYNAGOGUE OF SATAN with all their ***ZIO-JOO***-filth of pornography, sterility for everyone except for ***JOOZ***, abortions, contraception, prostitution, poofters, lesbians, trans-freaks, drugs, pills, electronic and other games, constant ***ZIO-JOO***-BRAIN-WASHING-FULL-SPECTRUM-***ZIO***-LOBOTOMISATION and worship of the ***TOTAL FILTH*** of the ***ZIO-JOO***-SHIT-SKATA-EXCREMENT-FAECES-MONKEY-APE-PITHICUS-FREAK SHOW-VOMIT-DIARRHOEA-KOST – "***NOT ONLY DO WE GAS OURSELVES AND YOU PAY THE COST, BUT YOU CAN'T EVEN QUESTION US ABOUT IT***" !!!

[465] Which mass democracy under ***JOOZ*** and the relative wealth and wealth-extraction power of ***ZIO***-USA and (more so previously) ***ZIO-JOO***-ROPEAN imperialisms from circa ***ZIO***-1900 actually did, at least up to fully ideologically, if only partially in practice. Remember, ideal-typical analysis always includes the ideals and the ideological positionings of the actors concerned.

came forth (were created) who did not correspond with the bourgeois (re)presentation, conception, notion, perception of the individual[466]. From / Out of (all of) that, it had to follow (/ the conclusion necessarily arose / was drawn) that not all individuals, because (on the basis, by virtue) of / with the only criterion their property, quality, characteristic as physical individuals, (could automatically) fit(ted) into the bourgeois concept(ual plan) of individualism – otherwise (/ if that were possible, then) the grievances, complaints, charges, accusations against the atomisation of society would be nonsensical, absurd, pointless –, but only such individuals who possessed certain material or intellectual-spiritual preconditions, prerequisites, presuppositions, and over and above that, found a home (resided) in / were native to the bourgeois family or in / to other institutions. Advocacy for / in favour of the rights of the individual as a whole person against the impersonal mass linked, associated, connected, joined, therefore, expressly or implicitly, with the concept of the person, a whole series of factors, upon which social hierarchy rested / was based, so that opposition to atomisation amounted to a/the defence (plea(ding)) (in favour) of the social hierarchisation of individuals. Of course, there could not by talk any longer / more of a hierarchisation in accordance with the measures, criteria, yardsticks, benchmarks of societas civilis. Hence, the immanent logical difficulties of the liberal position as soon as it was a matter of the proof of / proving / showing what were the limits, boundaries of equality. The difference between spiritual-intellectual endowment(s) / talent(s) / gifts / aptitude(s) and merit, ability, prowess, competence, efficiency could be given, stated, specified as the only, single, sole anthropological justification, giving reasons for, substantiation of inequality, however, the/this argument stumbled over (the) everyday, daily experience, which knows no precise, exact, accurate, and often also no approximate / approximative correspondence between the social

[466] And that "kind of thing" continued in the Krazy Man's case up until today !!!

position and the personal merits, assets, virtues, attributes, traits, characteristics, qualities, properties of the individual, and furthermore, it could be reinterpreted in the sense of (the) democratic thought / perception (in respect) of (about) the elite. Because out of / from the ascertainment regarding the inequality of talents, virtues, assets, merits and of performances, achievements, accomplishments, efforts, results, no legitimation of the dominance of a whole / an entire class can be derived, deduced, since (the) talents, virtues, assets, merits and (the) performances, achievements, accomplishments, efforts, results are connected with concrete, specific transient, transitory, ephemeral, fleeting, evanescent, perishable individuals; on the basis of / with such criteria, only the dominance, rule, dominant authority of an elite is thinkable, conceivable, imaginable, whose composition would constantly change – and exactly, precisely in order to achieve (for) pure meritocracy (to prevail) (/ in order for the prevailing, predominance of pure meritocracy to be achieved), one was supposed to / had to take away from the individual all (of the marching gear, field pack (kit) which) / that did not have anything to do / interrelate / was not connected with talent and performance (merit and achievement, accomplishment, effort), i.e. all advantages, benefits which an individual accrues, enjoys because / on account of his belonging to a certain group or class. But precisely such an endeavour would have to / necessarily have as a consequence the total, complete atomisation of society (/ segmentation, fragmentation, breaking up of society into individuals)[467].

[467] In other words, the bourgeois liberals and their "rights of man" as between "equals" had as their already nearly dead foe the remnants of the elites of societas civilis, but in the age of the Industrial Revolution and complete societal ***ZIO-JOO***-mammonisation-money-fication-commodification-***ZIO-JOO***-PRE***SS***-MEGAPHONES-heightened social mobility-massification-atomisation-etc., etc., etc., got tangled up in "further developments", which exposed them as weak, both in argument and spirit/fighting power, against the real-deal foe in ***da JOO***, who was able to "ride the wave" of "full equality" bullshit, whilst keeping himself as part of a privileged ***ZIO-JOO*** "rule the world, master race", which through atomisation, division and lobotomisation / brain washing was able to kid up to everyone into thinking it's "ok" to be ruled by SYNAGOGUE OF SATAN, ***GREAT SATAN***, ANTI-CHRIST, DEVIL-EVIL ***JOOZ***, who, always with their very many ***ZIO-JOO***-ZOMBEE-STOOGEZ, preach "equality", "democracy", "human rights", "freedom" etc., when none of that applies as a whole or at all, especially since it is of the ***GREAT SATAN*** ANTI-CHRIST, seeking to increase ***ZIO-JOO***-group power and CONTROL (**KONTROL**) over non-***JOOZ***.

This aspect of the problem points (alludes) to (indicates, abuts) already (with) the endeavour of the democrats[468] to reinterpret the bourgeois-liberal topos (i.e. commonplace, formula, schema) of individualism in such a manner that from / out of the individualistic principle (principle of individualism), an ideal of material equality would have to / necessarily result, arise, emerge. In the course of this / In order for that to happen, the individual is separated from substance-related ties, bonds, kinds of binding and social prerequisites, presuppositions, preconditions as far as possible, because it is assumed, accepted, considered that exactly, precisely these factors (substance-related ties, bonds, kinds of binding and social prerequisites, presuppositions, preconditions) do not allow one's (most) own (most inner, innermost) personal core to unfold (and develop)[469]. In their detachment (/ When they are detached) from such bonds, ties, kinds of binding and prerequisites, presuppositions, preconditions, (the) individuals are exchangeable, interchangeable, or, in other words / said otherwise, all social roles stand/are open in principle for all individuals. Against this latter formulation, a liberal would have no objection (/ A liberal would also accept this formulation), but in this case the essential difference with regard to the democratic perception would then lie / be found in two points[470]. First, since / whilst the liberal accepts the substance-related ties, bonds and social prerequisites, presuppositions of the individual, and in fact the individual is recognised as a full (fully fledged (adequate)) person only against this

[468] To repeat the obvious, "democrats" as the historical actors understood themselves in relation to ideal-typical analysis, which always includes ideological ideals, has absolutely nothing to do of essence with the democracy of Greece and the Greco-Roman worlds, based on a ***pre-modern demos*** and not on a ***(post-)modern mass***. Also, see many footnotes, above.

[469] There is no innermost personal core. All humans are subject to human rationality (false consciousness / ideology, belief, the capacity for basic scientific description), the drive of self-preservation and the extension of one's own power, regardless of whether they kill and or sacrifice themselves or not, and all normative values are relative and not inherent in anyone or anything. This means that everyone and everything can be de-constructed, not just "everyone" and "everything" except for the ***JOOZ*** (**JEWS**) and the ***ZIO-JOO***-ANTI-CHRIST-***GREAT SATAN*** SYNAGOGUE OF SATAN, who want to rule everyone as a "master race", and won't allow, along with their many ***ZIO-JOO***-ZOMBEE-STOOGEZ, the truth as all relevant FACTS to be told about them, i.e the ***JOOZ*** (**JEWS**).

[470] As we can see from this discussion, a liberal, as far as scientific observation is concerned, has absolutely nothing to do with all the ***ZIO-JOO***-LED degeneracy of HYPER-TECHNICISED HEDONISMUS-KONZUM of FULLY ***ZIO***-ED mass democracy.

background / on this basis, then he must cede, assign, convey, give way to certain individuals in the struggle for the occupation of social roles a factual – not formal, form-related – lead, precedence; this lead/precedence is seen, viewed indeed as / considered to indeed be, on occasion / sometimes, lamentable (sad), yet, in any event/case, an unavoidable, inevitable (given) fact, which, nevertheless, can be made up (atoned) for / remedied, redressed, repaired, made good, rectified through / by means of particular, especial merit, ability, prowess, competence, efficiency and some luck[471]. However, for its (i.e. the said unavoidable fact's) putting (setting) aside / to eliminate, neutralise, defuse this fact – and this is / here lies, rests the second point – no institutional or dirigiste, administrative measures are permitted to be taken, but things must take their course in the certainty that the invisible hand will (probably, absolutely, no doubt, surely) find the socially most useful, beneficial, utilitarian and most viable, stable solution[472]. On the contrary, in relation to that, in the world of democratic ideas / democratic thought(s)/intellectual world, the new understanding, perception (in respect) of the individual and of individualism goes together with / accompanies the demand, requirement that society, or else the state, is allowed, may and should, ought to intervene (interfere, interpose itself), in order to ensure / make sure that all social roles are (f)actually, and not merely formally / nominally / as a formality / perfunctorily, accessible to all individuals[473]. It is obvious that the new definition / determination of individualism and the new definition / determination of the duties, tasks, obligations of society, or else of the state, are most closely, tightly, narrowly

[471] That's exactly how things "work" in the "meritocratic West" today (and yesterday and tomorrow). If you are not a ***JOO*** (**JEW**), then you can only get in amongst the ***JOOZ*** (**JEWS**) within "Western" elites if you either work your arse off for the ***JOO*** (**JEW**) and or are of use (utility) to the ***JOO*** (**JEW**).

