

# **Identity, power, culture**

**by Panagiotis Kondylis**

**(50 cards with notes)**

**[edited and textual attention/management by Euaggelos  
Ganas (published in Greek in *Nea Hestia*, 78<sup>th</sup> year, v. 156,  
issue 1769, July-August 2004, pp. 6-19.)]**

**[[Translated from the Greek by C.F., ©, April-May, 2019]]**

# **Panagiotis (Panajotis) Kondylis**

## **(1943-1998)**

### **Identity, power, culture (civilisation)**

#### **(fifty cards with notes)**

**Editing/Edited and Textual Attention/  
Management: EVAGGELOS GANAS**

*During the final years of his life, Panagiotis Kondylis was working on a plan for a three-volume Social ontology. Upon dying in July of 1998, he left as a textual remainder (residual, residue) (as textual fragments) the manuscript of the first volume, and about 5,000 cards with notes, jottings, comments etc., which concerned the second and third volume.*

*The first volume of the work, The Political and Man, Basic features of social ontology, Volume I: Social Relation, Understanding, Rationality, circulated (was released/published) in Germany in 1999 with editing and textual attention, care and management by Falk Horst. The Greek edition is in the offing (anticipated). The other two volumes would have borne the titles (been named):*

*a) Volume II: Society as Political Collective*

*b) Volume III: Identity, Power, Culture*

*The cards with notes etc. of the [[Kondylisian unpublished]] textual remainder contain, at times, clarified and elucidated judgements by the author, in the form (kind, sort) of aphorisms, at other times, criticism/critique, positive or negative, of the opinions of classic or of less known authors regarding the topics and themes under discussion, at still other times, quotes and citations from the works of other authors, and their critical appraisal. These texts are written mainly in Greek, but also with the frequent use of German and, more rarely, English and French, in accordance with the language of the author under discussion.*

*My engagement and (pre)occupation with these cards cum notes etc., and the gradual copying of them, convinced me that, even if under no circumstances they do not replace the work which Panagiotis Kondylis would have composed (i.e. written), they give prominence to or showcase, however, the basic axes of his positions, and they would be (constitute) a valuable guide for the reader interested in (or who would love to do) further research. That is why I thought about presenting a small selection of these cards with notes etc., in a pre-publication, hoping that more experienced and worthier researchers can be enticed (lured) and want to work for the purpose of a future total (overall) publication of them (i.e. of the notes etc. on cards). The fragments which are presented here come from the material for the third volume, and were selected based on the criteria of their aphoristic character.*

*From this position (standpoint), I would like to thank Melpo Kondylis, the sister of the author, for her care and concern in saving the archive in electronic form, and for the trust she showed me in offering me access to this (archive). I hope that this publication is a first small step in the fulfilment of her deep desire for a complete edition of the work of Panagiotis Kondylis. I would also like to thank Kostas Koutsourelis, who with his great experience in translating helped me, on the one hand, to avoid certain translation-related errors, and on the*

*other hand, for the fragments to have the high level of prose to which Panagiotis Kondylis got us accustomed. Let this, finally, small publication constitute in the July-August issue of the hospitable New Hestia also a modest memorial or commemoration for the six years since the death of the author.*

father Ev. G.

\* \* \*

[[1<sup>1</sup>]] The more we analyse the relations of the human and the animal kingdom, the more clearly we see that the specific difference (*differentia specifica*) rests upon the acceptance of meaning. This seems to be the case if we take seriously advances (progress) in the research of behaviour, and we bring to our consciousness that a great part of animal (bestial) and social functions or behaviours is common to (both) man and (to) animals (beasts). Now, the *differentia specifica* becomes absolutely understandable, if we think about how many things meaning includes: as the peak abstraction it (meaning) contains also the secondary abstractions which are referred in instrumental abilities (tools (instruments), language)<sup>2</sup>. The pursuit of power interrelates precisely with this *differentia specifica*.

[[2]] If, as the pursuit of power, we designate or set the attempt at maintaining the (one's) relative position of power (power position), then in the pursuit of power, we must classify whatever aspires to the maintenance of the existent positions of power (power positions), to wit (namely), whatever is presented as

---

<sup>1</sup> Translator's footnote, absolutely nothing to do with P.K.: I'm numbering the "cards".

