

## 2. “Nation” in the planetary age (era) (The nation in the planetary epoch)<sup>i</sup>

To talk unobjectively, partially and ideologically about the nation is the rule, and will surely remain the rule. Nonetheless, it does not hurt or do any harm if one every now and then breaks this rule, even if one is in danger of getting caught between two opposing sides firing at him. On the one side of the battlefield stands the nationalistic “Right”, which sees in the nation the natural framework of living (life framework) for humans, without of course explaining how collective life and survival had been possible for centuries and millennia without nations in the newer sense of the term. Over and above that, the “Right” often mixes and confuses the right to life of the nation with the sovereignty of the state, not wanting to leave the fate and destiny of the nation possibly to a multi-national state, although many historical examples prove and certify that nations under such circumstances preserve and maintain themselves (*or*: can admirably keep themselves and stay alive), and in fact can flourish. But the “Right”<sup>ii</sup> apparently does not bring so much unshakeable trust to, i.e. does not have so much unshakeable trust in, the indissoluble resilience of the nation as against, i.e. so as to be indifferent to, the fate and destiny of the (more or less national) state, i.e. nation-state<sup>iii</sup>. Its concept of the nation becomes so much more abstract, so much more an aesthetic construct pertaining to the critique of culture (cultural critique/culture criticism), the more national cultures pale, fade. There is no lack of a certain piquancy that many a “right-wing” nationalist, who still likes to call himself (*or*: One cannot help but smile when one sees today in Europe that some “right-wing” nationalists, who moreover call themselves) “conservative”, put(s) forward, advance(s) or use(s) against “Maastricht”

partially the same arguments as the classical conservatives against the founding of the German Reich in those days (*or*: of the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> century against the formation of contemporary nation-states)<sup>iv</sup>; precisely these conservatives, i.e. the representatives of classical conservatism, incidentally, gave their preference always to the multi-national state held together by means of dynastic loyalty before, i.e. compared to, the national state or nation-state (*or*: rejected the ethnically and nationally homogeneous state and gave their preference to the multi-national state, whose cohesive tie was loyalty to the dynasty and the crown (e.g. Austro-Hungary)).

On the other side of the riverbank stands the cosmopolitan and pacifistic “Left”, which expects and hopes for, from the disappearing and vanishing of nations, stable peace. The fallacy is patently obvious: there were wars just as much as in the pre-national past (*or*: before the creation of nations<sup>v</sup>), and no statistic(s) has or have substantiated and corroborated the thesis that through nationalism wars (would) have multiplied. Still not before long, mankind stood on the brink of atomic devastation not because of unchecked and unbridled nationalisms, but because of the competition and rivalry of two camps, which both invoked universalistic ideologies<sup>vi</sup>. Of course, national clashes and conflicts have once again become topical<sup>vii</sup>. It is an optical illusion to hold to, i.e. regard, at a given point in time, a precisely active source of unrest as the single and as the final source of unrest[[, i.e. just because war is happening because of nationalism/geostrategy-geopolitics now, that does not at all mean that war has always or will always happen because of nationalism/geostrategy-geopolitics; on the contrary.]]

Although now the “Left” would like to neutralise, or preferably rub out and wipe out, the obviously vital nationalisms, it busts its chops (tries very hard) at the same time to prove that there are no nations of pure water, i.e. pure nations, at all, that is to say, sweat and blood, i.e. blood, sweat and tears are shed for

nothing, and the madness and lunacy (insanity) is perfect<sup>viii</sup>. The facts, which in the course of this and in that regard, are noted (registered and recorded), must undoubtedly be taken very seriously. It has really proven to be a futility, and in vain, to define pure races and [[pure]] nations, or to lay down and establish a fixed list of objective and generally valid features on the basis of which a nation could be defined. What on each and every respective occasion was cited and referred to as such a feature (origin (ancestry, descent, provenance, extraction), language, religion and so on) was neither always existing, nor (fully) commensurate with reality, or it did not constitute a necessary or sufficient condition of the founding of a nation. We cannot examine here, perhaps not even in general ascertain, to what extent the concept (and notion) of a people is natural and racial; what is certain is that it does not coincide with the concept (and notion) of the nation (ethnos), which is to a determinative degree or crucial extent, a political concept<sup>ix</sup>.