[472] During the ***ZIO***-Cold War, all the ***ZIO-JOO***-BULLSHIT about "free markets" and "invisible hands" etc. was just another ***ZIO-JOO***-FREAK SHOW to cover the FACT that ***ZIO***-USA was the strongest and most efficient Great Power at Robbery and Exploiting others, with up to massive state intervention in up to all facets of life, incl. the economy.

[473] In practice, of course, everyone in one way or another is ***JOO***-ED in the "West", given that the ***JOOZ*** (**JEWS**) ***grossly disproportionately and vastly asymmetrically*** CONTROL (**KONTROL**) up to everything.

interrelated, (inter)connected. Because these tasks, duties are supposed to consist exactly in the detachment of individuals from their substance-related ties, bonds, kinds of bonding and their social prerequisites, preconditions, presuppositions, in order to restore, manufacture, make, produce, fabricate that equality materially / on a material basis as between them, which could / can only be formal / form-related as long as that detachment does not take place / occur / is not carried out[474]. The liberals called this, on the one hand, the uprooting (deracination, extirpation, eradication, extermination) of the individual, the narrowing (constriction, contraction, shrinking) of (the) personality and the atomisation of the social Whole (/ the segmentation, fragmentation, breaking up of the social Whole into individuals), on the other hand, the restriction / limitation of concrete freedom for the sake / in favour of an abstract equality and the bureaucratisation or mechanisation of soci(et)al life (/ and the conversion of social life into a bureaucratic machine); for the democrats, this same process meant / means, on the one hand, a freeing (emancipation, liberation, deliverance, releasing) of the individual from the fetters of heteronomy (the authoritarian (autocratic) family etc. etc.) and the acquisition, attainment, obtainment of true self-sufficiency (self-reliance, independence, autonomy), on the other hand, the institutional guarantee for the fact that the self-sufficient, self-reliant, independent, autonomous individual can unfold and develop on the basis of the same preconditions, prerequisites, presuppositions as all (the) other individuals[475]. In the democratic concept(ual plan), perception, therefore, paradoxically, but logically, the radicalisation of individualism and the demand for the organised protection of individuals go

[474] Even if in reality there are still up to massive differences in personal wealth, a whole host of dependencies etc., the fact that every individual in mass democracy has at least ***the possibility*** of being "his own (wo)man/it" financially is, from the ideal type's point of view of macro-historical comparison, a novum and a *differentia specifica* of mass democracy.

[475] Again, the up to massive inequalities of reality (incl. ***ZIO-JOO***-group-SUPREMACY-RACISM-BIGOTRY-CHAUVINISM-PREJUDICE-BIAS-PRIVILEGE AND HATE) is not the point here, but rather the programmatic-ideological and rhetorical fundamental life stances, and in part at least practices, of individuals and groups of individuals in mass democracy.

hand in hand. Now, the effective institutional safeguarding (fortification) of individualism does not merely / simply mean the formal / form-related safeguarding (fortification) of the chance, opportunity to acquire, attain, obtain something through one's own activity (doing, deed(s)), which others already have, but to (legally) have (by way of right) as much as possible of that which is supposed to be possessed by everyone[476]. The social-ethical principle (/ principle of social ethics), according to which society is obliged (bound, liable) / has a duty (vis-à-vis the individual) to provide certain services and goods (to the individual), is transformed (converted), in the end / finally, into the thesis that the aim, objective, end of the individual (placed, put, set) on his own (/ the self-sufficient, self-reliant, independent, autonomous individual) is self-actualisation, self-realisation, for which society should at least provide the most important prerequisites, preconditions (/ in relation to which society should make available, have at his disposal at least the most important presuppositions for the achievement of that aim, objective). Whatever begins, commences, starts as ethically motivated social welfare (care), consequently ends (up) in individualistic hedonism (cf. sec. 3 of this chapter)[477].

Liberalism was (well-)known from time immemorial (i.e. from its beginnings) as the stronghold, bastion, bulwark, fort, refuge of "individualism", and accordingly / because of that, the democratic reinterpretation or else / and radicalisation of this latter (individualism) continued to be called "liberalism" in the interest(s) of the attainment, achievement of material equality, (a thing) which gave (provided, supplied, furnished) it (i.e. the said democratic

[476] That' why the ***JOOZ*** through their mass means of ***ZIO-JOO***-propaganda-BRAIN WASHING talk about "the cost of living crisis" in "the West", and not about the fact that ***ZIO-JOO***-capitalism-imperialism is not and won't be paying the dividends as a "system" of international ***ZIO-JOO***-robbery anymore unless ***ZIO***-USA can conquer and place under control (**KONTROL**) Russia, and eventually China too.

[477] Of course, all of this ***ZIO-JOO***-led degeneracy of abnormality (sterility and homosexuality and the Other and drugs and porn etc.) becoming "normal" could have occurred only based on the relative strength of the ***ZIO***-USA imperium to "suck up", rob and exploit the world's physical and human, incl. intellectual, resources, as well as turning all of "the West" into its image, but at a subservient level, whilst greatly influencing through geo-political competition and or imposition etc. the culture (as pertaining to the social Whole, and not necessarily in relation to all aspects of the said degeneracy) in and of China, Russia, "the Third World" as well.

reinterpretation and radicalisation of liberalism) (with) a double political-tactical advantage: it forced / compelled / coerced the liberals of pure/clean water (i.e. the pure, authentic, genuine, old-school, die-hard, orthodox liberals (circa 1900 with roots going back to around the 16th century)) into an ideological and moral dilemma (tug-of-war, catch-22, double mill), and at the same time it could distance itself (separate its position) from the nightmare, bogeyman, bugaboo of socialistic collectivism. This democratic or left(-wing) or social liberalism – as one wants (to call it) / (call it) as you like / as one wishes (to call it) – could / was allowed in fact to assert for itself more "liberality" than (the) orthodox liberalism to the extent that this latter (orthodox liberalism), to defend against / to oppose, resist the social state etc. sometimes / on occasion flirted, toyed with / had an eye on authoritarian solutions, that is, in extremis it was ready, prepared / showed a willingness to sacrifice political liberalism in part or completely, wholly, totally on the altar of economic liberalism[478]. Despite all the (terminological) overlaps, kinds of covering over or confusions, perplexities (at the level of terminology), the objective, factual contrast, opposition between both liberalisms came into consciousness already early on, especially since the accents, emphases, stresses were set, placed, put essentially differently on each respective occasion (/, indeed, the emphasis

[478] It goes without saying that the terminology here is a product of ideal-typical analysis at a particular level of analysis, which includes ideology, ideals, the ways actors see themselves and their foes etc.. Only between two ideological and normative positions is the antithesis "authoritarian" and "non-authoritarian" or "free" etc. possible, or is political liberalism separated from economic liberalism or social (democratic, left-wing) liberalism (not with "social" pertaining to the social whole, but to life stances and practices involving access to goods, services, sex, recreation, consumption, hedonism and the like), or orthodox / classical liberalism is distinguished from a latter / current understanding of liberalism. At the strictly scientific level of analysis of the concept of liberalism, without taking into account how actors understand themselves e.g. in rhetorically using the term "liberalism" in a mass-democratic society / context, liberalism is a social formation / social whole distinguished from societas civilis and mass democracy, which is the only social formation based on the general overcoming of the scarcity of goods (see *passim*, above), and there is no form of governance which is not in some way authoritarian, despotic, binding, autocratic, "dictatorial, tyrannical, totalitarian" etc.. P.K. never explicitly wrote that democracy as a polity / form of governance is not compatible, except as ideology, with mass democracy as a social whole (the *demos* is totally different to the (post-)modern *mass*), because that would have put him directly in the line of fire of ***ZIO***-USA (***ZIO***-GERMAN PIG-***JOO***-ROPA CHANNEL) ideology, which didn't do him much good eventually, because the ***JOOZ*** "got rid of him" by way of "medical error" before his 56th year on this earth. And I only go "on and on and on" coz I have Kyr' Aggelo et al.'s protection to the extent that, and for as long as, I have it.

differed substantially). (Generally,) It/it can be ascertained (in general) that classical liberalism is accustomed to / is in the habit of leaving / usually bestows, reposits, places the function(ing) of society upon/to the guiding force of the invisible hand, whereby / in relation to which the needs and the wishes of man are judged, evaluated pragmatically and not, first and foremost / first of all / in the first place, morally: people / humans naturally strive after that which they regard as / hold to be their interest, and out of / from the unavoidable intersection, crossing of their endeavours with (regard to) one another, the great resultant results, ensues, emerges, i.e. the equilibrium which is produced, fabricated, manufactured, made, created without consideration for individual well-being, welfare and woe, ache (/ the individual fate, luck of people); morality, ethics is here mainly, principally the/a matter, cause, thing of the individual, and not the measure, benchmark, yardstick, criterion, guide according to / in accordance with which society as a whole should direct its activity[479]. On the contrary, in relation to that, democratic liberalism[480] already since its beginnings is characterised by the tendency to evaluate, judge society as a whole in accordance with moral criteria and to question in regard to that / ask about that/such moral criteria whether it does justice to / is in line / corresponds / accords with the dignity of the individual person. Individualism is, accordingly, correspondingly, radicalised by (, commencing with) ethics[481], in other words it (i.e. individualism) is based on the rights (/ rights are put

[479] The social-ethical component lacking in liberalism is a feature of both societas civilis and mass democracy, but the content is totally different: the former values the spirit and eternal life, whilst the latter values material hedonism and consumption. And only liberalism separates public and private, to the extent it did that (at least in the ideal type), whilst societas civilis and mass democracy, so to speak, "want to know what's going on in the bedroom", the former from the point of view of the Christian concept of Sin, the latter (at least at the level of the ***ZIO***-ANTI-CHRIST-***GREAT SATAN***-MASS MEDIA, if not legally) from the point of view of ***ZIO-JOO***-ANTI-CHRIST-"SIN IS A RIGHT"-***JOO***-DAS-DEVIL-EVIL-SATANISM.

