

4. From mass culture to world cultureⁱ

Europe's colonial spreading and expansion had already spanned and embraced the planet when the question of world literature, united as to its human content, was raised by Goethe. Even deeper material interweaving(s) and intertwining(s), which accompany or go with the globalisation of mass democracy as the world-historically first planetary social formation, force and oblige us today towards reflection on the possibility and character of a world culture. Reason and stuff, i.e. motives, occasions and material, in relation to that, will surely exist over the next number of decades, perhaps even centuries. Because those interweavings and intertwinings are irreversible and irrevocable in so far as they take place on a planetary scale, under the pressure of the growing and increasingly greater population density, which is hardly going to subside and retreat (tail off and die down) in the foreseeable future. The perfection (perfecting) of the means of communication and of transportation (circulation, traffic) (*or*: of communicative and transportive means) constitutes simply the technical pendant (i.e. counterpart) of a world situation, in which spaces empty of humans and "natural borders" have largely disappeared (vanished). Clearly distinguishable – and separate from one another – cultures presupposed, i.e. had as their precondition or prerequisite, however, exactly such spaces and borders, every one of which grew in its own greenhouse.

"World literature" became a theme (topic) or concept when the new-times European culture was still striving towards its high point. On the other hand, world culture was put on the order of the day (agenda) because European culture surpassed its high point or zenith long ago, that is, because the circle of the European New Times as an epoch with specific features closed, and that

(epoch) of the planetary age opened. This can also be recognised in that the general concept of culture or of “paideia ((ideal) rearing and education (learning, cultivation))” shaped and moulded by European culture since the Renaissance and thereafter, in the twentieth century has been gradually decomposed and dissolved, so that nowadays it is not possible to use such European culture as the main thread (i.e. guide) for the investigation and examination of the problem of world culture; at most this European culture is now to be contrasted, i.e. it is useful for comparative purposes. Of course, not every culture and every civilisation develops, processes or forms a descriptive or normative concept of culture (civilisation). In any case, no culture has dedicated (devoted) itself with similar or such intensity to the working and carving out or processing of such a concept of culture as the newer, i.e. new-times (modern-era), European culture. This European culture sketched or designed an ideal of culture (cultural ideal) as an ideal of education (paideia as rearing and (highly literate and intellectually advanced) cultivation) (educational/paedagogical ideal) (*or*: This European culture correlated the cultural ideal with an ideal of paideia), which indeed was obliged to be directed and oriented towards a normative concept of nature, and was supposed to be built or founded on refined and cultured (ennobled) natural installations (or facilities (constructions, systems, laying out, origins) provided by nature), yet simultaneously aimed at the autonomisation (= making autonomous) and higher positing (i.e. elevation) of the cultural/civilisational sphere vis-à-vis the material sphere of social life. This was a novelty (newness) (*or*: This constituted something new) not only in comparison to cultures which little appreciated education (cultivation, paideia, learning) (or held education/paideia in low regard)ⁱⁱ, but also in comparison to other cultures, which indeed knew how to distinguish between the educated (learned, cultivated) individual man (person) and the uneducated (unlearned, uncultivated) people (folk), yet under (or by) education (cultivation, learnedness, paideia), primarily understood ethical

perfection, and expected of such perfection a national-educational effect (i.e. an effect educative and favourable in respect of the edification and educating of the people and folk)ⁱⁱⁱ. Socrates and the orientalist guru were, in this respect, not very far apart (at a very great distance) from each other.

Socrates and the guru

Conversely, education (paideia, learning, cultivation) in the newer (i.e. of the New Times) European sense, was a cultural end-in-itself, detachable from direct practical-ethical cares and concerns, and in fact was a possible ally of the Devil^{iv}. Accordingly, it was expected that the said new-times European education or paideia would bring about and lead to ethical side-effects in the wider (broader) sense, especially since this education or paideia's attainment or conquest, like that (attainment of conquest) of virtue, demanded a self-overcoming, willpower and self-disciplining^v. This education (paideia) was an individual good, that is, it constituted a value within the framework/context of an, in principle, declared as individualistic culture, [[i.e.]] bourgeois culture^{vi}, which wanted first of all exactly through this value to be demarcated and delimited against that which it apostrophised as the rawness, apaideia, i.e. lack of, or inadequate, paideia, and barbarity of the feudal war aristocracy^{vii}.

