

# THE LUMINOUS (ILLUMINATED / BRIGHT) AND THE SHADOWY (SHADY / UMBRAGEOUS) SIDES (FLANKS) OF VISIONS

*(An answer to Ger. Lykiardopoulos)<sup>i</sup>*

Translated from : «ΟΙ ΦΩΤΕΙΝΕΣ ΚΑΙ ΟΙ ΣΚΙΕΡΕΣ ΠΛΕΥΡΕΣ ΤΩΝ ΟΡΑΜΑΤΩΝ (Μιά απάντηση στον Γερ. Λυκιαρδόπουλο)» στο: ΚΟΝΔΥΛΗΣ, ΠΑΝΑΓΙΩΤΗΣ, ΜΕΛΑΓΧΟΛΙΑ ΚΑΙ ΠΟΛΕΜΙΚΗ, ΔΟΚΙΜΙΑ ΚΑΙ ΜΕΛΕΤΗΜΑΤΑ, ΘΕΜΕΛΙΟ, ΑΘΗΝΑ, 2002, pp. 75-90 by da Krazy Man Barbarian

Idiom Barbarian Idiot © 2026.

τοῦτο τό ὄραμα καί τήν κρίσιν

δέ ἐροῦμεν =

*"This is the dream; and we will  
tell the interpretation thereof  
before the king."* [King James]

Δανιήλ, 2,36 = Daniel 2:36

The observations of / [[made]] by G.L. on/regarding my essay, treatise "The old and the new godhead (deity, divinity)" (see respectively, correspondingly *Σημειώσεις* 16, p. 79-87 and *Σημειώσεις* 13-14, p. 81-109) are written with frankness, outspokenness, bluntness, directness, candour, candidness and perspicuity, succinctness. Nonetheless, between the logical and the rhetorical kind of perspicuity, succinctness or cohesion, there is / exists an essential difference, and I fear that G.L. did not pay attention to it as much as / to the extent that he should have. Otherwise, he ought to have posed to himself the question as to / of how it is logically possible to expressly, explicitly accept the correctness of in-part / partial basic theses, positions of mine and at the same time to reject, repel, spurn, repulse the general positioning, in which they (the

said in-part basic theses) are integrated. Either the integration must be on my part logically defective, faulty, deficient (but this is not what G.L. contends, asserts, claims, maintains) or his partial acceptance [[of my in-part positions]] is not (to be) reconciled / reconcilable with the general rejection, repulsion, spurning [[of my overall positioning]]. If this in reality is happening / occurring / taking place (as I shall show), then the rejection, repulsion, spurning can only have (extra-logical) causes / reasons / grounds (outside of, beyond logic) – and I say this believing / in the belief that one such ascertainment cannot be offensive for such a(n) ardent, fervent defender of / advocate for the “reality of the dream” like G.L.. That / The fact that psychological needs push, propel one towards logical leaps / leaps in logic, is (very) well-known / known to all and sundry / everyone. However, my purpose / goal / end is not to define these psychological needs, but rather to locate the leaps in logic / logical leaps. Perhaps the first / former (definition of psychological needs) would make this text cuter, more graceful, prettier, happier, whereas the second / latter (location of the leaps in logic) will make it / the (this) text obviously more prosaic and grumpier, more cantankerous. I’ll prefer it / this (more prosaic and more cantankerous text), however, although I know how frequently to untrained (unfocused) eyes the clear and fine conceptual differentiations look / seem like “(different kinds of) sophistry”. The gain, benefit, winnings, profit from restriction, limitation to the purely logical (and historical) part will be, if not anything else, at least the abidance of the conversation (staying, remaining) at the (a) (decent, seemly) level (of decency), at which G.L.’s text moves.

G.L. accepts at least three of my fundamental theses / positions : (a) he writes that, indeed, “we can ascertain the identity, identification, equivalence, sameness, equality of the conceptual structure between theistic metaphysics and atheistic humanism” (p. 85); (b) he writes that it could very well be that

every theoretical interpretation of the Idea of Man is a pursual, pursuit of dominance, dominant authority, sovereignty, rule (p. 86 ff.); (c) he writes that the rule is precisely that an ideology professes, promises universal, general, catholic emancipation, liberation, freeing and in practice is translated into new relations of rule / dominance, dominant authority, sovereignty (p. 86). He also writes that his objections do not turn against the logical validity (of my propositions, statements, sentences) (p. 82). Elsewhere he sees the weak side of my argumentation<sup>ii</sup> : that with the stressing of the priority of the conceptual structure vis-à-vis the difference between the contents of two or more ideologies one ends up “deleting, wiping out antithesis, opposition from the world” (p. 80)<sup>iii</sup>, and in (the fact) that generally the identity, identification, equivalence, sameness, equality of the conceptual structure cannot explain the differences of / in content (p. 81)<sup>iv</sup>. Here G.L. makes his first leap in logic / logical leap, which is at the same time a leap against the reading of my text<sup>v</sup>, in which (there is) the e.g. phrase (exists) : “the unconscious commonality of their (the ideologue’s) conceptual structure requires, forces them to come into opposition / clash over the possession of the same space, area, realm [. . .], whilst / whereas the conscious difference of the content is of use / useful [. . .] as a means of intensification and legitimation / legitimisation of both enmity as well as the claims to / on / of dominance, dominant authority, sovereignty, rule on both sides” (p. 82). In other words : claims to / on / of dominance, dominant authority, sovereignty, rule are projected by two or more sides in every historical conjuncture and precisely from this does the multiformity / (great) variety, diversity of ideologies arise, result. Since, however, the struggle, fight, clash, combat has as its objective purpose, goal, end(,) dominance, dominant authority, sovereignty, rule / ruling over others, ideologies of (the) opposing, conflicting sides must present that structure, which will justify it (the said