[480] The case of conservatism before and after 1789 is different to "classical liberalism" vis-à-vis "democratic liberalism". In the case of conservatism, the foe in both instances remained the classical liberal, albeit the conservative post-1789 was interested less in feudalism and more in the last of the feudal privileges since liberalism had generally taken hold of society after (and before) 1789, whereas in the case of liberalism, only "classical liberalism" has a mass-democratic foe, not "democratic liberalism", which is just another way to say mass democracy or "well on the way / road to" mass democracy.

[481] Ethics from the scientific point of view means the "rights" and values under the ANTI-CHRIST, ***ZIO-JOO-***DEVIL-EVIL-***GREAT SATAN***, just as much as morality and Sin under Christianity etc..

forward, given priority) which are supposed to / should be inherent in the person as a person (/ the person as a person is considered to have), whereby / in relation to which the person as an individual is regarded as an end-in-itself, which society has (is obliged) to serve; commonplaces pertaining to natural rights, which cropped up, appeared in the ideological arsenal of liberalism very early (on)[482], are now interpreted as commands of humanistic solidarity. Nonetheless, the paradox occurred / was observed that democratic "liberalism", despite / notwithstanding all of its ethical fundamental positioning, not least of all under the influence of socialistic ideas, increasingly argued sociologically in order to underpin, support, substantiate, back up its political and social demands (/ more and more supported, rested, based its political and social demands on sociological arguments), whereby / in relation to which the same human person, whose main attribute (ontological predicate) is supposed to be / regarded as dignity, is comprehended, presented in the same breath / simultaneously as a product lacking (without) will (weak-willed, feckless product) of "objective factors". This logical leap / leap in logic stemmed from / was due to a polemical necessity, because only from the thesis that man in his present-day constitution is exclusively or for the most part the / a product of his conditions, circumstances in which he lives, can the norm be derived, deduced that the conditions, circumstances ought to be changed so that (a/the) true / "true" man (i.e. man as an ethically inspired (stamped, coined, shaped, minted, moulded, embossed) anthropology describes him[483]) can unfold; it is self-evident for the conditions, circumstances to then be changed (/ as is self-evident, the conditions are obliged to change) so that more equality in the material sense can be attained / achieved. On the other hand / Conversely, the antipathy, discomfort,

[482] E.g. Hugo Grotius (10 April 1583 – 28 August 1645) and Samuel von Pufendorf (8 January 1632 – 26 October 1694.

[483] In other words, only a true believer ***ZIO-JOO***-ZOMBEE-STOOGE or an ANTI-CHRIST-***GREAT SATAN***-DEVIL-EVIL-ZIO-***JOO*** would believe that the "woke programme" is not a construct under ***ZIO-JOO***-POWER AND CONTROL (**KONTROL**) and man's "inevitable destiny" (just like all ethical "programmes or systems" are constructs under all forms of (and not just ***JOO***) CONTROL (**KONTROL**)).

disquiet, unease, uneasiness, discontent of orthodox liberalism towards/vis-à-vis/in regard to such sociological explanations and recipes springs from the wish/desire to emphasise, stress, point out, highlight the autonomy, self-sufficiency, self-reliance, independence of the individual and his action in order to consolidate (strengthen, solidify, cement) the conviction that for the hard-working, efficient, competent, worthy, deserving person, the formal / form-related rights are already enough, sufficient for him to move forward, make headway (progress), progress, advance. In/During the polemically determined (induced) reversal of positions, the liberal[484] must, therefore, now put the sociology of the invisible hand somewhat aside and argue morally. (Generally, anyway,) / In any case, in general, it holds / is the case that the liberal sharp, acute, intense contradistinction between freedom and equality is rather averse to sociological arguments, whereas the democratic entanglement, interconnection, interweaving of both of these magnitudes often invokes (precisely) such arguments.

The liberal antipathy, dislike, aversion against/to(wards)/of sociological argumentation in this special, specific interrelation springs, moreover, from the concern, care for the safeguarding, protection, maintenance of the clean, clear(-cut) form-related, formal separation between public and private, which has to do with the option, selection, choice in favour of formal, and against material, equality, in the sense that the individual as a public person possesses certain rights and chances, opportunities, whilst he as a private person decides what he will make of (/ how he will utilise, make use of) that. The contradistinction, keeping apart, distinguishing between/of the public and of the private aspect of the person from each other is supposed to remove the basis for (the ground from under) (/ intends, aims to weaken) the sociological argument (consideration, reflection, deliberation, thought) that the individual factually surrenders,

[484] The "orthodox" or "classical" liberal, who is the only scientifically (not polemically and in the real world of action) valid liberal.

delivers himself to / is in practice the plaything, toy of the public sphere (publicness), whose shape (form) or else reshaping (reforming, remoulding) is exactly what matters (/ and that the key question is exactly the form or the metamorphosis, transformation of this latter (public sphere))[485]. On the other hand / Conversely, this argument (consideration, reflection, deliberation, thought) gains ground (gravitas, seriousness) / wins (out) in the democratic thought (intellectual) framework to the extent that (the) private (sphere) and (the) public (sphere) are blended, merged, mixed (up) (combined, commingled) with each other, and indeed already because the public sphere (publicness) is supposed to take care of / care about / be interested in some aspect(s) / sides and decision(s) of the person, which in accordance with bourgeois criteria was / were private. If the conditions, terms for the free[486] development (unfolding) of the person are not least of all / first of all sought in material equality, thus it is clear, evident, obvious, apparent, manifest that here neither between the private and public aspect of the person, nor between private and public matters of concern, is a distinction made anymore. If society, on the basis / by reason of its ethical mission, determination, purpose, calling is oblig(at)ed / bound / beholden / liable to take care of the person as a person as comprehensively (extensively, multilaterally) as possible, thus, in the end / finally, the happiness[487] and unhappiness (fortune, luck and misfortune, bad luck) of the individual becomes the measure / criterion / benchmark / yardstick for / in regard to the answering of the question (as to) whether society has completed, fulfilled its task, mission, duty successfully or not. Correspondingly, Accordingly, Analogously, the concept of equality is changed / transformed (too, as well). It is not a matter anymore of (the) same/equal chance /

[485] Even though the technologies have been developed, mass democratic society has not yet moved anywhere near fully to the next stage / a new, as it were, novum, of the post- or meta-human world, which presupposes the complete domination and robot-ification of the planet by and under ***JOOZ***, from the point of view of ***ZIO***-USA.
[486] Obviously, as a relative and ideological magnitude.
[487] Hence, inter alia, all the ***ZIO-JOO***-emphasis on being "gay", commencing, as we've seen in ***ZIO-JOO-***LLYWOOD movies, from before ***ZIO***-WW2. And because in reality many people are not that "gay", there are all the ***ZIO-JOO***-DAS drugs/pills "to keep people's chins up" …

opportunities to obtain (gain, acquire) unequal status (social position) and unequal wealth, but of equality in the result / of outcome, i.e. in pleasure (enjoyment, delight, indulgence, consumption); only in this way / manner, can – in accordance with / according to (the) democratic opinion / mind / perception – the danger, risk, possibility be banished, exorcised, excluded that the descendants of individuals, who (meritocratically) obtained, gained, acquired unequal status and wealth, (will) have a head start / an advantage / precedence, precedency before / vis-à-vis others / other people, and consequently set in motion / start the old vicious circle again (/ setting also again the previous vicious circle)[488]. These are / All of that, of course, (constitutes) extreme projections and perceptions, which have never been realised; simultaneously, however, they constitute guiding (general) principles of (/ perceptions which guide) action – an action, which in this form slightly, little, to a minimum extent corresponds with the liberal understanding of politics[489]. Because here / now democratisation is declared as the permanent task, mission of democracy[490], that is, the liberal constitution is not seen as / considered to be the conclusive determination of the formal/form-related rules of the game, but rather its normatively loaded/charged formulae (formulas) are interpreted as a command for society to be reformed in the democratic sense (in a democratic direction). This action is very often called "liberal"[491], but with that a merely political liberalism is meant, which takes steps for the realisation of material equality,

[488] Of course, under ***ZIO-JOO***-CONTROL (**KONTROL**), the ***JOOZ*** as the ruling oligarchy in "the West" reserve the right ***only to themselves*** to continue as rulers ***from generation to generation*** as INCESTUAL-ORGANISED-HYPER-CRIMINAL-HYPER-CONSPIRATORIAL-RAT-TUNNEL-***ZIO-JOO***-RAT-RODENT-PRIMITIVE SECRET SOCIETY-MAFIA-SAVAGE TRIBE-EXCREMENT-MONKEY-APE-VOMIT-FAECES-SHIT-SKATA-FREAK SHOW-KOST-PARASITES.

[489] Liberalism (in its scientifically sole form of "classical/orthodox" liberalism) was all in favour of the patriarchal family and descent, notwithstanding dandy-like and other (e.g. exotic etc.) tendencies in bourgeois culture, in addition to the separation of the private sphere from the public sphere.

[490] All the "democracy" talk here, above and below, is of course about mass democracy, including as an ideal type, the way the actors see themselves, what is held to be ideal and what actually happens in practice, and always in respect of the ideologisation of ***ZIO-JOO***-ANTI-CHRIST-***GREAT SATAN*** POWER AND CONTROL (**KONTROL**).