Consequently, the concept of culture, via the concept of education (paideia, learning, cultivation), gained a dimension which visibly and perceptively distinguished and separated it from that which we could call the "objective concept of culture". Under that (i.e. by the "objective concept of culture"), the more or less unreflected way of living of a collective is to be understood (*or*: This here means/signifies the more or less self-evident and unexamined mode of life of a collective entity), its long- and short-lasting (long-lived and short-lived) mores, manners and customs (conventions, traditions), its – in art or in worship

– objectified perceptions of good and bad (evil), its way and manner and kind of enjoying and of dying (*or*: of taking pleasure in life and of receiving, and reacting to, death). This objective concept of culture applies equally to “pre-modern” and “modern” societies, and makes today’s common dichotomy between them still more problematic than it is anyhow. It has – as “folk, i.e. the people’s, culture” – also played a role within the bourgeois framework and bourgeois thought, by calling into play and being useful for – in each and every respective different form, version and dosage or emphasis – the underpinning of the in itself political concept of the nation (*or*: the founding of the nation, even though this latter concept is essentially a political concept). Since, however, the bourgeois-liberal and the anti-liberal concept of the nation already early on went their separate ways, thus the idea (notion, (re)presentation) of the, as it were, earthy, i.e. native, rooted-to/in-the-soil, primeval and indigenous, and in its essence, unchangeable and immutable “folk, i.e. the people’s, culture”, found its most decisive supporters more likely amongst old-conservatives, i.e. representatives of classical conservatism and of right-wing nationalism, who mistrusted the individualistic and at the same time cosmopolitan connotations of the ideal of education (paideia, learning, cultivation) (*or*: of the bourgeois educative-paedagogical ideal); whereas this ideal was (inter)mixed by socialists and communists on several occasions with the concept(ual plan or conceptualisation) of “class” (*or*: socialists and communists, again, frequently (inter)mixed the concept of “folk, i.e. the people’s, culture” with the concept of “class” and “class consciousness”)^{viii}. In any case, the fatal blow against the bourgeois concept of culture and of education (paideia, learning, cultivation) came not from these sides (i.e. classical conservatives and right-wing nationalists on the one hand, and, socialists and communists, on the other hand^{ix}), but from the literary-artistic modern (modernism) and avant-garde.

Extinct folk (i.e. peoples') cultures

Cultural individualism was here, first of all, driven or pushed to extremes by the creative individual (person) laying claim for himself to the sovereign right of using (*or*: the creative individual seeking for himself the right to use) cultural goods from all times (periods, epochs, eras), and lands (countries), as equivalent building blocks and materials within the framework and context of increasingly newer combinations – further still: of regarding (to regard) everything and anything possible as such building blocks and materials, irrespective of (which) origin and of (which) initial inspiration. Through that, that chasm or gulf, as the proponents of such views believed, between “art” and “spirit” was supposed to be bridged, which (i.e. such chasm) arose from the higher position or priority of the cultural element and of education (*paideia*) vis-à-vis the rest of the social spheres or sectors^x. The paradoxical consequence of these positionings and activities was that exactly that extreme individualism, which the new directions heeded, had its ground to stand on, or its foundations, taken away (*or*: was that precisely the extreme individualism which they declared was undermined)^{xi}. Wherever everything can be or constitutes art and culture, and or a cultural good, there, no artists and bearers of culture (cultural bearers/carriers/vehicles) in the bourgeois sense of the terms exist. Advertising, consumption, entertainment and culture can thus coincide. This all has led, in different variations on each and every respective occasion, to a rehabilitation or restoration of the objective concept of culture^{xii}. What once was called folk, i.e. the people's, culture, was now called mass culture^{xiii}, and although the former more likely stood under the sign, i.e. was under the influence, of tradition, whereas the latter more likely lives a changing mode, i.e. is adapted to alternating fashion^{xiv}, nevertheless it is a matter on both sides of concepts of