<sup>2</sup> Translator's footnote, absolutely nothing to do with P.K.: I remind any reader(s) that P. Ekeh is cited in *The Political and Man* with regard to the *differentia specifica* betwixt man and non-human animals being creating symbols/language and tools, and not just using what is available in nature (biologically) – BUT cf. notes on card #45 below. (Unless I am mistaken, Ekeh is the only black (African) man to whom P.K. ever referred (not that that is important in itself in regard to producing science qua scientific observation and scientifically verifiable and valid theoretical explanation)).

the attempt at maintaining social equilibrium (balance). From this point of view, the (collective) *pursuit of power* is *conformism* (whatever I do not have, no-one will have) and similar phenomena.

[[3]] Thought is oriented towards the separation friend-foe (of friend-of foe) (the separation of friend from foe), regardless of whether the act reaches contradistinctions, confrontations and tangible oppositions. Because every thought makes the distinction good-bad/evil (between good and bad (evil)), whilst every act does not reach a clash and or conflict.

[[4]] Society teaches separation into friends and foes at the same time (moment) and in the same manner which it teaches someone to separate the good from the bad (good from evil) (something which is absolutely essential for its (society's) survival). These two oppositional pairs directly correlate (interrelate) (the "bad/evil" is the foe), but also indirectly: in someone learning to identify bad/evil and the inimical; in learning to rationalise his enmity and to christen/ baptise the inimical, "bad/evil".

[[5]] If the pursuit of power, one way or another, is connected with the shortage or dearth (lack) of certain goods, then, in the final analysis, it (i.e. the pursuit of power) has to do with the finiteness of man and of his world. If we ponder precisely what this finiteness means, then we shall understand why the pursuit of power is inevitable *and* why the demand for its (i.e. the pursuit of power's) transcendence amounts to the demand for the transcendence of the finite, namely, to the demand for the construction of Paradise.

[[6]] For those who stress “sociality (or sociability)”: man did not create culture (civilisation) only because he is a social animal; if this was the *only* condition, then many other animal species also would have developed culture.

[[7]] Primitive society presents/displays a surprising, astonishing *variety* and *diversity* of beliefs, rituals and infinite variations in their use, their spreading, expansion or proliferation etc.. This variety/diversity greatly surpasses economic-community(-related) (communitarian) and or general anthropological determinations and definitions, and bears witness/attests to an intellectual(-spiritual) creativity *much higher than (far superior to) the functionally necessary*.

[[8]] The old problem of the opposition or contrast between (the) organic or nature, and, culture, my position (re)solves it (the said old problem), by following the ideational conversion and transformation of biological magnitudes. How fertile and broad (wide) this way/manner (mode) of approach is, appears from the connection of *self-preservation* and (of) the *meaning* of life.

[[9]] Essentially, it is not only that symbolic value surpasses biological (value), but also that it (symbolic value) maintains inside it(self) the formal (form-related) regularities of (the) biological (value). *Only thus (in this way)* is the phenomenon explained that man can sacrifice biological values for the sake of symbolic values! Symbolic value can, namely (to wit), be preferred vis-à-vis (the) biological (value) because it itself has become the vehicle of/for natural selection – that is to say, under the circumstances of society, all those (people)

are more powerful who are prepared to die for a symbol or a value, than all those (people) who fear for their life<sup>3</sup>.

[[10]] When we connect *meaning* with the mechanisms of natural selection, then we surpass contemporaneously and in one blow (all at once, once and for all) both biologism, as well as moralisation (ethical/moral(ity) talk, moralising)<sup>4</sup>.

[[11]] Theology says in its (own) way (manner, mode) that *spirit(-intellect)* and (the) *desire for power* are connected: Satan<sup>5</sup> is pure spirit(-intellect), and in its/his revolt against God is pushed (along) by purely spiritual(-intellectual) motives; here material goods are not at stake!