struggle, fight). The identity, identification, likeness, sameness, equivalence, equality of the conceptual structure means that whoever raises, makes claims of / on dominance, dominant authority, sovereignty, rule / ruling over others must use for his purposes, ends, goals the dimension of Over There / That World and Over Here / This World – and the variety, diversity of the content(s) means that each and every respective determination of the Over There / That World and of the Over Here / This World must be different to the opponent's (determination of the Over There / That World and of the Over Here / This World), so as to be / that it is of use as a weapon of / for fighting, the fight, struggle, combat, battle, conflict. The / A(n) identity, identification, likeness, sameness, equivalence, equality of content would mean, signify the eclipse, abolition of the (ideological) reason / cause of fighting, the fight, struggle, combat, battle, conflict, and I am the last person who would deny the fact of fighting, the fight, struggle, combat, battle, conflict or its ideological reasons, causes. *Precisely / Exactly because* ideologies express claims of / on / to dominance, dominant authority, sovereignty, rule / ruling over others, they differ just as much between themselves as the bearers, carriers, vehicles of such claims – and *precisely because* they express claims of / on / to dominance, dominant authority, sovereignty, rule / ruling over others, they contain the dimension of (the) Over There / That World and of (the) Over Here / This World. Between the common to all / everyone dimension of (the) Over There / That World and of (the) Over Here / This World and the multiformity / (great) variety, diversity of content(s), (there is) an organic relationship (exists), since both express two interconnected, interdependent, intertwined needs of fighting, the fight, struggle, combat, battle, conflict for / over dominance, dominant authority, sovereignty, rule / ruling over others. The identity, identification, likeness, sameness, equivalence, equality of (the) conceptual

structure is not the opposite, antithesis of (an) ideological multiformity / (great) variety, diversity, as G.L. contends, argues, asserts, but precisely its precondition, prerequisite, presupposition or its counterpart, analogue, correlative. From a / the historical and sociological point of view, the logical magnitude “identity, identification, likeness, sameness, equivalence, equality of (the) conceptual structure” does not mean, signify anything other than the elementary fact that a number of sides simultaneously raise, make claims of / on / to dominance, dominant authority, sovereignty, rule / ruling over others – begetting, generating, giving birth / rise to the variety, diversity of ideological forms, types, in which their fighting, fight, struggle, combat, battle is expressed and with which it (their fighting, fight, struggle, combat, battle) is conducted / carried out. The source of the multiformity / (great) diversity, variety (of the content(s)) is the fight(ing), struggle, combat, battle, however the source of the fight(ing), struggle, combat, battle are the simultaneous claims of / on / to dominance, dominant authority, sovereignty, rule / ruling over others by several sides (that is, the identity, identification, likeness, sameness, equivalence, equality of (the) conceptual structure). G.L. accepts, as we have seen / saw, the fact of the identical conceptual structure of (the) conflicting, opposing ideologies, and I do not imagine that he denies that in every historical conjuncture a number of factions raise, make at the same time claims of / on / to dominance, dominant authority, sovereignty, rule / ruling over others. From these two propositions, sentences, statements together the conclusion is obligatorily, necessarily extracted, drawn that (the / an) identical conceptual structure and the / a variety, diversity of content(s) are not only not mutually exclusive, but rather, on the contrary, contrariwise, the one is inconceivable, unthinkable, unimaginable without the other. In the light of this conclusion, the contention, claim, argument by G.L. that supposedly for me the opposition,

antithesis of ideologies “does not exist except in the kingdom, realm of phenomenology (appearance)” (p. 80) is also unsupported, unsupportable, untenable, unsustainable, unsustained. On the contrary, the antithesis, opposition is charged with all the existential vigour and ire, wrath, anger of those opposed to, opposing, conflicting / in conflict with one another; it (the said opposition, antithesis) is phenomenological, appearance-related/based *only on the basis of the criterion of the abolition of every (kind / form / type of) dominance, dominant authority, sovereignty, rule / ruling over others*, that is, on the basis of the measure, yardstick of comparison of the nominal and the real value of ideological promises. G.L. does not make the necessary logical and historical distinction between the level of claims of / on / to dominance, dominant authority, sovereignty, rule / ruling over others (where the opposition(s), antitheses are tangible and existential) and the level of promises as regards the abolition of every (kind / form / type of) dominance, dominant authority, sovereignty, rule / ruling over others (where the opposition(s), antitheses are phenomenological, appearance-related/based and verbal, lectical). Not being able to, obviously, despite all his disbelief vis-à-vis the world view of the “liberators, emancipators” (p. 86), reconcile himself with the idea that the abolition of every (kind / form / type of) dominance, dominant authority, sovereignty, rule / ruling over others is a chimera, mirage, he argues from the point of view of the hope for its (every (kind / form / type of) dominance’s, dominant authority’s, sovereignty’s, rule’s / ruling over others’) abolition. Only from that point of view, can the censure, reproach that for me the opposition(s), antitheses of conflicting, opposing ideologies are phenomenological, appearance-related/based have meaning (and be correct, right).