[491] Well, they're not going to call it ***ZIO-JOO***-ANTI-CHRIST-GREAT-DEVIL-EVIL-SATANIC, are they?

even if / when this restricts, limits, reduces, restrains, cuts back economic liberalism[492]; in/with this specific sense, the concept of liberalism is used mainly, principally, chiefly because / on account of its pleasant normative connotations; it can, nevertheless, turn directly against the social content of bourgeois liberalism and hardly, barely differs from social-democratic positions[493]. Anti-communist(ic) social democracy, as it had an effect in recent decades in Western Europe[494], can, incidentally, in its fundamental ethical positioning be seen, viewed, looked at, regarded as an important variant of the democratic reinterpretation of liberalism.

Although the liberal critique / criticism of democracy already in the 19th century named, signified (without room for misunderstanding) the controversial, contentious, debatable questions, issues and had worked (carved) out, processed and shown the content-related contrast and opposition between both directions with almost ideal-typical clarity, yet, nevertheless the democratic reinterpretation of liberal commonplaces constantly gained ground. The transition from classical bourgeois liberalism to modern mass democracy has in its broad lines been investigated, researched and is known, yet, nonetheless, however, here we must briefly enter/go into some points which often create, provoke, induce conceptual and historical confusion. First of all, we must distinguish between the, from country to country varying, in the narrower, tighter sense, political (social reasons)(,) and the general social reasons having a long-term effect, which (have/had) paved the way for the aforementioned reinterpretation. The former (political reasons) can be summarised, summed up in the following manner. In the sector of foreign policy, liberalism was obliged, to different extent, degree on each and every respective occasion, to rely upon

---

[492] See footnote 478, above.
[493] Until the end of the ***ZIO***-Cold War, these positions were not as "full-on" in relation to all the ***ZIO-JOO-*** HOMO-GLOBO-GLOBO-HOMO-"I AM WHAT I FEEL"-ETC.-***ZIO-JOO***-ANTI-CHRIST-DEVIL-EVIL-SATANISM, which eventuated after the said period in history.
[494] Until 1991.

alliances with conservative or democratic forces, which in their way, manner and in connection with ones own aims, objectives pertaining to domestic (internal) politics, policy, represented the national idea; the necessity of establishing, introducing, bringing in general, universal conscription (compulsory military service) constituted a tangible piece of evidence for the unavoidability, inevitability of the installation, introduction of democratic elements in the life of modern states, irrespective of how their political and social constitution otherwise looked like / seemed (/ the rest of their political and social texture). In the sector of domestic (internal) politics, policy, liberalism again had to make sure that (/ take measures not to push) the lower strata, and above all the anti-capitalistically adjusted/minded/oriented labour force, working class, (were not pushed) into the arms (bosom) of the conservatives, who, despite all the(ir) disgust, abhorrence, repulsion, aversion, revulsion, loathing for/towards/against the pleb(eian)s, now and then, occasionally launched the thought, idea of (the) general, universal right to vote, suffrage and of social legislation in order to in particular, particularly damage, harm, hurt, injure the liberal industrialists and in order to protect (safeguard, defend, secure, shield) the interests of the great, large landowners, landholders[495]; under this pressure, compulsion, coercion, a wing of liberalism gained the impression that it would in the long run be worthwhile, beneficial to tie (for) the working class, labour force through certain concessions to (be attracted to) the liberal cause (faction)(,) and at the same time to (correspondingly) interpret and present this latter (liberal cause) (in its totality, entirety). Finally, in countries in which the liberal idea for certain reasons from the beginning had received, got, preserved a strong, intense legal moulding,

[495] In the 19th century, but generally quite before 1900, really, true conservatives in the last throes of their existence. But with the ***JOOZ*** and their ***ZIO-JOO***-ZOMBEE STOOGEZ gaining more and more CONTROL (**KONTROL**) of the mass media/culture/the means of brain-washing, the state and the economy, the last of the Christian conservatives by circa 1880-1890 were well and truly finished, even though they still "moved like ghosts" amongst diplomats and in the army etc. into the first half of the 20th century, especially up until circa ***ZIO***-WW1.

imprint, minting, stamp(ing), character(,) and placed in the foreground / stressed (leit)motifs like for instance the rule of law and human rights, a social and democratic reinterpretation of liberalism took place, proceeded, progressed more easily than in others in which liberalism originally, initially and primarily, chiefly had been / was connected with (the) laissez-faire (principle)[496].

Amongst the general and long-term (effective) social reasons (having an effect), which helped, assisted, aided (came to help) the democratic reinterpretation of liberalism, three deserve our particular, special attention. We must, firstly, think about, reflect upon the mechanisation of life and the, with that, spreading (dissemination) of mass consumption, which started with (a) great momentum, impetus (swing, sweep, flourish, verve) around the turn of the century[497]. The machine now penetrates, permeates, infiltrates, forces one's way / breaks / advances into – to a previously unknown and inconceivable (unimaginable, unthinkable) extent – the everyday life of simple working people, and indeed both in the form of the means of transport(ation), as well as in the form of the household appliance[498]; it (i.e. the machine) ceases to be / stops being, primarily an instrument, tool of work, labour and becomes a self-evident (constituent, component) part of (the daily course of) life in general. Simultaneously, a far-reaching, wide-ranging replacement of traditional (artisanal, handcrafted) objects of use / everyday objects (made, constructed in a handcrafted manner) by industrial mass products takes place. These processes, which inspired in the avantgarde foes of the bourgeoisie (/ inimical towards the

[496] Especially (up to circa ***ZIO***-1900/***ZIO***-WW1) the great ***ZIO***-ANGLO-***JOO*** centres of ***ZIO-JOO***-SATANISM-IMPERIALISM, ***ZIO-***Great Britain and ***ZIO***-USA, but also to a lesser extent e,g, ***ZIO***-France, ***ZIO***-Italy and ***ZIO***-Holland as compared to e.g. ***ZIO-***Germany, ***ZIO***-Canada, ***ZIO***-Kangaroo and the ***ZIO***-Scandanavian countries, even though Rule of Law and Human Rights as great ideological "flags" from circa ***ZIO***-WW2 onwards were projected on a world-wide scale on the basis of ***ZIO-***USA power following ***ZIO-***Great Britain power.

[497] I.e. circa 1900, from the 19th to the 20th century.

[498] Electricity plus mechanised transport plus the household appliance plus the mass industrial product is the basis, along with universal mammon-ification and the centralising state, of ***ZIO-JOO***-ANTI-CHRIST-***GREAT SATAN***-DEVIL-EVIL-SATANISM (INCL. FULL-SPECTRUM ***ZIO-JOO***-DAS-LOBOTOMISATION-CREATION OF "NEEDS"-PAVOLV'S DOG STIMULUS/REACION-BRAIN-WASHING), and look where we are at today, only about 100/120 years later.

bourgeois class avantgarde) hymns to the cold spirit of the machine and contributed to the undermining of the bourgeois synthesis between classical and technical education (formation, forming, shaping, culture, acculturation), seemed to provide material proof/evidence (/ tangibly prove) that from now on / henceforth a constant betterment, improvement of the life of the broad masses on a solid basis lay / was (with)in the framework of the possible. The socialists had already earlier posited / posed / considered the development of the productive forces as the/a guarantee for the overcoming (transcendence) of capitalism; "socially" minded / inclined liberals (/ liberals with "social" tendencies), who endeavoured, as they believed, to necessarily adapt / made an effort, as they opined / in accordance with (according to) their opinion, at the necessary adaptation of their doctrine to the new circumstances, conditions, relations, did not want, of course, to go so far (/ up to there (i.e. the overcoming of capitalism)), on the other hand, they ascertained that on the basis of the new possibilities of technique (technology) and industry, (a) real, tangible content could be given to their ethical postulates, demands, requirements, and accordingly, through that, indeed, not capitalism as such, but probably (anyway, perhaps, arguably, surely, no doubt), the most, more inhumane face(t), shape, form of economic liberalism / the liberalism of the economy could be put, set aside. But with the discovery of the dignity, worthiness of (the person of) every individual, the discovery of the lower strata as potential consumers (also) went hand in hand[499]. The new possibilities of production demanded, required new possibilities of sales (selling, vendition), and the looming, emerging, apparent danger, risk of serious crises of over-production could be prevented, precluded only by means of / through an essentially different evaluation, appraisal of the role of the worker, labourer in the overall, total economic process. As / Whilst

[499] So human dignity was no longer a matter of social status and descent, but now becomes a matter of being a hedonistic, self-racist, decadent and degenerate ***ZIO-JOO***-ZOMBEE-STOOGE-consumer, especially once mass production and mass consumption surpassed / developed past its preliminary phase after ***ZIO***-WW2.

the worker, labourer became / turned into a consumer, he gained, achieved, reached, obtained independence, autonomy, self-reliance, self-sufficiency and freedom of decisions, which he never had as a producer[500]. He becomes someone who must be courted, won over and convinced[501], that is, he becomes a person not in the abstract, ethical, but in a very concrete sense. It is no (neither a) coincidence / not by chance and also not (neither) a (vulgar-sociological) construction (of vulgar sociology) that the ethically inspired, stamped, moulded, minted, embossed, shaped democratic reinterpretation of liberalism gained ground in parallel with the technical and economic developments which made out of / from the worker, labourer and the small man / the "common people" in general, generally an at least potential consumer.