---

<sup>3</sup> Translator's footnote, absolutely nothing to do with P.K.: quite clearly then, under non-stop, decades-long FULL-SPECTRUM ZIO/USA-JOO-HEBROO-SATANIC CIRCUS MONKEY-MAMMON-DEVIL-EVIL LOBOTOMISATION AND NON-STOP BRAIN WASHING, it's quite possible – in fact it is reality – that the majority of relatively white people are going down a path of potential self/auto-genocide and think/accept that such a path “is normal”, just like they think it is “normal” for the ZIO/USA JOO-EXCREMENT-FAECES-DUNG-VOMIT-FILTH (seen as a subjective matter of Taste) to have at elite level GROSSLY DISPROPORTIONATE wealth and forms of power in various sectors in various countries with the key countries being England, France, ZIO-USA, Germany, Russia, Canada, Australia etc.. It's now up to Han Man and or Ape Man and or ??? Man to deal with these manifestations of the ZIO-JOO-HEBROO-JUDAS-SATANIC CIRCUS MONKEY-CUM PROTESTANT/PAPIST/ATHEIST/HOMOSEXUAL-FEMINOFAGGOTISED SEWER.

<sup>4</sup> Translator's footnote, absolutely nothing to do with P.K.: as in footnote 3, above.

<sup>5</sup> Translator's footnote, absolutely nothing to do with P.K.: **AAAAAAA-HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHHA!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!** Now, the reality is that every society with its dominant ideology or dominant ideologem(e)s, is going to set up some kind of contrast between Good and Evil, God and Satan, or whatever else it wants to call it. And that takes place whether we are talking about a “primitive society” or a mass democracy (having come into being after three world-historical nova). Theologians and philosophers will normally (or invariably) make the distinction without regard to immediate struggles for material goods, and that is why – more often than not – they are much more ridiculous than bearers of Common Sense (i.e. knowledge acquired from the struggle to survive in a society either (to a great extent) directly against nature (as in “primitive societies”) or more so against the complexity of a relatively developed and more differentiated society of multiple (competing) basic levels of inter-relations and inter-actions). Power = KEY (and Power in humans is tightly connected with Identity and non-physical forms of Power (with the violent/physical forms of Power, more so “in the background” and called upon, only when necessary)).

[[12]] If the spirit(-intellect) is born from the hypoplasia (i.e. incomplete or arrested development or underdevelopment) of the instincts, then the pursuit of power<sup>6</sup>, which resides (indwells or lives) (with)in the spirit(-intellect), and thanks to the spirit(-intellect), acquaints itself with – and knows of – its full (complete, total) unfolding, is born precisely from the hypoplasia of the instincts and the diffusion of the drives, urges and impulses. Precisely the abandonment of the psychology of the drives/urges/impulses brings us to the factor of power! Power is not (a) drive/urge/impulse, but – as a magnitude which is anthropologically diffused – is mixed in whatever a (hu)man does!

[[13]] The bridge between power as the safeguarding, securing and assurance of self-preservation, and power as the determination of the (one's) friend, is built with constructions which – in the final analysis – mean that (the) others are obliged to be like us, that is to say, to have the same perceptions and views and to be saved in the same manner. Here, the individual [[element, dimension, aspect, sphere]] converges with the general; this convergence constitutes precisely the unifying element of all forms of power – and this explains why Reason (Discourse, Speech, Ratio), redemption (exoneration, atonement) etc. can equally be power, like sovereignty too.

[[14]] In order to include in the definition of power, the factor of the safeguarding (securing or assurance) of self-preservation, we must say that power is the ability to influence the behaviour not only of others, but also *of oneself*. Indeed (Actually, In actual fact), one feels the ultimate weakness

---

<sup>6</sup> Translator's footnote, absolutely nothing to do with P.K.: It seems to me P.K. defines power (Macht, ισχύς) as being of human interactions and interrelations (and it seems increasingly as being akin to influence). And that's fair enough. I, personally, tend to think of power as all-encompassing of nature and its energy and then becomes more particular or specialised, so to speak, re: humans. I have no problem – personally – of following my friend Takis, though I am a bit of a FOOL and like to “do my own (Sancho Panza) kind of thing”.

(feebleness, debility) not only when one is not in a position to do anything against others, but generally when one feels that one does not control one's acts, which or will not have the desired results, or will not have any result, that, to wit, our behaviour is not controlled by (us) ourselves and does not bring the desired results. Then we feel powerless – even before any matter of control of the behaviour of others is posed/put/set.

[[15]] Until now it was believed that the pursuit of power was connected with the old theory of drives (urges, impulses), namely, it (power) was located in a separate drive (urge or impulse). We shall show that the pursuit of power exists precisely on account of the non-existence of separate drives (urges or impulses), that is to say, (on account) of the unity of the dynamic(s) of (the) drives (urges or impulses).