Against my position, thesis regarding / about the identity, identification,

sameness, likeness, equivalence, equality of the conceptual structure of conflicting, opposing world views, G.L. presents, projects the argument that the magnitude “conceptual structure” means, signifies “(the) reduction of the multiple(x) to the simple” or (the) “nihilistic simplification of the multiplicity (manifoldness) of thought”<sup>vi</sup> (p. 81). And this argument flows from the absence of clear logical distinctions. In this case, the logical-epistemological level is confused with the level of reality. Language and thought realise abstractions, in the sense of the conceptual compression, condensation of the multiformity, great variety / diversity of the tangible world, already at their elemental levels. I do not imagine that G.L. never himself uses the word “fruit” only because there is no such thing, but only a category of things which are synopsised / summarised under that name. In a manner which is phenomenologically, appearance-wise paradoxical, but internally necessary, the abstraction from the specific, concrete to its uniqueness, singularity makes mutual understanding easier and indeed constitutes its condition<sup>vii</sup>. Being rooted / Having taken root already inside of language’s structure (every word is an abstraction – even every perception of the sensory / sensorial organs as well / too), it (abstraction) constitutes the  $\alpha$  (alpha) not only of every scientific analysis, but also of every dictum, statement, even though I would absolutely agree with G.L. that it ought not constitute its  $\omega$  (omega) too / as well. Precisely / Exactly because the / an abstraction is unavoidable, inevitable, even for him who argues against it, the argument does not suffice as (a) censure, reproach that something multiple(x) is reduced to something simple. It must be specifically / concretely demonstrated that this simple thing is *also*, as a logical tool (instrument) / tool (instrument) of logic, unable to grasp, comprehend, capture, conceive of the multiple(x). In my essay, treatise I developed an elementary conceptuality with a specific, concrete purpose, end, goal : on the basis of the distinction between

conceptual structure and content (which is based, predicated, established, grounded, founded on the (well-)known to every beginner studier / student of Logic expansion, dilation, division, distinction, separation, differentiation of form and content), I wanted to explain the historical fact that the promises of general, universal, catholic emancipation, liberation are, in the end, translated into new relations of dominance, dominant authority, sovereignty, rule / ruling over others. G.L. does not deny, as we saw / have seen, either the distinction or the fact. If, however, he denies that the distinction (logically) interprets the fact, then he himself would have to offer a new interpretation. (There is) no / No other way / manner / mode for the rebuttal, refutation, confutation of my position / thesis (exists). It is methodologically impermissible to request, require, ask for the use of logical tools, instruments for purposes, ends, goals other than those which created them. For G.L. the issue is “how *one* lives and (how *one*) dies” (p. 86). Yet the ultimate, extreme individual case –to the degree, extent it becomes an object of concern, care and study– concerns / is relevant to the confessor or the psycho(patho)logist – not (to) history and (to) sociology. Is perchance G.L. himself in the position to totally *explain* every single individual case ? If yes, then he has reached heights of knowledge about / of man and of knowledge about / of himself (self-awareness) unknown hitherto / until today in science<sup>viii</sup> ; if not, then the invocation of the uniqueness, singularity of the individual has only the character of (a) sentimental protest. Or perchance –inversely, conversely, the other way round– does G.L. want to argue, contend, maintain, assert that e.g. Marx(’s) or Pareto’s work did not help at all as regards the understanding of human activity, only / just because the explanation of every individual case does not belong to its jurisdiction / area of competence ? This stance is not inspired by indifference for the individual case, but rather gnosiological / gnoseological, epistemological



modesty, the avoidance of lyrical grandiloquence and the keeping to / observance of / compliance with elementary rules.

Let us, however, look at / see the problem also from the point of view (not of deduction but) of induction : G.L. would have to show how it is methodologically possible from the collection of individual and unrepeatable (unparalleled, unique, singular) cases and only from the collection of individual and unrepeatable (unparalleled, unique, singular) cases for social and historical science to be created. Perhaps he will say that this social and historical science does not interest him – nonetheless, he then must agree with me that the less / least appropriate, suitable, proper, fitting way, manner, mode for someone to show their indifference vis-à-vis a certain interpretation of things is to write polemics / polemical material against it<sup>ix</sup>.