That can all, without a second thought, be accepted – however, it is politically totally irrelevant. The politically burning question reads, or is, whether concrete collectives have the need and are disposed and ready – if necessary under or with the summoning and mobilisation of, in relation to such collectives, suitable mythologems –, to be defined as a nation, and in the name of this nation to act, that is, to live and to die. If they do this, and in fact in the process, cannot be put off by the question of truth, i.e. whilst being indifferent as to what is truth and what is a lie, then they obviously must have their – good or bad – reasons, and it is asked (*or*: the only essential matter is) whether they also in the future regard this construct as the better path for the protection of their interests. Should this be the case, then historical proof and counter-proof would be to no avail. Also, in the past, the nation did not step onto and appear on the political stage because it had in actual fact just been shaped, but because a certain elite had invoked the idea of the nation, and masses were aware of, and appreciated, being mobilised

in this sense (*or*: and managed in this way to mobilise masses). Thus, the French nation was not non-existent in 1788, and in 1789 it was all at once, there (*or*: in 1788 in order to appear in 1789); it was also not the case that the French nation had to first constitute the state (*or*: had to create the state from the absolute beginning). The state was there long before, and had pre-existed for centuries, and the invocation of the nation served two goals: to shape or render the internal space of the state – through the putting aside and eliminating of feudal particularisms and feudal localism – homogenous, and to replace the dynastic principle with the principle of the sovereignty of the people (folk). It is difficult to see how one here could deny to nationalism its political usefulness and practicality (*or*: could doubt the political expediency (effectiveness) of nationalism).

But the mass-democratic and planetary age is a different one than (as compared to) the liberal and European age (*or*: But the mass-democratic and planetary epoch does not at all coincide with the liberal and European epoch). Today the internal spaces of the states are homogenised<sup>x</sup>, even Caesars and usurpers shoot their mouth off and invoke the sovereignty of the people (folk). If the nation is meant to survive, then its invocation must correspond with the new relations and circumstances, and serve the – connected and related with such relations and circumstances – new aims and goals. The answer to the question of whether and in which form the political units (entities, unities) known to us as nations will be preserved, depends on the definition of the relations and circumstances, and of the aims and goals. The core and key feature of today's world situation is the planetary spreading, diffusion and extension of producing and consuming mass democracy (*or*: of mass democracy as a social formation established and based on mass production and mass consumption), the constant growing of, or growth in, material expectations in the world, and

hence also a sharpening of competition and rivalries, which under the pressure of ecological and demographic factors can become dubious and dangerous.

The question is thus: will the nation and the nation-state prove to be the best form of organisation (organisational form) for participation in the struggle over distribution; will they prove to be the most competitive political and economic unit (entity, unity) at the planetary level? If one formulates the question in such a way, it becomes evident that the answer ought to be dictated by the concrete case, not by in principle sympathy and incurable love for “the” nation, or, by the blanket ban, wholesale excommunication and blind curses in respect of and against the nation. In other words: the question is not whether “the” nation in abstracto (*or*: generally and abstractly) can or should survive, but whether this or that existing nation fulfils or not the terms and conditions of the political unit (entity, unity) capable of surviving (*or*: the viable and sustainable political unit) in the planetary age. Considered thus, we must apply different yardsticks and use different weights and measures from nation to nation, from continent to continent, from region to region. China, typically enough, stands not under the political compulsion (*or*: is not politically pressured) to decide and choose between national and planetary ability at survival (*or*: its national and planetary viability), provided of course it remains a united centralistically ruled and governed, i.e. centralised, state (the course of history in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, as I believe, to a great extent will depend on whether China remains such a state or not). At the other end of the spectrum<sup>xi</sup>, nation-states are found which are in all actually dependent in a political and economic respect. Whether they will agree with and accept such dependency and their fate, so that at least through and with their subjugation (subjection, subordination) to a great Power, or to a stronger power (more powerful force), they will not totally lose contact with, or be totally detached from, planetary events and (the) planetary evolution (development(s)); or, whether they will revolt against such events, evolution,