[[16]] (The fact) That man is a symbolic animal allows him to expand (dilate) violence from power and to enjoy power at the level of recognition. This means, parallelly, a dynamisation of the factor of power, because, since power obtains (acquires) many face(t)s (or views), and since the multiplicity of the face(t)s (or views) creates correspondences and analogies with the predispositions and the proclivities (propensities, tendencies) of (the) subjects, all the (more and) more people yearn and long for it (i.e. power). In order for someone to yearn or long for it (i.e. power), one does not need to be corporeally more powerful than others, one does not even need to exercise sovereignty. (In the rest of the animal kingdom, no power exists without sovereignty – at least, if not also violence.)

[[17]] Precisely the reflective structure of myself/oneself makes me seek (pursue, strive for) power, because this makes me ask myself every now and

then who I am – in relation to (the) others. (And at this crucial point, we see that power nests (there) where the ethicists and moralists locate the ethical/moral core (nucleus) of man).

[[18]] The pursuit of power as the subject's continual attempt (try(ing)) and effort at obtaining that which it/he is never going to have ever: stable and undisturbed identity. Whoever would have something like that, would not want power, because he would be God, namely, absolutely tranquil and self-sufficient<sup>7</sup>.

[[19]] Towards the answer(ing) (in respect) of the great aporias (doubts or kinds of puzzlement), (the) philosophers will invent all the (more and) more sophisms. But these are of use simply for the conduct(ing) between/amongst them of struggles of prestige and (of) power – not for the solution to ((re)solving of) practical problems.

[[20]] We could separate the levels of power, and say that the forms of the struggle for power (power struggle) at the level of persons present a much greater anthropologically given stability than whatever (is the case for) institutional forms (of power), which vary radically from society to society. Thus, whilst the institutionally fixed relations of power (power relations) are radically different in the Middle Ages and today, nonetheless, at the personal level, the game of power (power game) maintains (retains) more or less the same structures. The game of power (power game) between institutions maintains/retains, this (game of power) too, fixed (stable, steady) features to the

---

<sup>7</sup> Translator's footnote, absolutely nothing to do with P.K.: in other words: all human existence relates to some form of society, culture and power/identity (friend/foe, good/evil,... -related situation).

extent which the institutions are represented by people. Pope and Emperor can fight (be at war with each other) on the basis of the same formal rules (and norms) of the game<sup>8</sup> as Churchill and Hitler, even though they represent *toto coelo* different institutions.

[[21]] Of course, there is (exists) no drive (urge, impulse) of power separate from and beside the sexual drive (urge, impulse) or the b, c, d drive (urge, impulse). The pursuit of power is sourced (flows) from (has as its source) every pursuit separately, when this (every pursuit) meets (with) obstacles in its satisfaction, it resides (indwells or lives) (with)in, namely, every pursuit, and it could be considered/regarded the dynamic(s) of the pursuit. The psyche is concentrated (concentrates (itself)) on each and every active pursuit, in which the rest of the pursuits are subordinated (never are all the pursuits equally active). The pursuit of power appears then as the concentration of the psyche at on one point, and in this sense, it unifies the subject around a fundamental pursuit.

[[22]] It would be nonsensical for it to be said that politics (which differs from war) is not a *power struggle (struggle for/of power)* because here we seek and have friends too, not only foes. Because a) enmity also is (the) widening (extension, expansion, expanding) of familiar – or one's own – power; until now friendship has only existed only in a world where enmity has *also* existed. And b) it (friendship) is entered into in a world where enmity exists *too*. Without the dangers of the world, and without the pursuit of our recognition on the part of others (i.e. us being recognised by others), friendship has no

---

<sup>8</sup> Translator's footnote, absolutely nothing to do with P.K.: e.g. friend vs. foe, good vs. evil, leader and followers, sacrifice for the common good, the invoking of a higher authority and or ((implicitly or explicitly) eschatological/teleological(-like)) destiny, reality (realism in regard to concrete military and other action) and ideology/myths/motivation of the masses etc..

meaning. Proof: precisely in the war against a foe, one seeks everywhere friends!

[[23]] If inside so-called aggressivity (aggression) fear simply is hidden that the others will first do something against us, then for this (fear) to be effaced (eliminated, expunged, obliterated, blotted (wiped, struck) out), a world must be created where everyone can have everything – even those things which someone else wants (them) simultaneously. Such a world is impossible.