culture which are so far-ranging or broad that they can stretch across all areas of social life, that is, the separation between culture or education (paideia, learning, cultivation) and life does not apply and is effaced^{xv}; that is why today one speaks of the “culture of the body”, the “culture of protest”, the “culture of the horoscope”, the “culture of General Motors” and or the “culture of Disney Land”, without having the feeling or sense that these are false or meaningless expressions (*or*: that such expressions are incorrect or lacking in meaning)^{xvi}. On the other hand, the objective concept of culture which related to the traditionalistic folk, i.e. the people’s, culture, in our century was made, and became increasingly, popular^{xvii} not least of all through the work of American “cultural anthropology”^{xviii}. In any event, the ascertainment that world culture in the age of globalised mass democracy could only gain acceptance and forge ahead against the background of the imposition and predominance of the objective concept of culture weighted and assessed in this way or that (i.e. otherwise), remains decisive (*or*: What remains decisive is the ascertainment that the road of world culture in the epoch of universal mass democracy could open only from within the prevailing of the objective concept of culture in its a or b version). The formation and spreading of the world culture cannot therefore be reconciled with any concept of culture whatsoever, but especially requires the driving out and superseding (ousting, dispelling, displacement) of the – in the European New Times (or Modern Era [[say, for the purposes of this article: c. 1500 – c. 1900]]) – dominant bourgeois concept of culture and of education (paideia, learning, cultivation). World culture must, therefore, go on its way or pass over the corpse of the latter (bourgeois concept of culture and of education/paideia), and take as its approach run, or starting point, the objective concept of culture, and indeed in the sense of mass culture^{xix}. Not only because in the meanwhile the folk, i.e. peoples’, cultures have either gone extinct and died or have become sterile, but likewise for reasons which are traced (go) back or reduced to the structural differences between folk (the people’s) culture, and

mass culture. Whereas a folk (the people's) culture could flourish only under the geographical and demographical conditions hinted at the beginning^{xx}, and already because constitutively in itself mass culture contained or entailed a delimitation and demarcation against other folk (peoples') cultures, modern Western mass culture is distinguished and characterised by its in principle unlimited ability at assimilation and at combination, i.e. its unrestricted assimilatory and combinatory ability^{xxi}. Its Western origin by no means stands in the way of its globalisation or universalisation. Because the mass-democratic culture of the West had already at its beginnings – when it, namely, was being shaped and moulded still at the qualitatively elevated level of the literary-artistic modern, i.e. modernism^{xxii} and the avant-garde – opened (wide-open) a wide and broad door to the global game of the combination, i.e. to a universal combinatory game, by putting simultaneously and parallelly both the bourgeois, as well as the Eurocentrism of bourgeois culture/civilisation, under (or in the line of) fire [[incl. up to bombarding them]], something which incidentally lay in the logic of the thing/matter [[at hand]]. The mass-democratic objective concept of culture – which ruined or put aside the remnant(s) (residues, relic, carcass, remains, leftovers) of folk (the people's) culture, above all however, destroyed or dissolved the bourgeois concept of culture and of education (paideia, learning, cultivation) – [[and]] consequently represents and constitutes the necessary historical and structural condition for the coming into being of a world culture^{xxiii} – just as the mass-democratic dynamic(s) in the American and European West constituted and continues to constitute the motor for the globalisation of mass-democratic relations and circumstances (*or*: the driving force for the universalisation of the mass-democratic social formation). Only where culture as the combination of everything with everything is carried on without a fixed canon (rule, law, code, norm), and regardless of (*or*: whilst being indifferent towards) qualitative criteria – as bourgeois culture defined these same qualitative criteria –, may one expect that the hitherto or former folk

(peoples') or national cultures will be dissolved or decomposed into their component elements or parts, which then serve as the building blocks of a combination of a global or universal extent and breadth – irrespective of which individual culture will quantitatively excel and predominate in this super-combination or will set the tone, call the tune; and which individual culture gets the short end of the stick^{xxiv}. And only where such culture and living are identified with each other at least tendentially (*or*: where such culture and life are identified with each other, or at least tend to identify with each other), the extensive, far-reaching homogenisation of the external courses and sequences of life (*or*: the homogeneity of the material conditions of life) in itself suffices in order to bring about a more or less united world culture^{xxv}.