developments and that fate, because they see in the universalism of the great Powers a means of expansion and a means of blackmail and extortion – that will not be decided always by means of end(goal)-rational, expedient calculus and calculation, and the cold logic of interest, but by feelings, emotions and sentiments with deep roots. It also remains open as to whether their revolt, uprising and insurrection will be suitable for, and better serv(ic)e, the protection of conventional identities, traditional identity and traditional/conventional ways of living (modes of life), rather than subjugation, i.e. being subjugated to great Powers in order to serve and protect one's traditional identity<sup>xii</sup>. Because the revolt can, if it wants to be successful, demand a rapid, quick modernisation, whereas voluntary subjugation may be accompanied by the fostering, cultivation and renovation of traditionalistic facades as trade, business, industry and as psychological compensation (*or*: pseudo-facades for reasons of psychological over-replenishment and touristic exploitation (example, today's Greece)). In any case, the fate of the smaller nation-states decisively depends on the importance of their geopolitical position (situation). The geopolitically insignificant nation-states could more than likely be left in peace or disquiet (*or*: The more insignificant from a geopolitical point of view will probably be left alone in peace or in their internal unrest and turmoil).

With regard to Europe, the national question appears complicated because the leading Western and Central European nations are, according to planetary measures (criteria, yardsticks, benchmarks), middle Powers, that is, such Powers which can neither stand aside, nor can they assert themselves alone – or even against all others (all other middle Powers) – (*or*: nor can they maintain their position autonomously from every one of the other [[middle]] Powers (much less so, if every one of them turns against the rest<sup>xiii</sup>)). The new situation is only gradually dawning upon these Powers, because old habits of thought (thought habits, habitual ways of thinking) and mind-sets (casts of mind,

mentalities) hinder, hamper and obstruct the clear consciousness regarding, and comprehension of, the above-mentioned measures and the now planetary dimensions of problems, and also because one[[, i.e. as a former European imperialistic Power,]] still lives in part from and on the giant lead, advantage and reserves of the imperialistic epoch. During this epoch, the antagonism of the great European nations with one another did not impede or hinder Europe's great global predominance (preponderance) – completely on the contrary: the antagonism was an impetus and propulsion (drive) towards expansion, in order to keep pace with the expansion of the competitors and rivals (*or*: in order to not fall behind in relation to the expansion of one's competitors (rivals)).

This situation, which lasted for a good four hundred years, has now changed in a twofold manner (doubly): both Europe's specific (economic, demographic, geopolitical) weight, as well as the world-historical meaning of inner-European antagonisms, decrease and diminish. The globe (planet) does not group itself any more around the axes of these antagonisms, but the European nations must group themselves (be grouped) in view of global (planetary) antagonisms. Paradox, but true (*or*: It is paradoxical, yet also true): the great inner-European wars were possible because Europe dominated and ruled (in) the world; today they are no longer possible, because Europe has stopped being the motor and driving force of world history. This *factum brutum* (= heavy, raw fact or deed) – not “Reason” or “the bitter historical experiences”, as the Sunday orators, i.e. grandiloquent speakers, want or would have it – poses, puts and sets the question and problem of nationalism in Western and Middle, i.e. Central Europe on a new basis. As certain as this is, just as uncertain remains through which supra-national forms of organisation (organisational forms) can the challenge of the times be managed and even overcome. Equilibrium, condominium (i.e. joint sovereignty and domination; especially joint rule of territory by two or more nations and or states), and hegemony, are just as conceivable as various mixed

forms of national and multi-national statehood (*or*: the national and multi-national state) (because, as we said at the start: the survival of the nation is by no means identical with the preservation of the classical nation state, just as the disappearance of the nation does not have to necessarily bring about the end of statehood, i.e. the end of the state as a form of political organisation<sup>xiv</sup>).

However, it is also conceivable that pressure from the outside, or an internal hegemony (i.e. the attempt of a part to impose its hegemony<sup>xv</sup>) activates and reinforces centrifugal forces. That could please some nationalists over the short-term, however, a good piece of European vitality would be used up with that (*or*: Such a development could perhaps gladden some short-sighted nationalists, but it would pointlessly spend a great part of European vitality).

From the point of view of an economic liberalism (with which the cosmopolitan “Left”, despite its holding onto and continuing to use hackneyed meaningless phrases and emancipatory empty words pertaining to the critique of culture (cultural critique or criticism), in practice identifies<sup>xvi</sup>), it appears as if the question (issue) of the nation and of nationalism will be taken care of and solved by itself thanks to the interweavings and intertwining of the economy, and the international division of labour. Just as the division of labour in the highly technicised, i.e. technologically advanced and hyperdeveloped, mass democracies effected and brought about an atomisation, i.e. splintering and fragmentation of society into individuals, which broke up the social classes of the liberal age (epoch, era), so too now it is said, the same process through its planetarisation, i.e. extension to the whole of the planet, is supposed to cut up, carve up, dismember and fragment nations into individuals, and will make feelings of national belonging together vanish into thin air<sup>xvii</sup>. We do not want to recall here the cogent and valid arguments, which in the sociological discussion of recent decades, were put forward against those who wanted and tried to interpret and explain “collective action” on the basis of economic utility (use,