[[24]] Man stands out (distinguishes himself) from (the) other animals, because only he sets problems (poses questions) to which no solution exists – whereas (the) other animals set for themselves only problems which they can solve. And beyond this: man does not retain in two separate spheres the problems which are subject to being solved (i.e. are solvable) from those which are not able to be (capable of being) solved, but rather *confronts and deals with the solvable (problems) from the point of view of the non-solvable (problems)*, he sees, to wit, the former (solvable problems) from the point of view of meaning and of values.

[[25]] Eros/Love as (a) relation where both parts/sides find absolute *recognition* and where, indeed, (both parts/sides) can mutually demand *exclusive* recognition (faith, trust, loyalty, allegiance and belief).

[[26]] Whoever believes that he possesses all (the) goods, believes also that «μη ἐνδέχεται παθεῖν μηδὲν κακόν· καὶ γὰρ τοῦτο τῶν ἀγαθῶν» (Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 1385b 22-24) (= Greek = [[those who are fortunate think that]]) they

are not subject to suffering anything bad (or: cannot possibly suffer evil); and this is (one) of (the) good things (i.e. this is something good)). That is to say: whoever seeks or pursues a situation in which he will not be at risk or in danger, seeks/pursues a specific, concrete good, separate from all the others. In view of the existent, independent (autonomous or self-contained) good of security and safety, forces are mobilised which would not have appeared if it were not in the consciousness that excluding and putting aside, in advance, dangers, constitutes a good (in/by) reaching a situation which does not contain any danger. The pursuit/seeking of *this* situation sets in motion the endless pursuit of power.

[[27]] Psychology cannot explain the individual character. It can analyse permanent and general tendencies of every behaviour, however, it cannot determine that specific/concrete dosage and mix(ture) of them (of the said permanent and general tendencies) on each and every respective occasion, which constitutes the individual character. It (Psychology) can say what jealousy is, but not why one is more jealous than someone else<sup>9</sup>.

[[28]] Acts of sacrifice and of self-destruction are the price which someone must pay in order to remain in agreement with his ideational ego. The change in/of identity induces (provokes, engenders, causes) incomparably greater difficulties – apart from that, the same (change in identity) is an act of self-destruction, whereupon that self-destruction is preferred which takes place straight away and reinforces/strengthens the existing (existent) ideational ego, reinforcing and strengthening, at the same time, the course of life until now.

---

<sup>9</sup> Translator's footnote, absolutely nothing to do with P.K.: so basically, analyses of the kind which say "x is crazy" simply because he is against us, and "y is sane" simply because he is for us, amount to ideological bullshit, trying to conceal or otherwise blur the anthropological-social-ontological constant of power, in order for "us" to seem "normal and sensible and rational and logical" and our foe to seem "crazy". What is really ALWAYS at stake is POWER and everything which goes with it, such as MONEY etc..

[[29]] Two basic schools for the texture (composition, constitution) of the *(one)self*: a) as many *(one)selves* exist in every person as social persons or groups exists too (in every person). b) The *(one)self* is united, a particular self-contained (autonomous, independent) evolutionary process (elaboration, operation). Accordingly, the role of social control is appraised or evaluated, of self-control, of societisation and socialisation (ἐκκοινωνισμὸς) etc.. The attempt by someone to prove one of these two views and perceptions is tantamount to the squaring of the circle. Someone impersonates many persons/faces precisely because he seeks *one* thing: recognition. For there to be one, there must be many. Frequently, the same person/face knows that he impersonates (is impersonating) many (persons/faces). The price (to pay/to be paid) to be successful towards the outside is to become weak(er) (weaken oneself) towards the inside – one can, however, do the opposite as well.

[[30]] The relation(ship) between subjects is the negotiation of their identities. If it is not possible for one to completely (totally) accept the self-understanding of the other (because this would entail the adoption of a scale of values (value scale) dangerous for one's own identity), then it is examined – since the maintenance of relations is considered to be more advantageous – which points will be neutralised-ignored and which (points) will be changed and transformed on both sides (either permanently, or ad hoc; namely, in view of this relation(ship), even though they (the said points) can remain active as to another (relation(ship))). But even also when the first equilibrium (balance) is achieved, it is possible, on the basis of acquired positions, to undertake or attempt the reoccupation (i.e. regaining) of the ground/territory (terrain) which was conceded or given away (donated) initially. Thus, at a later stage, the clash and conflict which was initially avoided comes into being (is born, arises).



undisturbed unity; since it is undisturbed, it seems that it does not contain unknown coefficients (factors, agents or contributors). However, the fact that the known coefficients, factors etc. have been balanced or have found an equilibrium (either emotionally or in our image/picture regarding our ego, or either also between these two), it does not mean that unknown (coefficients, factors etc.) do not exist.