A world culture can therefore only come into being if culture in general and as such is no longer comprehended as the super-ordinated sphere, which is expressed in education (*paideia*, learning, cultivation) as an individual acquisition on each and every respective occasion. Its main function would of necessity be that of the melting pot, it would have to therefore *mutatis mutandis* pull off and bring about (carry out), on a world scale, the same thing which the mass culture inside of the multi-ethnic state of the United States performed, effected and achieved: to be the force of levelling, and through that, of integration (*or*: to level, flatten and thus to unify). For the solution to (For the solving of) such a task (an exercise), the greatest possible common denominator appears to be far more important than separating (dividing/separative/divisive) qualitative elements (*or*: For such a function to be fulfilled, the greatest possible common denominator, of course, has far greater significance than that which the qualitative elements and the separations (demarcations, severances) which are entailed in them, have). The individual would have to participate in the world culture with the same self-understanding and effortlessness as he today participates in mass culture, or yesterday had participated in folk (the people's)

culture. In short: today's Western mass culture on a world scale – is that culture which would be the sole conceivable world culture (*or*: the only possible world culture would not be any culture other than today's Western mass culture on a universal scale). Content-related differences (*or*: Differences in form and content) from continent to continent, and from land to land (country to country), would, in the course of this, count just as little as the analogous deviations, deviances and divergences inside of the framework and context of today's Western mass culture. It matters not so much as regards contents, which are almost interchangeable in any way one likes (*or*: What is essential here is not the content or the form), but the free game of the combination, i.e. the free combinatory game, itself, corresponding to the topical and current context in respect of life, of interest (*or*: topical and interesting sector of social activity), on each and every respective occasion^{xxvi}.

If now the formation of Western mass culture is a necessary condition (and at the same time a structural pattern or model) for (the) world culture, then on the other hand, such Western mass culture does not represent and constitute a sufficient condition for that world culture^{xxvii}. A world culture, in which all world citizens would participate with the same self-understanding as the members of erstwhile tribes and nations in the folk (peoples') cultures of days gone by, would require and demand – over and above and apart from the mass character of the culture – that the fundamental questions of culture (cultural questions) will not be turned into points of contention and battlefields. This would be possible because of either the ceasing, not happening or effacing and eliminating of major conflicts inside of a harmonious world society; or because of the extensive and far-reaching excluding/exclusion of the cultural dimension from the agenda of conflicts. However, neither of both of these possibilities has in the foreseeable future any prospects – to be taken seriously – of realisation. The world society will necessarily effect and bring about worldwide solidarity

just as little as national society in itself was able to achieve the solidarity of social classes and of groups (class and group solidarity)^{xxviii}. And for as long as within the framework (context) of world society, acute conflicts will take place, which will go and be beyond the level of animal/bestial struggles over naked, bare survival, the collective societies concerned will, in relation to that, tend to give emphasis and legitimation to their material aims and goals by invoking symbolic-cultural magnitudes. Inside or in the framework/context of a world culture, whose values on every side were indeed acknowledged in principle, but would be interpreted differently, things would be similar, therefore, from this point of view, to the situation which prevailed inside of national or folk (peoples') cultures.

Cultural state of affairs of the hermaphrodite (Cultural hermaphroditic condition)

However, all of this concerns the distant hypothetical future^{xxix}. The present and the foreseeable future are characterised by (stand under the sign of) a mixed, ambiguous or conflicting constellation or conjuncture. The global spreading of Western mass culture has increasingly weakened the national and folk (peoples') cultures; and given the thickening and condensing of international circulation and communication, and the growing equalisation and homogenisation of external life forms and the external way of life, their (i.e. national and folk (peoples') cultures') renaissance on the earlier/previous basis^{xxx} is hardly to be reckoned, expected or is extremely unlikely. On the other hand, however, their[[, i.e. the now defunct life forms and ways of life of national and folk (peoples') cultures']] remnant(s) (residues, remains, leftovers) are still strong enough to serve as symbolic weapons and hinder, obstruct and prevent the frank, point-blank and open collective (*or*: unambiguous and