To the extent, degree that the conceptuality of my essay, treatise concerns the interpretation of the multiple(x), it wishes / desires to stress the role of polemics in the genesis of ideologies (from the level of the large group up to the personal level). As we (have) said, multiformity / a (great) variety, diversity, being the reverse side / face of the identity, identification, equivalence, sameness, equality of the conceptual structure, arises (with)in the framework / context of a multiple(x) and multi-dimensional competition, rivalry. As a rule, every world view is born either as the simple polemical reversal of the content of another world view, or, as the combination of content(s) from various sources in accordance with the specific, concrete, -on each and every respective occasion-, correlation of forces and tendencies. That is to say : for the multiformity, (great) variety, diversity of ideologies as to details / the minutest detail / each and every respective case to be grasped, comprehended, captured, conceived (of), an as far as possible precise re-composition /

reconstruction of the specific, concrete situation is needed with a compass for / of orientation the – on each and every respective occasion – multiple groupings / formations of groups around the ceaselessly shifting, mobile axis “friend-foe”<sup>x</sup> or “active-prospective / aspirant / candidate ruler, sovereign, dominator, dominant authority, master, lord”. This interpretation, as with every other interpretation, is inevitably abstract in its programmatic formulation; the problem is whether it proves to be fertile, fruitful in the interpretation of *specific, concrete cases*. Only with that criterion can it be verified or rejected. Beginning / Setting forth (off), now, from the erroneous impression that the concept of the identical, same, like, equivalent, equal conceptual structure excludes the grasping, comprehension, conception, capture of the multiple(x), G.L. summons, recruits, mobilises, conscripts, calls forth the vision precisely as that element which saves, rescues, salvages the (what is) individual and unrepeated, singular, unique from the steam-rollers, road rollers, juggernauts of conceptualities. However, on / in regard to this crucial point, his thought makes, does a leap ; this time the semasiological, semantic with the logical value of a word is confused<sup>xi</sup>. Because the word “vision” semasiologically / semantically appears (at least logically in accordance with the common (“market”) perception) to suggest, imply, connote something entirely different from / other than (the) “conceptual structure” –something pulsating, palpitating, throbbing and individual in contrast to the “nihilistic simplification” of the latter / second (“conceptual structure”)–, G.L. concludes that it (the word “vision”) would / will have to be used as the highest / supreme / paramount tier of jurisdiction (authority) / authoritative criterion, if we want to save, rescue, salvage and mean the multiformity / (great) variety, diversity of life. However, the logical value / worth of the word “vision” has no necessary relation(ship) with its semasiological / semantic value. From a logical point of

view, that is, as a concept, the word “vision” does not differ in the least from the expression “conceptual structure”. More simply: the vision is an abstraction at least equally with / as much as “conceptual structure” (as well, too), that is, it exists only in the form of countless, infinite content(s), which are never identical, equal, equivalent / identify from specific, concrete vision to specific, concrete vision. For the living multiformity / (great) variety, diversity it does not suffice / is not enough that “the” vision / “vision” be counterposed to conceptual structure, but rather the same infinite multiformity / (great) variety, diversity of vision from epoch, era to epoch, era must be explained, from place to place, from group to group, from (hu)man to (hu)man. By confusing the semasiological / semantic with the logical value of the word “vision”, G.L. does not even suspect that, equally with him demanding / just as he demands –and justly, rightly does he demand– an interpretation of the (great) variety, diversity of (the) ideological content(s) despite the identity, identification, sameness, equivalence of their conceptual structure, (thus / in this way) he too ought to declare to which factors is the inconceivable (great) variety, diversity of visions which tormented (tortured, racked, harassed) or consoled (comforted, solaced) people, humans from time to time / throughout the ages due. Does not e.g. the reduction of everything to the category “vision” constitute a “nihilistic simplification” of the difference in / of content between theistic and atheistic visions ?

Just as I have already explained, in my view, the reasons for / causes of the differentiation of / in the content of ideologies are basically polemical – and I have the impression that G.L. precisely so as not to bump / run into / impinge upon the factor “polemic(s)” or “claim of / on / to dominance, dominant authority, sovereignty, rule / ruling over others”<sup>xii</sup>, makes no effort, attempt as regards the interpretation of the multiformity / (great) variety, diversity of the

vision, being satisfied with its praise, praising, exaltation. Indeed / In actual fact, he wants to reserve for the vision a position beyond claims of / on / to dominance, dominant authority, sovereignty, rule / ruling over others or the exercising of (governmental) power / authority, domination, dominion, control. The vision has for him existential roots, it is interwoven with the human condition itself.<sup>1</sup> And by wanting to divide, distinguish, separate, differentiate, expand, dilate the vision (away) from claims of / on / to dominance, dominant authority, sovereignty, rule / ruling over others (by wanting, that is, to put the first, former (vision) in the position of the highest tier of jurisdiction (authority) / authoritative tier / criterion, which in my scale the second, latter (claims of / on / to dominance, dominant authority, sovereignty, rule / ruling over others) possess), he doubts that “every kind of giving meaning to life belongs to the ideological stock, store, consignment, trust of (governmental) power / authority, domination, dominion, control” (p. 85). Here G.L. causes, creates terminological confusion / makes a terminological error, which wrongs / does an injustice to my argumentation by correspondingly assisting his argumentation. As the careful study of my essay, treatise can show, I divide, distinguish, separate, differentiate, expand, dilate the terms “(governmental) power / authority, domination, dominion, control” and “dominance, dominant