[[33]] The drive (urge, impulse) (Trieb, ὄρμη) is a united energy, power or act(ion) (ἐνέργεια), a stream or current of activity, power or energy and of forcefulness (vigour, intensity or dynamism) (ἓνα ῥεῖμα ἐνέργειας καὶ δυναμικότητας). Its each and every respective channeling makes it differ, take forms and present itself like/as one or the other [[thing]] (which is the first drive/urge or impulse? Volition, i.e. the will? Self-preservation? Sovereignty? All are the same). This (drive etc.) itself exists beyond (the) good and (the) evil (bad), and only (the) labeling in accordance with these concepts gives it the corresponding image/picture, just as it gives to its bearer the feeling (sentiment or emotion) of pleasure and of displeasure (of recognition or of qualms, regrets or pangs/feelings of guilt). The same drive (urge or impulse) is subject to all (the) cases and instances, the same (drive etc.) is at times presented as aggressivity or aggression, and at other times as ethics or morals (morality).

[[34]] To what extent is the ego of the ten-year-old the same as (the ego) of a fifty-year old? Does it happen to change completely (totally) like the/a ship, which – every now and then – a part of it (the said ship) is replaced, and in the end it does not keep but the (its) name – whereupon it is the same only (and only) because some people regard it as the same? If society did not consider an individual as identical with (regard to) itself/himself within the succession (or

sequence) of time, to what extent would the same (individual) have (an) awareness, apprehension, cognizance, sentience or apperception of this identity? That is to say: if the fifty-year old sees his ten-year old self, to what extent will he recognise a continuous ego? And even more (so): if I could see my present self, comport (and bear) itself and move, would I recognise it in the case I had not seen it(/him/me) in the mirror?

Because sometimes the past appears like a dream, to wit, what is the degree of truth in the reconstruction (remoulding, redevelopment, recasting or regeneration) of past experiences? Does not the lack of a fixed ego allow (permit) but scattered cross-checked representations from the past? To what extent is the past as organised history of life [[i.e. biography]] necessarily fiction (myth-moulding or confabulation), which we need for the present?<sup>11</sup>

[[35]] We avoid/evade becoming acquainted or familiar with and knowing the other: the unselfish analysis of his (the other's) motives does not allow/permit us to take vis-à-vis him, the position we want – especially, it (the said unselfish analysis of ...) can shake and unsettle the feeling or sense of superiority or indulgence and lenience vis-à-vis him. We prefer his conventional image or picture which serv(ic)es the needs of our affect.

[[36]] Success reconciles [[itself]] with the world, as this (the world) is. Because its (the world's) structures are presented then as the precondition (prerequisite), or, at least, reconcilable and compatible with regard to our success.

Nonetheless, this does not mean that the successful (person) relinquishes and gives up every critique (criticism). (In particular, if this critique had been woven

---

<sup>11</sup> Translator's footnote, absolutely nothing to do with P.K.: obviously a lot of the time "a bit of this" and "a bit of that" are involved, i.e. both the representation of factual reality and the representation of a kind of myth etc., in varying doses, depending on the situation.

and had been consolidated in the – before success – period of non-appearance and obscurity and of the (inter)related complexes/clusters). Because critique gives [[us/one]] the sense/feeling of power, and the successful (person) wants to now enjoy this (sense/feeling of power), fixing, fastening and consolidating his old critique with his present success, and giving, thus, the desired continuity (continuance) to his development/evolution.

[[37]] Man struggles ceaselessly in order to present towards the outside a personality [[which is]] consistent and complete(d). He continually deceives himself for himself. His behaviour is regulated in accordance with the image or picture which he wants to give; that is why between his behaviour and his real self, a chasm exists (politeness and courtesy(, gentility, nobility) consists in overlooking it – in others). Aggressivity (Aggression, Aggressiveness) increases when others see the chasm, and especially when we know that they see it<sup>12</sup>. Then we try to find (out) what base motives the behaviour of the other has vis-à-vis us.