straight-out catholic/general/universal) confession of faith in one single world culture. Collective subjects today live – as well as in the foreseeable future[[, will live]] – in a cultural state of affairs of the hermaphrodite (cultural hermaphroditic condition), which is capable of explaining some schizoid features in their behaviour. Whereas bourgeois culture and education (paideia, learning, cultivation) in the lands and countries of their origin and flourishing and peak, draw their last breath (are at the last gasp), the everyday habits (and ways of life) dictated by modern consumption, the modes of work and labour determined and imposed by modern technique (technology), and the kinds and forms of entertainment interrelating with electronic means, flow and converge together into a more or less homogen(e)ous world culture^{xxx}. Above this objective cultural basis, do the frequently and in many ways stereotypical national and folk (peoples’) cultures – and the national and folk (peoples’) cultures for their part already translated by and large into the image-language [[i.e. imagery (with audio)]] of mass culture – float, which nevertheless also in this in part ghostly, spectral shape or form can (*or*: which nevertheless also are as phantasms in a position to) have an effect of mobilising masses, if other factors drive and propel [[things]] and press towards or in that (direction). The worldwide unification of the technological equipment in daily (everyday) life and at the (one’s) place of work, will not be able to in itself put aside this cultural dichotomy, division and conflict. Because modern technique (technology), despite its Western origin, is world-theoretically neutral, and very different cultural contents can exist against the same technological background (*or*: co-exist on the same technological basis) – not to mention at all that exactly in the free spaces of a highly technicised society, there is much space, or a large place, or a wide field of action, for positionings inimical to technique (technology). In any case, a return to the more or less primeval (native, self-sown) and self-sufficient (independent, autonomous) cultures is excluded as long as the population density on a world scale makes an intensive world

circulation and world communication unavoidable and inevitable. Under these circumstances, preconditions or presuppositions, great cultural variety and cultural multiformity with regard to collective bearers can have continued existence (exist) only as cultural conflict, not as the being side-by-side (next to one another) (*or*: not as the parallel existence) of autonomous cultures.

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 – which could deliberately be (partly) wrong and or unfair – 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.*

ⁱ FAZ title: „Symbolische Waffen in der globalisierten Gesellschaft“ (= “Symbolic weapons in (the) globalised society”).

ⁱⁱ E.g. (nomadic) “savages” without writing or without an advanced written culture – if I’m not mistaken.

ⁱⁱⁱ E.g. “wise” Chinamen, “floating” Hindumen or ancient and Eastern Roman (Byzantine) Greeks. This means that the classics of the European New Times centred in the regions of present-day Italy, Germany, France and England/Scotland, added a further dimension of a relatively greater degree of “individualism” compared to the ancient-based cultures mentioned (which tended to be – grosso modo – far more tribal when considering individuality, with the individual probably breaking out more in ancient Greece (cf. Homer) than in ancient China and ancient India), and this European new-times relatively greater degree of “individualism” can at least in part tie in with Weber’s “Protestant Ethic” thesis. Never forget, though, in all societies (no matter how relatively “tribal-collectivist” or “individualist”), there are always individuals and the group/collective/society. See P.K.’s *The Political and Man* for further theorisation and scientific non-normative description and explanation thereof.

^{iv} Reference, inter alia, to the end of the squarely Christian (Medieval-Feudal)-centric Era (with very limited Secularisation at best and with a Strict Limitation on the Activities of the Representatives of Satan (HAHAHAHAHAHA!!!!!!)), as well as to Goethe’s *Faust* (?).

v And, of course, what we have today are **FULL-SPECTRUM ZIO-LOBOTOMIES** FROM PROFESSORS AND TEACHING STAFF TO THE SMARTEST STUDENTS AND PUPILS, LET ALONE THE DUMB ONES AND THE RETARDS.

vi Of course, bourgeois individualism is individualism compared ideal-typically to *societas civilis*, and by no means has anything to do with mass-democratic atomisation; i.e. the ideal-type of the bourgeois still included patriarchal (extended) family, nation and or broad ethnological-racial collectivity, Church-Religion – notwithstanding the Secularisation and Agnosticism, the operation of the “free market” and the lack of a social welfare state, as well as all the “moral hypocrisy”, the separation of the public and private spheres, etc., etc., etc..

vii And in recent decades we’ve had not only generalised APE-LIKE-DUMBING DOWN, but the Western mass-democratic INDUSTRIAL-MILITARY COMPLEX ZIO-WAR LOBOTOMY!!! WELL DONE!!! 10 POINTS!!! GIVE YOURSELVES A PRIZE!!! (Of course, *they* are well within their rights of retorting: “But apart from the fact that the masses and the people were always dumb more or less, wars have always taken place, including outside of “the ZIO-USA system” and well before the Advent of ZIO” – and *they* would be absolutely correct in saying that as a General Statement of Truth – whilst of course AVOIDING the specific, concrete questions in respect of the specific, concrete recent decades...).