Secondly, the worker, labourer had to now be reckoned / taken into account, consideration not only as a consumer of material goods, but also as a political consumer[502]. The time, age, epoch of the penetration, infiltration of industry in everyday, daily life of the masses was at the same time the time, age, epoch of the formation of mass political organisations, which, first of all, initially, was tackled, undertaken by the socialists, and not least of all under the influence of their example became the main organ, instrument of their political activity inside of (the) mass society democratising itself / becoming democratic. For the liberal parties, this process of massification meant, signified two (kinds of) things. To the extent that the pressure of the socialists or the tactical manoeuvres of other (directions, tendencies of) parties brought about (/ had as a consequence) a widening, broadening of the right to vote, they (i.e. the said liberal parties) had to (/ were obliged), at least for electoral (voting, advertising, promotional) purposes, confess belief in words, paroles (/ use slogans)

[500] The independence and freedom are clearly relative to another situation, and by no means absolute magnitudes, which don't exist except as ideology, fantasy etc..
[501] In other words, ZOMBEE-***ZIO-JOO***-BRAIN-WASHED AND LOBOTOMISED.
[502] Which meant a lot more FULL-SPECTRUM ***ZIO***-LOBOTOMISATION-BRAIN-WASHING.

pertaining to the social(-welfare) state and mass democracy. Against this background / Under these conditions / In these circumstances, the position of those who seriously took and systematically pursued, carried on, conducted the democratic reinterpretation of liberalism, gained, acquired, won direct tactical value, worth and real political weight(,) because they seemed to be building the from now on / henceforth necessary, even if / albeit not always liked by, popular with the bourgeoisie, bridge to the strata of new voters (constituents). The transformation / conversion of (the) (liberal) [[political]] parties into mass organisations (brought) at the same time (with it) (entailed) that the (special, particular weight of the) higher, superior, upper, elevated bourgeois elements lost weight (was reduced) in them (i.e. the said liberal political parties). Of course, the liberal parties retained, maintained, kept up some features (attributes, traits, characteristics) for a long time to come of the more or less loose, slack association of notables, dignitaries, prominent elders and or men of (urban) property and money; the (step)ladder, gamut, scale of the hierarchical mass organisation could, in any case, be climbed much more easily by members of the petty bourgeoisie or even of proletarian origin(s), whose popularity, resonance, approval, echo with / in regard to voters or else / and their own political career often seemed more important than the on occasion, sometime painful defence of economic liberalism (liberalism of the economy) or of the – on each and every respective occasion – matter of concern, interest(s) of this or that bourgeois group. The increasing, growing power of (the) (professional) associations (organisations) in mass society contributed(,) in relation to that / as well, next to / in parallel with the organisational restructuring of the [[political]] parties, to the making common, usual (spreading, diffusion, propagation, promulgation) of a(n) image/picture of politics which was no longer the earlier bourgeois one / image of politics, but for the most part / by and large / roughly corresponded to the realities of the process of democratisation.

The increasing complexity and bureaucratisation[503] of the economy, which ran / proceeded in parallel to the increasing technicity, technicality and bureaucratisation of politics (/ the conversion of politics into a(n) all the more / more and more / increasingly technical or bureaucratic pursuit, occupation, engagement), was (had become) the third great factor which favoured the democratic reinterpretation of liberalism. And/Also in this case, the shift, transposition, displacement at the level of theory was connected, interlinked / interrelated with / depended on the weakening (attenuation) of the social status, position of the bourgeoisie, bourgeois class. As the bourgeois of the old school (type, stroke) inside of the mass party more or less faded (away) or perished (went under, declined, vanished, was lost), thus he could not as such any longer assert himself or develop, unfold from the moment (that in the place of) the family business (went, stepped) (was replaced by) corporations (public limited / groups of companies, incorporated concerns), trusts (business associations) or banks, whose functioning was dependent on a(n) self-contained, self-reliant, independent, autonomous and permanent (enduring, lasting) stratum of specialists, technicians (engineers) and administrators (custodians, stewards, trustees)[504]. Even when (property) ownership (property, possession) did not (completely) lose its personal character, in any event, a disharmony cropped (popped) up, emerged, arose between the possession, holding, ownership of property / ownership and its factual, real function in(side) the economic process / process of the economy, which in many ways / from many points of view was felt to be / became perceived as parasitism[505]. The from / out of that resulting, consequent revaluation, appreciation of function or of (professional)

---

[503] There is no ***ZIO-JOO***-"free enterprise" outside of the ***ZIO-JOO***-controlled (**KONTROL**)-state / administration.

[504] Working for the "MAN", i.e. ***JOO***. All this means a ***ZIO-JOO***-"free for all" where primitive secret society and savage tribe ultra-criminal, hyper-conspiratorial-super-incestual-rat-tunnel-***JOOZ*** as ***ZIO-JOO***-LIZZARD-ENTRY-ISTS pervade and permeate and or otherwise control (**KONTROL**) up to everything in society in regard to the economy and state, and eventually culture, under the ***ZIO-JOO***-ANTI-CHRIST-FREAK SHOW-DEVIL-EVIL-***GREAT SATAN***.

[505] ***AAAA-HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!***

competence strengthened the democratic and egalitarian tendencies as well as the proclivity, propensity, tendency, inclination, trend towards the putting forward, introducing of a liberalism which was not or not solely, alone moulded, shaped, formed by (would not serve or would not exclusively serve) the interests of the bourgeoisie, bourgeois class. The predominance, prevailing of (the) bureaucratic organisation at the level of the large, great, big enterprise and of the economy in general meant, signified that some, certain specifically bourgeois qualities, properties, characteristics or virtues became superfluous, if not detrimental, deleterious, damaging, injurious, noxious, pernicious[506]. The (e)special (particular, specific) technical kinds of knowledge now become more important than the general kinds of knowledge, the chasm, gap, gulf between work or technique (technology) and culture (as cultivation and education) deepens. A new phase in the history of the bourgeois and the bourgeoisie (bourgeois class) corresponds with/to the new phase in the history of capitalism. The bourgeois of the economy (/ The economically active bourgeois) of the 20th century[507] has less and less time and leisure (idleness, ease) in order to become / make himself the bearer of bourgeoisness (i.e. (the) bourgeois custom(s) (habit(s), practice(s)) and ((the) bourgeois) ethos, morals, ethics in all its aspects, he restricts (limits) his interests in order to remain master (lord) (retain control) of the/a complicated situation (position), whereas (whilst) other members (relative, dependants) of his class, who can even/also be members of his own family, are concerned with / take care of / care about (the) matters (of concern) of the spirit(-intellect) (/ spiritual-intellectual things) and in the course of this often contemptuously, scornfully, disdainfully look down upon "business" (/ economic dealings). In this (their) alienation (strangeness, unfamiliarity) or aversion (dislike, repugnance, abhorrence) (of theirs) vis-à-vis

[506] P.K's first publication (1970) was a Greek translation of James Burnham's *The Managerial Revolution* (1941).
[507] At most and in part in relation to the first half of the 20th century only.

the praxis / practice [[of the bourgeoisie]], they lose, of course, despite all possible (contingent, potential, eventual) artistic or other(wise) intellectual proclivities, inclinations, tendencies and performances, accomplishments, achievements, the predicate of bourgeoisness (i.e. the features of bourgeois customs (habits, practices) and (of (the) bourgeois) ethos, morals, ethics) – just like the bourgeois of the economy (/ the economically active bourgeois), who, for his part, leans on / approaches more and more the type of the engineer or of the manager, in short, from a bourgeois he becomes / is transformed into a mere / simple entrepreneur (businessman, contractor)[508]. Historical and sociological analysis ought not / is not allowed to / may not fall victim to the optical illusion which comes into being from the confusion of the fate, destiny, lot of physical persons with the fate, destiny, lot of historical-social types and categories. Undoubtedly / Without doubt, many bourgeois families over/across/via the (for whole) generations could assert their higher, superior social and economic status, but they did that as a rule not *as* bearers of bourgeoisness (i.e. bourgeois customs (habits, practices) and ((the) bourgeois) ethos, morals, ethics) and of the bourgeois life stance and scale of values, but completely, entirely on the contrary, only in so far as they could undertake and cope, deal with / manage (/ undertake with success) the roles and functions which in the new situation were decisive/determinative (were essential in the new state of affairs); the fact that they already belonged to the upper stratum gave them, certainly, from the very beginning, (a) good chance(s) / opportunity to find a connection / to adapt, adjust (themselves) to the varied, changed, modified, transformed, new circumstances, relations, without falling, sinking, plummeting, subsiding from their earlier, previous social level. And the other way around / conversely: bearers of bourgeoisness (i.e. bourgeois customs and morals) are either ruined / destroyed / go to ruin in the mass-democratic age, epoch or they survive by

[508] Up to much more of a "money man" as compared to a bourgeois with all the bourgeois cultural "baggage" and learning accumulated from circa 1500/1600/1700 until circa 1900/1945.

fulfilling the same social function as the (by-descent) nobility, aristocracy after its social decline, (down)fall, eclipse, abasement, degradation, coming down; they, namely, offer (role) models, examples, prototypes of mundane, secular behaviour and decorum (prudishness, stuffiness), which are imitated, mimicked by the newly rich / nouveaux riches when these nouveaux riches want to differ / be delimited / demarcated from other nouveaux riches. The misfortune, unhappiness, bad luck of today's nouveaux riches consists, of course, in the fact that they have far less time and patience than (earlier, previous) (the) nouveaux riches (of other epochs) (in order) to internalise a(n) (originally alien, foreign, strange) life style / style of life (from the start, initially alien, strange, foreign to them)[509].