profit, benefit) calculus/calculation or the weighing up of benefit and damage<sup>xviii</sup>. Let us start with or take up the question (*or*: Let's better see the matter/thing from the standpoint of the issue) of distribution. Even if we remain with, or are restricted by, this economic criterion, the possibility is not to be dismissed out of hand (*or*: we cannot at all exclude the possibility) that this or that human collective comprehends the nation and the corresponding form of political organisation as the best means in order to enforce and defend its interests, in relation to which of course, a policy or politics of economic interests could be effectively connected with nationalistic ideologem(e)s and or ideologies [[a nationalistic ideology]]. If the nation, again, appears to be out-of-date, then the collective must be widened and extended and decide and choose in favour of another form of organisation of the political unit (entity, unity). But collectives will, anyway, always remain in the game, unless every political organisation becomes altogether superfluous<sup>xix</sup> (*or*: However, collective entities will always exist and act for the purpose of safeguarding for themselves an advantageous position in the struggle over distribution – except if every political organisation is now rendered superfluous). Economistically thinking liberals, who reckon on and expect something like that, should read Adam Smith more attentively (carefully).

Whether or how the nation as a political or also as a cultural unit (entity, unity) will remain preserved, does not depend on any unchangeable and immutable substance it has, which is supposed to inhere in it, but on the long-term demands of the planetary situation – more precisely: on the manner which the actors or active subjects will comprehend and prepare to confront these demands. Several combinations and variations are, in the process, conceivable and imaginable, and at an advantage do nations find themselves which on the basis of their potential can also constitute, in the planetary age, competitive political units (entities, unities). For Western and Middle, i.e. Central Europe,

the national question, because of the peculiarity of national composition, is particularly delicate. And for Germany – as the largest country (land) in this space, yet at the same time as a middle planetary Power – perhaps still more delicate (*or*: And even more delicate does this national question present itself in the case of Germany as a country which is, on the one hand, the most populous in this space, but from a planetary point of view, it is nothing above a middle Power)<sup>xx</sup>.

---

## ENDNOTES

All endnotes are by the translator, and **have nothing whatsoever to do with P.K.. Readers can and in fact probably must simply ignore them and draw their own conclusions from P.K.'s texts only, though some of the endnotes might be useful to some readers, and other endnotes are really only for the very few people who can look at themselves in the mirror and say "Oh my God, I'm really ugly, and retarded". I do it every day, and it's the only way to prepare yourself to be a truly profound thinker, and not a propaganda-spewing mouthpiece.**

<sup>i</sup> The *FAZ* title: „Die Zukunft der Nation“ (= “The future of the nation”).

<sup>ii</sup> In today's “objective” journalistic lingo, “far Right”.

<sup>iii</sup> = The “Right” wants a state *and* nation, because it does not have any confidence that the nation can survive without the state, which somewhat ironically means that the “Right” does not have that much faith in its nation, which it thinks is “eternal” and “special”, etc.,....

<sup>iv</sup> Classical conservatives were focused on conserving as many aspects of *societas civilis* (feudalism) as possible, and were opposed to nationalists who wanted nation-states with their formal-legal equality, etc.. So, theoretically and *mutatis mutandis*, “Maastricht” is something a conservative should not have had so much of a problem with, rather than having recourse as a “nationalist” to the nation-state, which once upon a time was Anathema for a conservative. In other words, you are arguing against “Maastricht” as a “conservative” against the nation-state, whilst supporting your own nation-state against “Maastricht”!

---

<sup>v</sup> As discussed throughout [www.panagiotiskondylis.com](http://www.panagiotiskondylis.com), a “nation” can be defined as that created c. the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries on the basis of x, y, z criteria, or far more broadly on the basis of a, b, c criteria as a social phenomenon, i.e. social fact in Durkheimian language, which has existed since ancient times, and can be seen as similar to the notion of civilisation. All of this is a matter of defining the concept at hand in relation to concrete historical and or present social phenomena. What is, though, absolutely laughable in terms of scientific understanding, is the solely polemical usage of “conservative” vs. “liberal”, when both refer to virtually the same social fact: Western mass democracy.