viii Obviously, P.K. is here talking about “socialists and communists” at the very latest until about the end of the Cold War – but more accurately until about the end of the Second World War and before the cultural revolution of the 1960s and 1970s, which has its roots planted firmly in the period c. 1900 (say: c. 1870 to c. 1930), and not about “left-wing” supporters of GROSSLY DISPROPORTIONATELY ZIO-influenced USA “One World, Global Village, Homo-Globo, Fem(in)o-Faggotised” imperialism and its FILTHY, DISGUSTING, EVIL, PERNICIOUS SATANIC ENDLESS AND UNENDING AND INFINITE HATE AGAINST THE HISTORICAL PEOPLES OF EUROPE AND THEIR HISTORICAL TRADITIONS AND COLLECTIVE IDENTITIES, CONSCIOUSNESSES, MYTHS, ETC..

ix I repeat again, that P.K. is talking here about “political sides” which stretch back to the 16th century in so far as “classical conservatives” are concerned (see *Konservativismus*), but with the main focus being from c. 1750 to c. 1950 (with the socialists and communists becoming significant and then prominent “players” in the political arena from c. 1850).

x This is the sociological way of saying “dumbing down” or that the foundations were laid for full-spectrum ZIO-LOBOTOMY in circumstances of mass-democratic TV/then also Internet-centred consumeristic hedonism or “degeneracy”. Cf. Joseph Sobran: “in 100 years we have gone from teaching Latin and Greek in high school to teaching Remedial English in college.” HAHAAHAAHAAHAAHAAHAA!!

xi P.K. is saying here that in circumstance of mass-democracy there is massification and atomisation of society, but not the individualism as part of the bourgeois ideal, whether classified as “Promethean” or “Faustian”, etc.. That age is over (e.g. no more Beethovens, no more Balzacs, no more Great Italian painters, et al.), and those who want it to “come back” or to appear again in some new kind of form, should probably re-think how realistic their position is and what is achievable in the real world, especially given that the centre of gravity is shifting overall or *grosso modo* away from USA-Europe towards China-India, even though there is no such thing as a nice clean, even “shift”, etc.. Ethnic group survival seems to me to be the order of the day, and in the case of Europe, a white-based (though by no means exclusively white) pan-ethnic European state – which does not seem to be coming about – in close collaboration with Russia (and the USA), would have been the best way for Europe and its ethnicities to try and survive. It’s not happening – what we are seeing instead are a whole series of failed and failing attempts to “do something” with no real vision for European Survival. The whole thing is a Fucking Disaster in the making. Historical Catastrophe Time.

xii P.K.’s distinction between “[high] bourgeois (education-based)” culture, and, “people’s or folk culture”, or arriving later in European history, “mass culture”, with both “folk and mass” culture being “objective culture”, in this article, should not be confused with the social-ontological/anthropological sense of culture and society which exists for all human groups in *The Political and Man*.

xiii Which obviously includes “pop culture”. Hence, we have, folk, i.e. the people’s, culture = „Volkskultur“ («λαϊκή κουλτούρα»); and “pop” in German is „Pop“ («πόπ»), which is a part of mass-democratic „Massenkultur“ («μαζικτή κουλτούρα»).

^{xiv} And hence in the context of ZIO-USA Imperialism, esp. from after WW2 but also from The Roaring Twenties, this means a GROSSLY DISPROPORTIONATE input and influence of a historically much Despised Group, undermining Tradition and Cultural Continuity of historical peoples, and that is – for us who care – and subjectively seen as a matter of Taste in relation to an objective historical cultural context of elements of Continuity – absolutely DISGUSTING. So, You Filthy Disgusting Animals are telling me (at school, for example) or implying e.g. that I should look at a Jackson Pollock (Krasner-Guggenheim – has anyone actually ever noticed what these disgusting, filthy people look like?!) in the same way I look at a Φώτης Κόντογλου? **THAT IS ABSOLUTELY SICK, AND YOUR DAY WILL COME – BE IT IN ONE CENTURY OR IN MANY CENTURIES. THAT DAY WILL COME. DEATH TO SATAN AND ITS UNENDING ULTRA-EVIL ANTI-HELLENIC, ANTI-ROMAN HATE!!!!**

^{xv} Personally, If I were P.K., I would have made a clarification here that the issue of High Culture vs. Low Culture e.g. during the Eastern Roman (Byzantine) Era or in Ancient and Later (“Middle Ages”) China or India, etc., is another matter altogether, and not part of this article’s treatment of forms of culture, since it is obvious here we are focused on Europe from the Renaissance to the 20th century. But all of this is obvious to an astute reader, anyway, and P.K. always assumed his readers would “have a brain” of some sort. Perhaps, he hung around Conze and Koselleck too much, and occasionally forgot – though he did often remember, given the number of his sarcastic remarks throughout his works – how ridiculously fucking dumb most “Professors” were.