The democratic reinterpretation of liberalism and the stressing of the ethical obligations, duties of society and the state vis-à-vis the individual as the individual entailed, next to / together with the lifting, abolition, cancellation of the separation between (the) private (sphere) and (the) public (sphere(s)) also the blurring of the classical liberal distinction between economy and politics. Politics, that is the state, could from now on intervene in principle in the economy, and indeed no longer simply in order to stake / mark / peg / work out, determine, define the legal framework of economic activity or to – if need be (necessary) / should the situation/need arise – give the economy a helping hand[510], but in order to put it (i.e. the economy) in the service of (social(-welfare)-state) ends, goals, purposes (pertaining to the social (welfare) state)[511]. Consequently, politics directs, guides, steers the economy by invoking not

[509] Which as we shall see below, simply reinforces the ***ZIO-JOO***-mixing of up to everything with up to everything, always excluding challenging the ***JOO***'Z POWER AND CONTROL (**KONTROL**).
[510] ***ZIO***-***M-C-M***-capitalism always needed the state at some point and in some way or another, and was never in practice "laissez faire" pure.
[511] And this was only possible (i.e. from circa ***ZIO***-(1850-)1900 onwards) once the world hierarchy of states / nations under the ***International JOO*** from ***ZIO***-GREAT BRITAIN and ***ZIO-JOO***-ROPA to ***ZIO***-USA had accumulated, produced and or collected ***ZIO***-parasitically and ***ZIO***-capitalistically-imperialistically-satanically enough SURPLUS, both internally and externally, to redistribute wealth within the ***ZIO***-sphere CORE "Western" countries.

purely economic points of view (/ factors which are not purely economic). Obviously, politics, which undertakes such a steering, guidance, guiding, direction (/ mixing, blending in the economy), has another/different character than that politics which did not want to know about that kind of thing (/ something similar). It is a matter of mass-democratic politics (/ the politics of mass democracy), which in contrast to liberal politics, does not want to be satisfied with civil freedoms[512] (/ is not satisfied with the safeguarding, fortification of the bourgeois/civil freedoms of the citizen), but orientates its action to the granting, affording, conceding, allowing and exercising of political freedoms, and first of / above all, the right to vote / suffrage / franchise. The sense / meaning of voting lay, in accordance with the perception of liberals, in the expression of a judgement as to whether the government on each and every respective occasion acted correctly (with)in(side) the framework of the established, determined rules of the game, without stepping over / overstepping (exceeding, transgressing, overrunning, transcending) the boud(arie)s, limits of its competencies (jurisdiction). In (regard to) the democratic notion, idea, imagination, conception, perception, on the other hand, voting / the vote means, signifies one amongst many possible and desired/desirable/wished-for forms of participation of the broad masses in political life, and to that extent / in this respect, a(n) order, mandate to the government to act in the sense of wide, broad, extensive democratisation[513]. This corresponds to the fact that liberalism wanted to limit, restrict law-giving, legislative activity to general laws, which would outline, delineate the room-to-move, space-to-play, scope, field of action of society in accordance with formal / form-related criteria and would

[512] Freedom, obviously, as a state of affairs relative to another state of affairs, given that no human, who is ***per definitionem*** *as a human* limited and restricted by other humans and or nature, can be free in any absolute sense.
[513] Which in practice means (apart from false-consciousness-ideological brain-washing as to polity) legal-formal equality in contradistinction to former oikos-based and class-based hierarchies and the right of all massified-atomised citizens to (increasingly) participate in mass consumption and the overcoming of the scarcity of goods in relation to heightened social mobility and an increasingly refined division of labour. None of this was ever possible without the hierarchy of states and nations under the ***International YID-KIKE-JOO-JEW*** and the associated ***ZIO-***GREAT-BRITISH / ***ZIO***-USA etc. ***ZIO-JOO-M-C-M***-capitalisms-imperialisms-satanisms.

(supposedly) / was supposed to leave the material content of act(ion)s to the discretion, judgement, estimation of individuals, whereas/whilst under mass-democratic circumstances, relations (/ inside the conditions of mass democracy), (the) measure(s) which regulate(s) concrete, specific cases replace(s) / substitute(s) / step(s) into the place of (the) general law. The (preventive) measure, step / These measures represent(s) and constitute(s) the instrument with / through / by means of its/whose help, aid, assistance politics intervenes, interferes, engages in the economy and in the life of society in general / generally, in order to extend, develop, consolidate, build, construct the social(-welfare) state and speed up, push (forward), promote democratisation[514]. But now it was the case that / In reality, of course/certainly, both under liberal constitutions, regimes and liberal governments laws were passed, adopted, voted which clearly donned, carried, had the character of (a) measure(s) in favour of this or that group, as well as under / in circumstances, conditions in which mass democracy was already on the rise / march / advance / gaining ground or had in essence won, certain measures ran counter / came into opposition to democratisation, that is, they were supposed to protect, safeguard (defend, secure, shield, shelter) liberal remnants (remainders, residues). This already implies that some common, popular, current, going, disseminated, widespread, rife perceptions about / regarding the competencies and boundaries, limits of the state in the liberal and in the mass-democratic epoch are one-sided, unilateral. On this important point, we must dedicate, in conclusion, some observations.

Often it is asserted (across the board, generally, sweepingly, globally) that liberalism in theory / theoretically and in practice espoused, went in for, championed a night watchman (kind of) state, whereas/whilst mass democracy tends, inclines, leans towards statism and dirigisme (administrative methods).

[514] I.e. to bring about in "the West" the complete ***ZIO-JOO***-ANTI-CHRIST-DEVIL-EVIL-***GREAT SATAN***-MAMMON-SATANISATION of economy, state and culture, i.e. society in general and as a whole.

(Contrary) To (to) / Against that, it must be counterposed in the light of the historical facts that the supposedly inherent, intrinsic, innate enmity of liberalism in respect of ((in regard) to(wards)) the state is a legend (/ constitutes a myth), which came into being / was born under the impression of the (emerging, looming) danger, risk (becoming apparent) of a harnessing, roping in, use of state power for democratic ends, purposes, goals. The rise of the modern state and the rise of the bourgeoisie ran (in) parallel (in regard) to / with each other for centuries[515], and the victory of the bourgeoisie did not entail any weakening of this state, but on the contrary its expansion, extension, strengthening, building up, consolidation and perfection. The free[516] unfolding of society(,) and in particular free competition in the economy(,) presuppose the unity of the rules of the game, i.e. a general legislation, which only the modern state and its bureaucracy can launch, introduce, initiate and protect against violations, transgressions[517]. The mistrust, distrust, suspiciousness or even rebellion, uprising of the bourgeoisie against absolutism stemmed not from an in principle opposition to the state – incidentally, by the way, the bourgeoisie duly appreciated the anti-feudal approaches, tendencies of the absolutist state –, but, on the one hand, from the feeling that now it (i.e. the bourgeoisie) itself is / was mature, ripe and strong enough in order to politically rule and dominate (/ exercise political rule), on the other hand, from the impression or the ascertainment that absolutism is / was of its character, nature not capable of completely breaking with feudal forces. After the overthrow, (down)fall of absolutism, its (i.e. the bourgeoisie's) state was indeed reformed, but only with

[515] Even if 1648 is taken as the starting point, the modern state and the bourgeoisie had clear roots going back in some cases for up to centuries before that.
[516] Always in regard to how actors understand themselves within the ideal type, and also always in relation to the "feudal" / societas civilis state of affairs.
[517] Which in "the West", of course, means a total ***ZIO-JOO***-LIZZARD-HYPER-CONSPIRATORIAL / CRIMINAL-RAT-TUNNEL-ANTI-CHRIST-***GREAT SATAN-ZIO-JOO***-DAS-TAKE OVER of the state and its bureaucracy, in addition to the economy and eventually culture too, and where the ***JOOZ***, YIDZ, KIKES are not as active e.g. in Scandinavian countries or in Southern Europe when compared to the ***ZIO***-ANGLO-GERMANO-FROG-***JOO***-DAS-worlds, the dominance of ***ZIO***-GREAT BRITISH, ***ZIO***-FROG, ***ZIO***-GERMAN and the ***ZIO***-USA **SYNAGOGUE OF SATAN** imperialisms-satanisms, including ***INTERNATIONL JOO*** world trade etc. ensures that everyone "falls into line", ***GREAT FUCKING ZIO-JOO-BALL-SATAN***.

the intent(ion) to expand, extend it (build it up) and to make it more effective. That is why the question is not abstractly whether "the" state was loved or hated by this or that party, faction in respect of an in principle positioning (/ for programmatic reasons), but concretely which state by which party, faction and under which conditions, circumstances was affirmed, approved of (/ became accepted) or (was) rejected. As long as bourgeois liberalism preserved, kept, conserved, held, retained more or less in tact its oligarchical features, it could or at least wanted to use the state for its own ends, goals, purposes, although one, on the other hand, must underline, emphasise that it did not achieve / succeed in this all along the line / across the board since it had to share political dominance (rule) at times with the nobility (old aristocracy), at other times with a strong peasantry, [[and]] at other times with military bureaucracies[518]. The rise of democracy[519] made possible the use of state power for ends, goals, purposes which often, frequently, in many ways, in many cases, on many an occasion ran counter to those of the bourgeoisie, and this necessarily made the positioning / stance of liberalism towards the state mixed, conflicting, ambivalent, ambiguous, equivocal anew / again, however this time, on an essentially different basis than during the time, age, epoch of absolutism or of the constitutional "monarchical principle". A strong and effective state is demanded, required, called for when it is a matter of the protection, safeguarding of the bourgeois right to property (ownership) and of the defence of that social order in which those kinds of / such rights flourish, thrive, prosper; such demand, requirement can sometimes / on some occasions can culminate, peak in the renunciation, abandonment of political liberalism for the saving, salvation, rescue of economic liberalism. On the contrary, the slogan (of) "less state!" is