<sup>vi</sup> “Proletarian Internationalism” vs. “Human Rights”.

<sup>vii</sup> Following the break-up of the Soviet Bloc and Yugoslavia, for instance.

<sup>viii</sup> The point is that nations have never been “pure” in the first place, and the “Left” is protesting against “nationalisms” when the latter cannot possibly exist without nations!!! Ditto: “racism”, “sexism”, etc..

<sup>ix</sup> I note that this sentence including a reference to nature and race and a people (folk) was not included in the German text – for obvious reasons! In any event, P.K. is saying that as far as the science of concepts is concerned, there is a difference, i.e. differentia specifica between a “people” and a “nation”. That of course does not mean that a nation cannot have a relatively high degree of racial relative homogeneity, which of course it can as all the historical evidence shows, but it also means that a nation does not as a nation, *qua* nation, necessarily have to have such a relatively high degree of racial relative homogeneity. Every case must be examined concretely as to its specific circumstances in its specific time and place, historical and or spatio-geographical context.

<sup>x</sup> This still holds true from the point of view of formal-legal equality, a national or European currency, a national language, etc., notwithstanding all the inroads of multi-culturalism, multi-racialism, mass invasion and or immigration and enhanced-reinforced mass ZIO-Lobotomy or ZIO-MassMedia-brainwashing and Retardism Gone APE, e.g. “everyone is equal”, “everyone is the same”, etc., whilst we know exactly who wield GROSSLY DISPROPORTIONATE forms or elite-level Power (incl. through GROSSLY DISPROPORTIONATE accumulations of Big Money Wealth).

<sup>xi</sup> Oh God! Here we go! P.K. is about to tell us that WE (“Greece”) ARE basically DEAD....

<sup>xii</sup> P.K. is alluding here to the fundamental national-patriotic and absolutely pragmatistic implications of Lenin’s anti-imperialistic stance (into which Stalin’s “socialism in one country” and “Great Patriotic War” fit, notwithstanding all of Stalin’s unbelievable and horrendous, ultra-cruel blunders – he really was a Great Oaf-midget), as opposed to the Zio-Trotsky-Lobotomised side of Lenin’s “World Revolution” thought, which transpasticated itself into Zio-Neo-Psycho-Con-Dem-Tard form – known in America as “The Blob” (and because I am not American – it’s a totally foreign culture to me, I don’t understand why, but they have their Reasons, obviously...), which of course could lead the world to Nuclear Conflagration if Real Patriots and People with Brains do not TAKE CONTROL, NOW, YESTERDAY!!! So, stay tuned to when or if I get around to the Lenin section of the “*Theory of War* – Summary Notes”! On the other hand, the Huge Damage already done to Europe and perhaps also to the USA by Totally Fucked-in-the-Head Zio-Lobotomised Globalisation and Globalising Satanic Circus Monkey Zio-Freaks already seems to be irreparable, unfortunately (for those of us who are not Zio-Zombies and Zio-Psychos). [[IF YOU’RE “SENSITIVE”, DON’T FORGET TO IGNORE ALL ENDNOTES AND TEXT YOU “ARE NOT EXACTLY FOND OF OR IN AGREEMENT WITH”!!! NEITHER P.K. NOR I WANT TO CONVINCING YOU OF ANYTHING, AND P.K. ABSOLUTELY REJECTS ALL OF THE ENDNOTES, AND WHATEVER HE DID NOT WRITE, AND RIGHTLY SO!!! FURTHERMORE, THAT YOU SUPPORT YOUR FUNDAMENTAL WORLD VIEW AND YOUR GROUP’S FUNDAMENTAL VALUES IS YOUR RIGHT AND PREROGATIVE, EVEN DUTY, SO IF YOU ACTUALLY UNDERSTAND *POWER AND DECISION*, YOU’LL HAVE NO PROBLEM WHATSOEVER WITH MY RAVINGS...]]

<sup>xiii</sup> My understanding of this sentence is that: if the middle Powers of Europe turn against one another, then no middle Power will be in a position to be a significant Power or player in planetary politics.