^{xvi} I.e. specific kinds of social interactions and social facts of themselves per se don’t necessarily make up a culture which is either “objective” (encompassing all social behaviour in a given social-political context) or distinguished on some kind of “High-Low” basis, and for the purposes of this article, between bourgeois-liberal education/paideia vs. illiberal (aristocracy-folk) *societas civilis* (or simply folk/people’s culture) or mostly illiberal mass democracy (absorbing whatever it could from both bourgeois liberalism and illiberal social democracy (socialism, communism, fascism (the “twisted” answer to the former socialism/communism, ideologically theorising nationalism “differently”, but in practice not differing all that much – sociologically-historically seen, from both bourgeois-parliamentarian nationalism, and “socialism in one country” communism-nationalism)). As we’ve said many time, today’s ZIO-USA use of the term “liberal” is just typical ZIO-BASED obfuscation of reality (which all groups do – let’s not forget that) in confusing mass democracy with liberalism in order to “keep the debate” in a place where people don’t investigate EVER, GROSSLY DISPROPORTIONATE crystal(lisation)s, accumulations and concentration of forms of Power in the hands of a particular elite based on PRIMITIVE SECRET SOCIETY NETWORKING, THE LONG HISTORY OF BANKING AND FINANCE and later corporations, etc..

^{xvii} And I add, not P.K.: “and dumbed-down”.

^{xviii} Which of course paved the way for all the Zio-Madness of everyone being “equal” whilst we-know-who got and kept through Primitive Secret Society Networking etc. GROSSLY DISPROPORTIONATE positions of relative elite forms of Power and Influence for themselves. It really is a matter of ABSOLUTE DISGUST when you look into it and if you are not one of *them* or one of their toadies or sycophants. For obvious reasons, P.K. leaves it at that (in *The Political and Man* he does allude to the intensely ideological nature of such “science”). It was not up to P.K. to touch upon, let alone go into, the issue of biology or race, particularly in Germany and particularly when he had beloved German friends who spent many years in his company and will obviously live out the rest of their lives in their Fatherland, hopefully in peace – if possible (though things the way they are going with the Invasions and out-of-control Invader and or Immigrant Crime and Disease-Spreading are not looking good for most of Europe, including Greece).

^{xix} So if we have a look at what is being taught in today’s ZIO-LOBOTOMISED schools, any remnants of the bourgeois “spirit” and bourgeois classics from Shakespeare to Bronte or use of ancient texts, tend to be re-interpreted in terms of – on average – lower IQ population groups (= further dumbing down) with all sorts of ridiculous and totally SICK ZIO-goings-on such as Negroes or South Asian Indians “playing the roles” of Achilles, David Copperfield, and GOD only knows what else. Of course, mass-democratic mass culture has, because it takes, “the right” to do all of that – and a lot more, from Faggotisation to Deeply Sick Zio-Lobotomisation even nowadays toying with Trans-Paedophilia and all sorts of ILLNESS GROSSLY DISPROPORTIONATELY participated in and promoted by ZIO-SATANISTS. If you seriously think that Western mass democracies have any Future on that Basis, you’d better either go and Jump off a Cliff, or get your Steam Cookers ready, because you’ll probably have to learn to live on Dim-Sims/Dim-Sums or Tacos or Iron Rice Bowls (if your descendants live).

^{xx} Re: one's own cultural spaces, borders, greenhouses, etc. – which, by the way, allowed for a relative racial homogeneity as part of the overall cultural-aesthetic aspect of the cultures in question – and without the SICK FILTHY AND DISGUSTING (ABSOLUTELY REVOLTING AND ULTRA-UGLY) GROSSLY DISPROPORTIONATE ZIO-INPUT INTO CULTURE.