---

<sup>1</sup> What is tasty, delicious, highly interesting / attractive is that G.L., in accordance with the polemical needs of his argumentation, uses semasiologically / semantically related phrases in order to prove contrary, opposite, antithetical things. When he criticises, decries, upbraids the “nihilistic simplification” of the conceptual structure, he writes : “Thus / In this way, holding in our hands as a stable given, existential unhappiness, misfortune upon which man constructs his meanings and his forms, holding “eternal human fate / destiny” and by deleting its “cultural” derivatives, resultants, aftereffects, derivations, products, we identify, equate everything with everything etc.” (p. 82). Precisely, from existential unhappiness, misfortune and from a permanent, that is to say -independent of “cultural derivatives, resultants, aftereffects, derivations, products”- consciousness, apperception, realisation, awareness of absence, something lacking, scarcity, deficiency, he himself deduces, however, the necessity of the vision : “the incurable despair, desperation, hopelessness” which the visions of paradises beget, give birth / rise to, generate exists in the whole course of human thought: always something is lacking / missing from man, and this sense, feeling of lacking, something missing, absence, scarcity, deficiency also constitutes the element of his infiniteness etc.” (p. 84). [[And precisely because the “vision” is just another way of saying conceptual structure with many different kinds of content, the retard has just argued for what he is arguing “against” !!!]]

authority” : the first, former is the fulfilment of the second, latter, and this means that the second, latter can be witnessed, encountered wondrously in the circles of “the oppressed”, whereby / in relation to which it takes precisely the form of visions and emancipatory statements. That / The fact that the giving of meaning to life does not (exclusively) have as its source / draw, stem from governmental power, domination, dominion does not necessarily entail that it does not have as its source / draw, stem from claims of / on / to dominance, dominant authority<sup>xiii</sup>. Solely thanks to this terminological confusion, can G.L. assert, contend, maintain, argue that the Over There / That World (being straightaway, directly a(n) aftereffect, consequence, resultant, aftermath, by-product of the/a vision) is not suggested, submitted, presented by governmental power, domination, dominion, but rather is used by it (governmental power, domination, dominion) (p. 84). The ascertainment is correct, at least in many cases, but does not touch (encroach) upon / challenge in the least the correctness of my own theses, positions.

By leaping over the tier of claims of / on / to dominance, dominant authority and by dividing, distinguishing, separating, differentiating, expanding, dilating so drastically vision and governmental power, domination, dominion, G.L. does not examine the historically important, significant case, in accordance with which the bearers, carriers, vehicles of visions, which were hatched, incubated in the epoch, age, era of “oppression” (that is, of the, frequently, often unconscious, claims of / on / to dominance, dominant authority), become thereafter, afterwards, thence themselves the bearers, carriers, vehicles of governmental power, domination, dominion. Water-tight / Air-tight compartments in this process do not exist<sup>xiv</sup>, and precisely this fact makes for me primary the investigation of a problem (about) which G.L. hushes up / remains silent : how much (of a) claim of / on / to dominance, dominant

authority, that is, how much future governmental power, domination, dominion is found already in the vision ? The genesis of the vision, at least according to G.L.'s text, is carried out / takes place in a historical vacuum - (since, indeed, as we saw / have seen, G.L. does not take the trouble / make the effort to explain what the reason is for (~~where~~ / to what) the multiformity / (great) diversity, variety of the content of visions (is due))- and is attributed to existential factors. Correspondingly, the division, distinction, separation, differentiation, expansion, dilation of the vision and governmental power, domination, dominion is not founded by G.L. with any real (historical or psychological) argument, but rather is expressed axiomatically. On the basis of the data of the newer, more recent (modern) anthropology, it could, nonetheless, be supported that the struggle for existence and power (already inside the primitive horde) is a few million years older than the production and consumption of visions of paradise – a fact which (to express myself carefully) makes at least more possible the view that the latter, second (visions of paradise) were born in the framework, context of the former, first (the struggle for existence and power), rather than that they (visions of paradise) pre-existed / (visions of paradise) pre-existing in order to be used later by this (struggle for existence and power). The study of the content of specific, concrete visions (e.g. of the prophetic books of the Old Testament or of the utopian / utopic novellas, novels, romances of the 16-18<sup>th</sup> centuries) shows, again, that every aspect of them constitutes a direct or indirect answer, response to specific, concrete historical stimuli, it (every such aspect) has, that is to say, a polemical purpose, goal, end; the putting / setting aside of general existential limitations, restrictions, confinements is not ever demanded abstractly, but is always connected with the annihilation, obliteration of an opponent, who is considered to be the cause (causative) of / responsible for current, present(-