[[38]] Inertia, the law of psychical economy: it is impossible for someone to live at the height of experientially (in terms of life and living) more intense moments. These are, in reality, few, and if they seem to be more, this occurs because in every contiguous (or approximately similar) cause, motive or occasion we reconstruct or remould the feelings, sentiments (or emotions) of the great, intense moment (apart from the fact that our feelings etc. are stylised in

---

<sup>12</sup> Translator's footnote, absolutely nothing to do with P.K.: **AAAA-HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHHA!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!**  
**!!**

advance, on account of culture: eros/love, admiration and wonderment in respect of nature, etc. are things [[which are]] culturally established and institutionalised). This law<sup>13</sup> applies to, and is valid for, people who are particularly creative. Great artists create, since (or given that) they gestate for many years and knead, ferment, mash their work in/at moments anything but having their head in the sky (i.e. being non-realistic): word by word, note by note, from a thousand daily causes, motives or occasions, from infinite, more or less chance/coincidental associations, connotations and other influences. The image or picture of the genius, who lives in [[a state of]] continual fever, is fictitious – proof being [[the proof/evidence is]] that all the greats were very hard-working and industrious. Genius means: to be so given to something, so/such that you *continually work* for that. Little work means, consequently, a lack of genius. But the/a great amount of work means, in its turn, the/a lack of genius as continual irrational fever.

[[39]] Precisely because the ego is not some stable identity, but an energetic fluid or liquid, which is formed and takes form pouring (or whilst being poured) in various vessels, it (the ego) absolutely needs certain poles on the basis of which it is constituted on each and every respective occasion. The two fundamental such poles are the friend and the foe, which/who satisfy the two fundamental needs of the energetic fluid/liquid: to expand (dilate) and to contract (shrink).

[[40]] To sophistry is the synopsis of the basic passions reduced to four (joy-sorrow, desire-fear); and (the synopsis) of the flaws (defects, faults), to three

---

<sup>13</sup> Translator's footnote, absolutely nothing to do with P.K.: a very rare, if not unique, reference to humans, human behaviour in general and "law" («νόμος»). It could well be that P.K. would have not included the word "law" put in that way in the final draft of the text he had in mind to write.

(mania in respect of one's own belief(s) and opinion(s) which produces hyperbolically great ambition, love of money, love of pleasure (incl. salacity, sensuality, carnality, sexuality)). Let it be noted that *the flaws are all forms of desire* – and only fear tempers or moderates desire.

[[41]] Feelings (Senses) are not very different amongst animals and humans, or amongst humans and humans (men and men). That which accords to them “depth”, and differentiates (refines) them, is intelligence and meaningfulness – and this is man's privilege vis-à-vis animals (beasts) and the privilege of some people (humans, men) vis-à-vis others (other humans/people/men). Nothing becomes directly perceived/perceptible or felt, but only through or by means of the cognitive-mental-intellectual [[meaning-bearing]] act. Precisely since cognition-intelligence and comprehension/understanding brings to consciousness a feeling/sense, it (cognition cum comprehension) makes it (feeling or sense) complex, complicated, namely, it interprets it (the feeling of sense) and enriches it associatively etc., to wit, with all its own means (i.e. the means of cognition cum comprehension)<sup>14</sup>.

[[42]] The fact that man acts in/under the shadow of death does not mean that he does not do anything else but think about it (death) (he (man [[in general]]) does not think like the existential philosophers). However, the more partial ((in-)part, separate or individual) dangers, to which he concentrates his attention, *these* stand under the shadow of death, and it is potentially possible or probable for them to climax (or reach their peak) in this sense (or with this concept). Man

---

<sup>14</sup> Translator's footnote, absolutely nothing to do with P.K.: and, thus, the age-old “philosophical battle royale” between cognition and will (or spirit/intellect and the senses) etc. is answered: they are all interrelated and inseparable, but separated only for the purpose of theoretical reflection through abstractions etc.. What really matters is the social relation and humans (as biological – in nature – animals too) always being within or at least referring to the social relation.

does not live in/under the shadow of death in the sense that the thought of death paralyzes him (man); conversely, he (man) seeks his aims as if he were immortal, namely, as if his aims were absolute. But death appears in his (man's) life as danger, as (a) foe, as fear.