^{xxi} AND that's exactly where SATAN and the Satanic Circus Monkey slip in. You have to understand that Christian cultures were relatively strong for as long as society was largely or recently largely agricultural and rural-based. As soon as the effects of the Industrial Revolution swept over society more and more, the more the massification and the atomisation progressed, the more SATAN's representatives with their Money etc. could slip in through Monetisation and Corporatisation and the Social Welfare State and Televisionisation qua DEEPLY PENETRATING FULL-SPECTRUM ZIO-LOBOTOMISATION (ultimately the work of SATAN and the DEVIL), and the more all of us of the West ZIO-LOBOTOMISED ourselves out of historical existence – something which was apparent to Henry Ford in the 1910s to the 1930s, but even more so especially after the Second World War.

^{xxii} The Impressionists, Baudelaire, Debussy, E. Pound, T.S. Eliot, P. Picasso, I. Stravinsky, L. Buñuel (these are some of the ones I really like!) and many, many, many more before them and after them!

^{xxiii} **DEATH TO SATAN!!!! DIE SATAN, DIE, DIE, DIE!!**

^{xxiv} And this is exactly wherein the problem lies for people with high in-group consciousness of their own who are absolutely DISGUSTED by the FILTHY “purveyors of culture” GROSSLY DISPROPORTIONATELY as a group in positions of relative Power. These ABSOLUTELY FILTHY, DISGUSTING ANIMALS ARE GOING TO HAVE TO BE DEALT WITH, AND IF WHITE FORMERLY CHRISTIAN MAN IS SO FEMINO-FAGGOTISED AND ZIO-LOBOTOMISED AS TO NOT DO IT, HAN MAN AND OR HINDU MAN AND OR APE MAN AND OR ??? MAN **WILL DO IT!**

^{xxv} **NO!!! NO!!! NO!!! DEATH TO SATAN!!! DEATH TO SATAN!!! DEATH TO SATAN!!!**

^{xxvi} Is it now understood, that sociologically i.e. taking both “the Base and the Superstructure” as one, (Western) mass democracy in itself – inter alia – because it “structurally” both as to physical as well as to ideational-ideological ACTION and INTERACTION, contains within itself the Seed of White Auto-Genocide? So, from that point of view, we are all kind of locked in. Because even if you have a degree of White and or Christian Consciousness, the Constant POUNDING of everyday existence of SATAN'S CREED and SATAN'S VALUES into the masses means that they fully or mostly accept the FULL-SPECTRUM ZIO-LOBOTOMISATION, FEMINO-FAGGOTISATION, APE-ANOMIE-OTHERISATION. The masses think its “OK and NORMAL” – in fact they BELIEVE it's “OK and NORMAL”, so no matter how much “meta-politics” you do, without MASSIVE JOLTS to the combined “Base-Superstructure” of “THE SYSTEM”, things will just continue Down the Path of the APE as ANOMIE, and civilisation to the extent it exists will be for the Han or the Hindu or ??? if they can manage to keep things somewhat UNDER CONTROL. And so and thus and hence and therefore it seems...

^{xxvii} YES!!! THE HOPE FOR LIBERATION – UNFORTUNATELY NOT FOR MY TRIBE, THOUGH, WHICH IS ALREADY EFFECTIVELY DEAD. BUT HAN MAN AND OR HINDU MAN AND OR APE MAN AND OR ??? MAN, IT'S YOUR TURN NOW TO SHOW US HOW GOOD AND TOUGH AND DURABLE YOU REALLY ARE!!! ***DEATH TO SATAN!!!***

^{xxviii} Anyone who can remember the 1970s and earlier will recollect, notwithstanding the overall relative stability of (most) Western mass democracies, that a lot of “shit” i.e. conflict still took place fairly regularly incl. between workers, unions and “capitalists/managerial elite/government/big business et al.”.

^{xxix} Which – as far as a world society with a world culture is concerned – of course will never come (about). I can (almost absolutely) guarantee you that, as can some Professors, who are not Mickey Mouse “Professors”, mentioned throughout the site: www.panagiotiskondylis.com.

^{xxx} E.g. until c. 1920 or c. 1960 at the latest.

^{xxxi} I.e. the tendency is there, and very real, of movement towards a more or less homogenous world culture, but...