day) sufferings, troubles, tribulations. G.L. accepts that the vision as Over There / That World “arises as the negative of the Over Here / This World” (p. 84), nevertheless, immediately (there)after he speaks / talks of the negation, denial of existential limitations, restrictions, confinements and only of that (“For man, happiness is always unattainable, unfeasible happiness”)<sup>xv</sup>. Obviously, it does not cross his mind / occur to him, that he himself is proving thus / in this manner (way) the absolute, ineluctable, inevitable, hard, invincible, irresistible necessity of governmental power, domination, dominion : because truly, for truth’s sake, really *then* is the necessity of governmental power, domination, dominion absolute, ineluctable, inevitable, hard, invincible, irresistible, when it is not founded simply on historical factors, that is, relative and transient, transitory, impermanent factors, but rather puts in / at its service the sole existential texture of man, which, precisely, according to what G.L. is saying / G.L.’s sayings (p. 84), gives birth / rise to, begets, generates the Over There / That World or that vision, which afterwards, thence, thereafter is called / summoned up, mobilised, recruited for the purposes, ends, goals of those ruling / rulers. On the basis of this –(regardless of whether it is) willing or unwilling(, it is indifferent)– participation of deeper existential strata, layers in the process of the genesis and consolidation of governmental power, domination, dominion, I absolutely accept the role of the vision in the human condition, and indeed I support this even more than G.L. does, observing that ideologies are only rationalised visions. One could counterpose to me that a vision able to participate / capable of participating in the process of the projection and imposition of claims of / on / to dominance, dominant authority, i.e. a rationalised vision, constitutes the/a denial, negation of the (what is) “pure” (vision) and not its continuation. The contention, assertion would, however, weigh (heavily) (up)on the logical scales / scales of logic, if the

existence of visions spotless, immaculate, lily white as to every kind of rationalisation (i.e. with no rationalisation whatsoever) could be proved – and that would mean / signify : amorphous visions.<sup>xvi</sup>

The from the very beginning participation of rationalising elements in the vision structurally corresponds with / to the from the very beginning participation of deeper existential strata, layers in the process of the projection and imposition of (dominance-related) claims (of / on / to dominance, dominant authority) – and also corresponds with / to the from the very beginning formation of the concepts of the Over There / That World and of the Over Here / This World in / under the form of communicating, connecting, adjoining vessels, which allows the bearers of claims of / on / to dominance, dominant authority to jump over in accordance with their polemical needs on each and every respective occasion from one (vessel) to another (vessel), presenting man e.g. at times like the image and likeness of God and at other times as the heaver, porter of Original Sin, at times like God at the end of History and at other times like the victim of “alienation, estrangement”, that is, like an object of “education and training (edification)”. I find it difficult to believe that G.L. misunderstood (misapprehended, misconceived, mistook) my essay, treatise so much that he classifies / includes me (he does not say it expressly) “amongst those who with scientific certainty draw the line which divides, separates the idea of man from his empirical reality by defining what precisely belongs to the Over There / That World and to the Over Here / This World” (p. 86). As I have just shown, precisely the active or (candidate, possible) sovereigns, rulers (to be) are interested not only in the separation, demarcation, but at the same time in the argumentatively convenient, handy communication (rapport, liaison, communion) between the two levels, which G.L. wishes / hopes / prays for too / as well. The distinction is made by me for



logical-analytical reasons in order to show the mechanisms of (the) function(ing) of ideological thought, and anyway, anyhow, besides, in any case, G.L. himself accepts it indirectly as a feature of both the theistic as well as the atheistic stance, when he accepts the Over There / That World as “their common, structural element” (p. 83) : the Over There / That World is certainly / indeed defined in its distinction from an Over Here / This World. It seems very characteristic to me that G.L. himself, who denies the clarity of this distinction when he wants to support his position / thesis that “the dream is also reality” (p. 86 – who denies it ? scientific observation doubts the reality of the dream equally as little as the psycho-pathologist also considers paranoia a(n) (extra-real) phenomenon (outside of / beyond reality), without, however, he himself having to become paranoid (in order) to prove that he believes in its / paranoia’s reality)<sup>xvii</sup>, stresses it / the distinction with emphasis when on the other hand he wants to show that the true dream, which according to his sayings / what he is saying is also the source of the Over There / That World, is irreconcilable with the (ruling in terms of governance) Over Here / This World (“when governmental power, domination, dominion summons, calls up(on), mobilises, recruits. . . the vision of paradise, it summons / calls up(on) / mobilises / recruits it (the said vision of paradise) *against* it (the true vision)”, p. 84).