[518] ***GROSSO MODO***, there was by no means a complete ***ZIO-JOO***-ANTI-CHRIST-***GREAT-SATAN*** takeover of political/state and cultural power in the 18th and 19th centuries as occurred under ***ZIO***-USA in the 20th century, even though the YIDZ-KIKES-***JOOZ*** were increasing their economic CONTROL (**KONTROL**) greatly to totally in ***ZIO-JOO***-ROPA in the 18th and 19th centuries, as they were in the USA in the 19th century.
[519] I.e. mass democracy as opposed to liberalism, which had taken over from societas civilis.

counterposed to the democratic demand(s) for the political steering, guidance of the economy, and in particular, for the extension, expansion of the state of provision, care, providing and of the social state (the social welfare state / the social state or the welfare state). The bourgeoisie, which in the meantime / meanwhile is no longer[520] a bourgeoisie in the historical and sociological sense of the word, but in large part / to a great extent / generally means, signifies just as little as the class of entrepreneurs (the entrepreneurial class) (/ coincides with the class of businessmen), knows that it must share influence over the state with democratic forces; since the reality and power of this state, in any case, are unmistakeable, obvious, conspicuous, immense, incalculable, inestimable, vast, thus/so it (the bourgeoisies, the bourgeois class) is forced, compelled, coerced to struggle for such influence – and this struggle is a struggle for the use of a state which can no longer be the bourgeois state, for bourgeois ends, goals, purposes. We have entered a phase in which the bourgeoisie / bourgeois class, or rather the class of entrepreneurs / businessmen (the entrepreneurial class), (just) like all other social strata and groups too/as well, depends / is dependent on the measures, i.e. on the political decisions of the state, and because of that / for that reason / accordingly, attempts, tries to influence it (i.e. the said state) with all (available) means (at its disposal). Bourgeois do not determine, define which general rules should / ought to be fixed, determined by the state so that economy and society can function outside of / apart from the state, but entrepreneurs, businessmen pressure, urge the state, in relation to that, to take, resort to measures in their favour and consequently intervene, intercede in (the) economy and (in) society. The change / transformation of liberalism becomes much more representative, graphic, vivid, descriptive / is clearly evident / becomes clearly visible in (relation to) (on) that, this (point).

[520] Somewhere during the period circa 1850 and circa 1939(/50), but definitely closer to circa 1900 than further from then.

2. Structural features (traits, attributes) of mass democracy

The central feature of mass democracy, which distinguishes it / makes it differ (stand out) from all earlier, previous social formations and makes it a historical novum is the overcoming of the scarcity (shortage, dearth) of goods. There can indeed be a mass society, but there cannot be a mass democracy of the western type when that abundance of material goods is lacking/missing/absent, which effects (brings about, causes) / has as a consequence a quasi-automatic binding, tie, tying, connection, bond of the concept of the burgher, townsman, (bourgeois), citizen (as citoyen) to / in respect of / with the consumer. Of course, we are not dealing with a formal-legal and constitutional connection, binding, but with something much deeper: namely, a society which overcomes the shortage, scarcity of goods and puts at its members' disposal consumer goods in always/forever greater numbers (larger quantities) must be / is necessarily structured as a mass democracy. Because both the organisation of labour, work, which is essential for the overcoming of the scarcity, shortage, dearth of goods, as well as the social consequences of this overcoming beget, generate, give birth from their bosom, womb mass democracy, bringing forth, producing, yielding, spawning and consolidating, strengthening, solidifying, cementing certain ideological and psychological positionings / stances, as well as the corresponding institutional and personal relations between men (humans). The overcoming of the scarcity, shortage of goods means first of all that less and less people (men, humans) have to themselves produce their own food and clothing or that less and less people can / are able to produce food and clothing for others; less and less people, therefore, produce things which do not serve their elementary subsistence (/ are useful for the elementary, elemental needs of survival), whereby / in relation to which material needs come into being which reach far beyond elementary subsistence (/ the elementary, elemental needs of

survival) and can be satisfied in / with several ways, modes simultaneously, i.e. through/with/by means of the supply (offer(ing)) of many comparable products. Consequently, for the first time in human history a state of affairs / situation was put / set aside, overcome, surpassed, outstripped, transcended which was decisive, determinative for the moulding, shaping, formation of social life and not least of all for / in regard to ethical perceptions, conceptions, ideas, notions, representations: the scarcity, shortage (dearth, lack, deficiency) of goods[521].

How deep this break with the historical past was, becomes knowable / is shown by a change, whose far-reaching, intricate, complex, complicated consequences will (pre)occupy us (keep us busy, concern us thoroughly / at length / in depth) in this and in the following sections in detail (/ parts of this work). Before the rise of mass democracy, the fact of the shortage (scarcity, dearth) of goods as reflected (expressed) ideationally in ethical perceptions (views, ideas, notions, opinions) which rested and were based on concepts like asceticism, abstinence, self-discipline etc., and sought to influence the

[521] **MASS DEMOCRACY AS A SOCIAL FORMATION (CF. WITH (OLIGARCHIC BOURGEOIS) LIBERALISM AND SOCIETAS CIVILIS AS PRIOR SOCIAL FORMATIONS / SOCIAL WHOLES) AND NOVUM (FOLLOWING THE NOVUM OF THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION, FOLLOWING THE NOVUM OF THE AGRICULTURAL REVOLUTION) IN RELATION TO THE OVERCOMING OF THE SCARCITY OF GOODS. FOR THE FIRST TIME IN HUMAN HISTORY, THE CITIZEN IS A CONSUMER OF GOODS NOT NECESSARY FOR LIFE (WHICH BECOME "NEEDS" WITH UP TO MANY VARIANTS TO CHOOSE FROM) AND SOMEONE WHO (USUALLY) DOES NOT PRODUCE THE FOOD AND CLOTHES HE NEEDS OR OTHERS NEED AS ELEMENTAL NECESSITIES OF LIFE. IT GOES WITHOUT SAYING THAT MASSIFICATION-ATOMISATION-INCREASED SOCIAL MOBILITY-THE REFINEMENT OF THE DIVISION OF LABOUR-HEDONISMUS-KONZUM-EXOTICISM-TOURISM-SELF-RACISM-LOOSE MORALS-THE *ZIO-JOO*-MAMMONISATION-MONETARISATION OF UP TO EVERYTHING-THE MIXING AND BLENDING OF UP TO EVERYONE AND EVERYTHING WITH UP TO EVERYONE AND EVERYTHING APART FROM INCESTUAL-RAT-RODENT-HYPER-CRIMINAL-HYPER-CONSPIRATORIAL-HYPER-PARASITICAL-RAT-TUNNEL-*JOOZ*-YIDZ-KIKES-THE *ZIO*-USA-IMPERIUM AND *ZIO-JOO*-DAS-*M-C-M*-PETRO-DOLLAR AND ASSOCIATED INTERNATIONAL DIVISION OF LABOUR ETC. RELATED TO:**

Because both the organisation of labour, which is essential for the overcoming of the scarcity of goods, as well as the social consequences of this overcoming beget from their womb mass democracy, producing and consolidating certain ideological and psychological stances as well as the corresponding institutional and personal relations between humans.

HAS ABSOLUTELY NOTHING TO DO WITH THE OIKOS-CLAN-GREAT FAMILIES, ONE (MAIN) RACE, ONE (MAIN) RELIGION BASIS OF THE GREEK AND OR GRECO-ROMAN *DEMOS* IN DEMOCRACY AS POLITY IN CONDITIONS OF THE *C-M-C*-AND OR BARTER-EXCHANGE-SCARCITY OF GOODS, A LARGELY AGRICULTURAL SOCIETY, SLAVERY IN THE SOCIOLOGICAL-HISTORICAL SENSE, PRE-MASS AND PRE-TECHNICISED CIRCUMSTANCES, ETC..

behaviour of the members of the most various, different societies in such a way that no demands or expectations would come into being which could / were able to overturn (upset, knock over) (the) existing structures and hierarchies, that is the (prevailing) decisions (in force / in place) for/regarding/over/about the distribution of (scarce, limited) goods (in short supply). As is self-evident / Self-evidently, Of course, this ethic(s), which we want to call/name the ascetical ethic(s) / asceticism in accordance with old usage (according to old custom / following a long tradition), did not merely command, require fasting, i.e. it did not refer only and not always directly to the scarcity / shortage of goods (which, by the way / incidentally, was regarded as natural and as such was no / did not constitute (a) problem / matter (of/for consideration)), but (it) was extrapolated (extended and crystallised) in principles regarding / about / such as the superiority of spiritual(-intellectual) goods vis-à-vis material goods and regarding / about the of necessity restraining (taming, reining (in), curbing, chastening, quelling) role of Reason in the face of the unbridledness (dissoluteness, unrestraint) of (the) drives, urges, impulses. Inside this old and tried and tested (proven) conceptual framework(,) there were, of course, shifts, displacements, whose most important (/ the most important of which) occurred, took place, was carried out by (means of) / through the new-times rehabilitation of sensoriality (sensuousness (as pertaining to the senses in general and not just to sex/porn as such) and corporeality) (/ when the New Times restored, in all its dimensions, the sensorial world) against Christian asceticism. Nonetheless, the principle idea, thought was not abandoned – (and, also) the bourgeois synthesis retained (held onto) it, especially since it got along well with / tolerated, endured well the desiderata, needs of the (accumulation) phase (of accumulation) of early capitalism (as well, too). On the other hand, mass democracy, whose economy cannot get by, manage without mass consumption and whose society cannot get by, manage, function without a corresponding self-understanding of its members (/ if its members do not correspondingly

understand themselves), needs hedonistic positionings, stances and ideologies as the guidelines of social action. Hedonism is here just as little to be understood (/ should not here be understood) as / like asceticism in earlier, previous social formations(,) in the narrow sense (of the term). As a counter concept of a widely understood, grasped, comprehended asceticism, hedonism is extrapolated (extended) likewise (in order to crystallise / to be crystallised) in principles which do not simply and directly legitimise material consumption, but over and above that, oppose, run counter to anthropological and normative perceptions, notions, ideas, conceptions which were connected with the ascetic ethic(s). Thus, in the place of the cardinal (basic) virtue of self-overcoming, self-transcendence, self-unfolding or self-realisation, self-actualisation is put (/ self-realisation takes the place of the cardinal virtue of self-overcoming), whereby / in relation to which / whilst at the same time the dualistic anthropology of Reason is abandoned (given up, sacrificed) and the right of the drives, urges, impulses of the united / unified (hu)man, person to (find) satisfaction is asserted, projected; likewise, also the pluralism of values replaces the earlier, previous fixing, attachment to a/one single binding value hierarchy (hierarchy of values) (which was) founded/grounded on/in certain supreme, paramount, topmost values, whereas the theories about, regarding human rights etc. are interpreted in the sense of / accordance with democratic-egalitarian ideas as well as (and (in accordance) with) the ideal of self-realisation, self-actualisation. Nonetheless, these extrapolations (extensions) of hedonism, in(side) which the hedonistic core often can hardly be recognised, distinguished (anymore)[522], can almost always be translated into a language which (makes clear, obvious) (allows) the immediate matters of concern of a (massively consuming) mass