<sup>xiv</sup> Thanks Mr. P.K. for reminding us! The Third Historical Main Phase of the Greek nation is DEAD, but a so-called “Greek” state still exists containing – apart from the innumerable Invaders, Occupiers, Conquerors, Objects of Turkish and German and Zio-USA foreign policies and various other “NGOs” and associated Organised Criminal Gangs – what purports to be the Fourth such phase, which is so ZIO-USA-GERMANO-

---

SATANIC CIRCUS MONKEY-LOBOTOMISED-DE-HELLENISED, I'd rather just go back in time in my mind... IT IS TRULY SICKENING STUFF!!! VOMIT!!! YUK!!!

<sup>xv</sup> I suppose this is approximately what Germany has done with its handling of the EU, though we must await for Reality to tell us what the “end” result is going to be, until the next “end” result, until...

<sup>xvi</sup> P.K. is basically saying that the whole spectrum of the so-called “Left” incl. the Psycho-Zio-Neo-Cons pretending to be the “conservative Right” (I mean, is there nothing these Satanic Circus Monkey People won't do to obfuscate reality with their Hocus Pocus and Retarded Magic Satan Tricks?) and Dem-Tards, all the way to SJWs and AntiFa, are just lackeys of International Capital or “Multi-national” Corporations and International Usury and the International Markets, and we all know who exactly GROSSLY DISPROPORTIONATELY wields all manner and forms of Power over those social phenomena. On the other hand, don't for one minute think there is a viable alternative. YOU SHOULD NEVER FORGET THAT. Revolutionary Change sounds good or can sound good to immature and or stupid ears and minds, but always leads to making things worse, or much, much, much worse, until if and when things get better again...

<sup>xvii</sup> This is so sickening. Obviously, the work of SATAN. It cannot be explained any other way. (I retain my sense of humour!)

<sup>xviii</sup> No, we don't want to do that because GUESS WHO, SURPRISE SURPRISE, IS GROSSLY OVER-REPRESENTED amongst the economic hyper-ideologues?!!! A-HAHAHAHAHAHA!!!

<sup>xix</sup> This to me seems somewhat facetious. P.K. is playing with us. If the political is part of the social, then the only social formation where there are no political collectives of any kind with very clear contours are (small) primitive tribes, i.e. a situation where the remaining humans in the year 2100 or 2200, for example, are nomadic bands of “scavengers”.... or even worse: the virtual “return to the animal kingdom” where the remaining humans are literally isolated individuals or very small groups “worse than scavengers”. Of course, I could be totally wrong on this point, though... he actually gives us the answer in the next sentence! He's referring to the ideology of individuals “with no group reference or characteristics” in the “free market” etc., which like all ideologies is partly, largely or TOTAL BULLSHIT!

<sup>xx</sup> And if you add to that the “invited” or “encouraged” by the Zio-Lobotomised Vulture Homo-Globo Elite the mass invasions, in addition to the “mass legal invasions” which “just happened” to be “pushed through” notwithstanding public opinion... Good Luck with all of THAT, “intelligent, erudite, cosmopolitan, sophisticated, nuanced” “people”... – The reality is however, that P.K. died in 1998 just when the great Zio-Lobotomised Demographic Changes to Europe were gathering steam, including unbelievably RETARDED mass Mohammedan and African immigration, viz. Tony Blair (and his party's Big Money Donors, and Ministers), et al. (is there no such thing as lessons to be learned from History, Moronic Spastics?), so we can't know what P.K. would have written. All that can be said is that if you let a particular Group at elite level wield GROSSLY DISPROPORTIONATE forms of Power on public policy, you are going to end up with a LOBOTOMISED SATANIC CIRCUS MONKEY MESS in relation to which the “impartial Mass Media” in “democratic polities” is going to (try to) convince you that all is well, just because SATANIC CIRCUS MONKEY *says so*, and notwithstanding all the mass rapes, assaults, murders, home invasions, dangers to public health, etc., etc., etc.. Well Done RETARDS! A job very well done! Give yourselves a pat on the back, and a beautiful brand new PRIZE – stupid, ridiculous ANIMALS!!! [[DON'T FORGET – FEEL FREE TO REJECT ALL OF THE CONTENT OF THIS ENDNOTE, ALL THE ENDNOTES AND OR P.K.'s TEXTS. NOBODY WANTS TO CONVINCING YOU OF ANYTHING. NOR IS ANY POLITICAL AND OR IDEOLOGICAL CHANGE SOUGHT. AN EXPRESSION OF OPINION(S) AND OR DISGUST OR SIMPLY DESCRIPTION AND EXPLANATION (BY P.K.), IS A PART OF FREEDOM OF SPEECH, IS IT NOT?]]