Not only is the vision itself formed as reaction and action, but also theoretical recourse to it, that is, its defence, advocacy, championing vis-à-vis the “nihilistic simplification” of conceptualisations, is a phenomenon determined spatially, locally and temporally, an act with a specific, concrete polemical point, peak, nib, pike, climax, summits, apex, pinpoint. Whoever followed the “adventures of (the) dialectic(s)” in Western Europe from the interwar period and thereafter, and particularly / in particular in / over the last fifteen years<sup>xviii</sup>,

knows under what circumstances, conditions a large portion / part of Marxist intellectuals and intellectuals acting/thinking/being like (pretending to be) Marxists suddenly reached the point of discovering the dream and the eternally unsatisfied (hu)man, fusing commonplaces of existentialist philosophy with the “young Marx”<sup>xix</sup>. For classical Marxists of the first and second generation it was self-evident that the new society would arise / emanate / result from the development, evolution of (the) productive forces, which, as it was said, could not be undertaken or even be withstood/endured by capitalism. The / That expectation was falsified, contradicted, refuted, confuted, belied, gainsaid not only as to capitalism, but above all as to the states of the planned economy, where the development of the productive forces all but meant, signified the realisation of emancipatory, liberationist promises. Precisely this trauma, wound drove significant, important groups of intellectuals to a falling out / breakup / parting of ways not only with Marxist-Leninist organisations, but also with the ideology of the development of the productive forces, which, in (its) turn / for its part, was founded / based / established by a rationalistic world view. The defence, championing of / advocacy for / in favour of the vision in all accents, stresses, pitches, tones, heroic and mournful, for decades constitutes the ideological refuge of such groups, helping them maintain, retain their self-esteem as the champions of the deeper / deepest essence of man / humans, even in a situation of their severance, abscission, cutting off, amputation from active political action on / of a grand scale. A study of the political-critical texts which were written in recent years, in particular by Soviet and East-German Marxist-Leninists, against the “New Left” and its ideals, is instructive to the fullest / maximum<sup>xx</sup>.

I conclude, end with the observation (which perhaps in the meanwhile has become monotonous), that G.L. commits, perpetrates something

argumentatively illegitimate, unfair, illicit when he asks for answers from me for questions which I do not even pose, not considering them (such questions) an / the object of scientific negotiation, since already their formulation presupposes a confession of faith in a scale of values / value scale. He asks for guidance, instructions for the determination of the practical stance of people, asking me, why we should prefer the stance of the active ruler, sovereign over / rather than the masturbatory stance of the fabricator, maker, constructor, manufacturer of visions (p. 87). From which phrase of mine does he conclude based on / obtain evidence that I suggest (make the suggestion) / imply that the first stance be preferred and not the second stance or vice versa / the other way around / conversely ? From my point of view<sup>xxi</sup>, both (stances) take root in the same need for ruling power, rule, ruling over others, dominance, dominant authority, sovereignty,(;) only that this need is fulfilled by each person taking a stance / side / party in accordance with his / its psycho-biological structure and the instances which marked his / its life. The right to intellectual-spiritual masturbation, which G.L. supports, defends, advocates for, champions so eloquently, I do not deny to anyone –however I do not deny also the right of the erotically orthodox to use the visions of the / those who are ecstatic as one person or in small groups in accordance with his needs<sup>xxii</sup>. (There are / exist no) ethical, moral / Ethical, Moral or other criteria to decide / determine who of the two is “better” (do not exist). However, it can, at least frequently, often(times), be ascertained empirically that the latter / second group (of) / fabricators, makers, constructors, manufacturers of visions have, from / out of overcompensation, more illusions in relation to the role or the value, worth of their person and their ideas<sup>xxiii</sup>. G.L. considers this ascertainment to be the aftereffect, consequence of my own “contemptuous, scornful, disdainful, condescending disposition” (p. 86) vis-à-vis the masturbatory visionaries,

forgetting, obviously, all that we know about (the) depth psychology / psychology of depth about the mechanisms of idealisation and of metamorphosis, transfiguration.

As in the case of the defence, championing of / advocacy for the vision, so too in the case of the defence, championing of / advocacy for visionaries, G.L. makes the same mistake : he thinks that he is defending, championing, advocating for / in favour of the opposite, antithesis or the other / reverse side of the (domination / sovereignty / governmental power-related) claim (of / on / to sovereignty, governmental power, domination, dominion), whilst he is defending solely, only one of its forms, which because it is acted out and takes place in house and does not behead –at least directly– anyone, it gives the impression of an escape from the game of dominance, dominant authority, sovereignty, governmental power, domination. To remain with / at his examples: on the one hand he seeks the right to prefer the visionary Plato to the tyrant Dionysus (p. 87), however he does not tell us how much the theocratic and militaristic / military-statist totalitarianism of the Platonic Republic / Polity / State / Commonwealth matches / fits in with his perception regarding / about (the / a) vision(s). In other words, he leaves unexamined the usual, common case in accordance with which “visionaries” enter directly or indirectly into the service of claims of / on / to sovereignty, governmental power, domination, dominion and he remembers, recollects (or rather, as we shall immediately see, he creates) cases in / during which those ruling, the rulers, the sovereigns are benefited by / receive the benefit / gain the advantage of preaching(s), homilies, sermons against “intellectuals”, which he appears to generally equate with non-practical men / humans / people (p. 87), that is, with people who exclusively have (engage in) theoretical preoccupations, pastimes, activities. G.L. ignores or sets, puts, pushes aside the