[[43]] For the multiformity and, at the same time, the fundamental unity of man (around basic drives, urges and impulses): (the fact) that a tree has a root does not bother it (the tree) from having many branches – nor does it bother the branches from occupying a much greater extent (or area (scope, range, expanse, space)) than the root.

[[44]] Since the instincts lose in man their distinctive locating (pinpointing) and function, they become loose (slack, relaxed), they spread (out) and they get mixed up, jumbled or mashed [[with other facets of human existence]]. (There) Where we had footings, bases, foundations or supports and functions separately, now we have a tumbled, untidy, tangled, messy, mixed pulp, a floating and fluctuating energy. Only this pulp can have plasticity, and that is why it can be moulded and created from the outside by the formifying (i.e. producing form(s)) strength of culture. However, the loss of the distinguishing/distinctive reference does not in the least mean the reduction of/in the intensity of psychical energy. *Precisely the opposite takes place. Culture is called upon now to give form to a greater intensity, and that is why the clash and conflict between rule (norm) and soul is programmed!*

[[45]] Man is not simply the animal (beast) which creates symbols. He (Man) is the animal (beast) which makes the symbols part of his real environment, and who behaves vis-à-vis them also like vis-à-vis the rest of the parts of his real

environment. That is to say: in this behaviour, he (man) participates whole (i.e. he wholly participates), with the mechanisms which his unconscious impulses move (i.e. set in motion). Only for this reason can the hypotheses of the spirit(-intellect) become the hypotheses of life and death.

[[46]] If the small quanta of power did not exist, society would not know of (be familiar with) either the great (quanta of power) – even if the transition from the former to the latter does not take place linearly. Small quanta are even also those which allow me to move and to act, in principle without (a) necessary connection with others. My ability at, or capacity for, motion/movement and energy, brings me into contact –that is, potentially and into conflict– with others.

[[47]] Even also the full/complete identification (i.e. equating) of one's own (familiar) behaviour with the behaviour of another, aspires to the reinforcement of the ego and of self-conviction. Because this other person/man as a rule is greater and more powerful, the child wants to take *these* properties (qualities and characteristics) when it (the child) identifies itself with him.

[[48]] In relation to historical ideal types (“capitalism”), in which the collective act is crystallised, the following optical illusion must be pointed out: although these types come into being and are born historically from the heterogony of ends, nonetheless their purity submits (i.e. suggests (or suggestively makes)) the impression that they came from a purely rational positing of goals and aims (and attempted realising of desires) (Zweckrationalität) *as to this aim or goal*, that namely, the act which created them had (*subjectively*) this meaning. But this meaning, they have only *objectively* (the point of view or standpoint of the

observer, who now is in danger or at risk of regarding as subjective meaning whatever exists as historical construct). At the level of heterogony, the optical illusion is inevitable if this rational positing of goals and aims (and attempted realising of desires) (Zweckrationalität) is understood and meant linearly.

[[49]] If we accept a rationalism of identity, perhaps we shall escape from the vicious circle (of) egoism-altruism: I can connect my identity with the perpetration (doing) of altruistic acts. Identity is found in itself above the conceptual pair. That is to say, it (identity) can be egoistical or altruistic. But *also* in the second case, an ego exists in order for it to be altruistic. No altruism exists which does not have an ego as its bearer, which during the perpetration of an altruistic act, feels or senses *fulfilment (filling, repletion)*. Altruism without existential fulfilment (filling, repletion), that is, accompanied by aversion (distaste, repulsion, abhorrence), is nothing but the forcing of the ego, that is, not altruism<sup>15</sup>.

[[50]] In the behaviour of others, the self (oneself) sees what is useful for him. Even if one is about to turn against others, one must adopt essential parts of their behaviour (starting from/with the language) in order to obtain/acquire the possibility of moving socially<sup>16</sup>. He must be(come) socialised in order to succeed in achieving his individual (personal) goals (ends).

---

<sup>15</sup> Translator's footnote, absolutely nothing to do with P.K.: this to me says that one cannot get out of the La Rochefoucauld position that all acts – “good or bad/evil” – are connected in some way with (personal, egoistical, [[I add]] and or group) interests.

<sup>16</sup> Translator's footnote, absolutely nothing to do with P.K.: obviously, we are dealing with someone within a particular society, and not e.g. with two sides (foreign to one another) about to engage in violence as war.