[522] Obviously, over time, what is repeated, "suddenly" appears "normal" and "natural" : consume what once upon a time wasn't needed (e.g. lots, tonnes of clothes, make up, white and other electrical goods etc.), enjoy Coca-Cola, eat McDonald's, go to the Casino, play the pokies, see a peep show, wank like a peeping tom wanker, take drugs, get stoned, and later, take it up the arse, suck cock, lick cunt, be a slut-prostitute, abort, contraception, be interracial, worship ***JOOZ***-YIDZ-KIKES AND THEIR FREAK SHOW-KOST IN ITS ***TOTAL FILTH***-SHIT-SKATA-EXCREMENT, be a vandal, do and or appreciate graffiti, etc., etc., etc..

democracy (consuming on a mass basis) (to appear). The thesis e.g. that human dignity or self-unfolding (self-realisation, self-actualisation) (cannot be completed, perfected, come to completion) (must, has to suffer) under (the) conditions of material (de)privation, hardship, want, could (was not in the least), on the basis of Christian-ascetic principles, not become immediately obvious (self-evident), and it amounts in concreto to the perception that the individual is supposed to be capable of consuming / able to consume goods (wares, commodities, merchandise) in order to be considered a whole (full) human, person (man). The interweaving of the aforementioned thesis with the democratic ideal of material equality (also) indicates the same (too, as well).

We mentioned in the previous section, chapter, that around the turn of the century [[i.e. c. 1900]], on account / because of new inventions, a comprehensive mechanisation of everyday life commenced (/ a broad, wide(-ranging) mechanisation of daily life started, began as a consequence of many new inventions). This mechanisation embraced, encompassed (included, took in), on the one hand, the sector of work (labour) and production, in which the complicated handcrafted modes (ways, methods) of work/labour were for the most (in large) part replaced by the assembly (production) line (conveyor belt), and, on the other hand, by the private domestic (household) sector (sphere, area) ((the) kitchen, (the) bathroom and their appliances ((mechanical) apparatuses, equipment), (the) (operations of) cleaning (processes/operations), (the) automation of heat sources and of the generation of cooling (cold), refrigeration (/ the production of heat(ing) and cooling (cold))); with that went / that was accompanied by the mechanisation of food (nourishment, nutrition, sustenance) (e.g. (the) (industry of) canned goods (foods) (industry), preserved (tinned) food(s) / the canning industry) and of the means of transport. The simultaneous mechanisation in all these areas, sectors was / constituted a(n) (additional) indication, sign, manifestation (amongst several (indications)) for / in regard to

the extent of the mutual, reciprocal dependence of/between mass production and mass consumption. As soon as / From the moment the technical prerequisites, preconditions of mass production were engaged/set, created, mass sales had to be secured; the human masses, which the industrial revolution / Industrial Revolution brought together (concentrated) in great, large economic centres, had to guarantee, vouch for the existence and the widening, extension of the system just as much through / by means of their consumption as through/by means of their work (labour) (/ with the property, capacity, characteristic of the worker, labourer as with the property, capacity, characteristic of the consumer). More (Said more) precisely: the production of consumer goods took (assumed) now such dimensions that for broad, large masses, consuming could turn, next to working, labouring, into a particular activity (/ consumption could become, in parallel with work/labour, a particular activity), which more or less extended beyond (outgrew, outdid, surpassed) the mere material securing, safeguarding of physical existence. The belonging together of (organic bond between) industrial mass production, organised mass sales and the concentration of human masses / masses of people in the cities was (became), in any case, immediately seen / perceived (recognised, observed), and the great, large department stores (emporia), which likewise around the turn of the century [[i.e. circa 1900]] already moulded, shaped, stamped the image, picture of the city of American and European metropolises, put this knowledge into lucrative practice (/ transmuted, transformed this ascertainment, finding into profitable practice (praxis)).

The simultaneous appearance of mass production and mass consumption by masses of people / human masses initiated, inaugurated, induced, introduced, instituted the conversion, transformation of mass society into mass democracy and was accompanied by three central phenomena, which, both individually (in isolation), as well as complementarily, socially incarnate (embody), as it were, (/

constitute in a/some way, the social incarnation (embodiment) of) the analytical-combinatory thought figure. In all three (central phenomena), the idea, notion (dominates) of ultimate, final – not further analysable – elements, which in themselves are of equal value / equivalent, and are / can be combined with one another on the same flat, level surface, where(by) / in relation to which the dimension of time or else history hardly, barely plays a role, and the functional points of view (criteria) have put/set aside the substance-related points of view / criteria(, dominates, rules). These phenomena are the (advanced, evolved) division of labour, the atomisation of society (/ the segmentation, fragmentation of society into individuals) and social mobility. The pre-industrial division of labour was principally, mainly (an) external (one, division of labour), i.e. the – on each and every respective occasion – essential social work was divided, split up, parcelled out, distributed to / between a number of vocational (professional, occupational) groups (groups of calling), but inside of which each and every respective work / labour process was hardly or slightly analysed, disassembled, dismantled, broken down in(to) special and at the same time complementary (in part / individual) (part-)tasks; only manufacture (the manufactory) and the first Industrial Revolution introduced the internal / inner division of labour next to / beside the external / outer division of labour to a considerable (any significant) extent. In the time, age, epoch of (incipient) mass production (just now/then commencing, starting, beginning), both the external, outer, as well as the internal, inner, division of labour reached, achieved now a(n) – until then, hitherto – entirely unknown intensity and meaning, significance. Very many new vocations (occupations, professions, callings, trades, careers) came into being / appeared, and at the same time a segmentation, dissection, analysis, breaking down, dismantling, decomposition, cutting up of the work (labour) process was carried out / took place above all inside of industrial production, which was / became exemplary (standard, model-like) and proverbial. This extreme division of labour rested and was based on an analytical model, schema

of thought, it was, namely, made possible through, by means of the successful effort, endeavour at dissecting, analysing, dismembering, parsing, dismantling, deconstructing of a Whole into / down to its ultimate, very last constituent parts (elements) / components, and then (subsequently) (at the) reconstructing (reconstruction) (of) this same Whole on the basis of the previous dissection, analysis, dismemberment, parsing, dismantling, deconstruction. The meticulous (scrupulous) dissection (analysis) of the work/labour process conclusively, definitively destroyed (knocked (brought, took) down) the age-old (ancient) handicraft ideal of a united product, which is manufactured, fabricated, made, constructed by one single (the same) hand [pair of hands] like an artwork – an ideal, incidentally, which survived (continued to exist, lived on,) alongside (next to) other, in part / sometimes very heterogeneous, approaches (tendencies) in (the) bourgeois perceptions regarding (in respect of) work (labour) and in (the) bourgeois aesthetic(s). The advanced, evolved division of labour meant, signified a rejection, denial, cancellation, negation of tradition and history exactly in the sense that it destroyed, annihilated every handicraft-related perception, notion(,) which was oriented towards handed-down (bequeathed), traditional, conventional (work) habits (of work (labour)) and (pre-)given models (prototypes)(,) and instead of this (handicraft-related perception), embraced (subscribed to, indulged in, paid homage to) the end/goal-rational, expedient, purposeful principle of constant improvement, betterment and renewal.

The atomisation of society / The segmentation, fragmentation of society into individuals (atoms), began, of course, such that in the course of the progress of (/ when, with the advances in) industrialisation, the natural (life, living, biotic) associations, ties, bonds, groupings (in respect of life, living) (the extended (patriarchal, large, big) family, the (household) (community) (of the house (oikos)), the clan (kinship group), the village (community)) became for the first

time in history economically (i.e. in terms of the economy) useless (impractical, unusable), in fact obstructive, cumbersome, detrimental, damaging, injurious. Bourgeois society, however, did not get to know in the/its extreme form, nor did it approve of, welcome the (this) tendency (towards atomisation). As we know, it (i.e. bourgeois society) retained, kept (the, its) belief, faith in substance-related ties, (kinds of) binding(s), bonds, and the social preconditions, prerequisites of the individual(,) and saw in the family the natural cell of the social organism. Only under (the) conditions of mass democracy was atomisation (the segmentation, fragmentation of society into individuals (atoms)) realised and legitimised to such an extent that the members of society could become widely, extensively, largely, to a great extent mobile and interchangeable (exchangeable) with one another.