distinction between intellectual and scientist, which consists in the fact that the second / latter / scientist concerns, busies himself with / goes about the collection, classification and analysis of empirical material / matter on the basis of a certain method<sup>xxiv</sup>, whereas the former / first / intellectual regards himself primarily as the defender, advocate, champion of ideals and values or visions (the distinction is contained in every serious manual of sociology at least from the epoch, times, age, era of the relevant / relative analyses by Schumpeter<sup>xxv</sup>, and I presumed it to be (well-)known, familiar when I spoke of / talked about “intellectuals” in my essay / treatise). The formulation “all respective Nietzsches. . . are. . . the candidate, possible victims of all respective Hitlers” (p. 87)<sup>xxvi</sup>, shows that G.L. is not (sufficiently) familiar (enough) with the historical details of the use of Nietzschean teachings by national socialism, but he receives / accepts without examination the (well-)known, familiar Stalinist version, to which Lukács<sup>xxvii</sup> later gave the form of a book (*The destruction of Reason*, 1948). Beyond that : the issue is what points of Nietzscheanism were used (albeit in only certain cases, by certain only national-socialist circles). As (Just as) / Like (Just like) in Marx’s work, so too Nietzsche’s work is characterised by a dual nature / duality : next to / beside the perspicacious, perceptive critic of ideological forms (in regard to metaphysics and (to) axiology) stands / there is the prophet and the visionary, who promises (the) transcendence over, overcoming, surmounting of European nihilism through / by means of the hyper-man / superman / supra-man. Precisely this (Nietzsche as a) visionary (Nietzsche) attracted national-socialist souls, and not the anatomist of conceptual structures – the intellectual, and not the scientist<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>2</sup> I would challenge G.L. to refer for me one only example of the ideological use of scientific –that is, axiologically free and consequently relativist– perceptions by active or candidate, possible rulers, sovereigns. In my essay, treatise there are / exist several observations in relation to the common prosecution of consistent relativists by all factions simultaneously – observations which perhaps G.L. did not pay heed / attention to as he should have.

Perchance on occasion / by reason of his own example, G.L. should ask himself one more time that perchance the drama [[of man / humans]] may not contain only paradises, but equally the overt aggressivity / aggressiveness of the “blonde beast” ?<sup>xxviii</sup>

By repelling, spurning, beating / fending off the analysis of ideological visions from the point of view of their conceptual structure, G.L. writes that he does not accept the logic of the final (end, ultimate) analysis, because it concerns (the) inquisitors (p. 84). What logic does he himself use when he suggests, connotes, implies, alludes to what are in his opinion the ultimate / final consequences of anti-intellectualism ? I fear, nonetheless, that objectively he has no other choice, selection than its (the said logic's) use, although in this way / thus he transgresses, violates the letter and the spirit of my text, which strictly refrains (abstains, desists) from / foregoes / the formulation of every / any (kind of) normative principle and every / any (kind of) exhortation, urging. Just as I do not say that one *ought to* prefer real rule, ruling over others, sovereignty, domination, dominion, governmental power over imaginary, fantastical sovereignty, domination, so too / likewise I do not say that one *ought to* prefer that which counts historically (that is how G.L. means it, p. 87) – even though I consider self-evident, for reasons which I explained above, that a historical and sociological way of looking at things has by definition as its object that which counts historically(,) and that, *since* I am observing things / matters / affairs from its (the historical and sociological way of looking at things') point of view, I cannot mix (up) the levels, engaging / taking part in methodological improvisations in accordance with the needs of the moment. Nowhere, additionally, does my text bear witness to, suggest, bespeak the tendency “of accepting authentic and accomplished, realised governmental power, domination, dominant authority” (p. 87). And again, G.L. confuses two

different things, that is, the *ascertainment* that governmental power, domination, dominant authority generally was / stood as something unavoidable, inevitable in history hitherto / until today, with the *order, command(ment), direction, directive* of accepting *each and every (form, type, kind)* of governmental power, dominant authority, domination. Just as from the position, thesis that governmental power, dominant authority, domination *generally* is not / does not get / cannot be abolished, it is not at all (to be) deduced, concluded that someone ought to affirm (the) *current* governmental power, dominant authority, domination. On the contrary, only the negation of the latter (current governmental power) does the way, path, road open (up) to a new one / governmental power – and together with that to the reinforcement of the governmental / authoritative-power-related “vicious” circle / cycle in its generality. It is not in the least self-evident that whoever does not believe in the abolition of *every* governmental power, dominant authority, domination becomes more docile, submissive, amenable, monkey-like, ape-like than whoever believes in it. The coup-leader / coup-plotter or the criminal is much less law-abiding than many who dream about or hope / pray / wish for the abolition of every governmental power, dominant authority, domination by living / partaking in – in the meanwhile – their measured, moderate, circumspect petty-bourgeois life. I repeat : I do not recognise any axiological, value-related scale on the basis of which I could decide, state, declare who is “better”. Precisely for that reason it is also not from my standpoint a problem whether we have to or not philosophise on the uselessness, vainness, vanity of philosophy or campaign against Reason with logical arguments (p. 87). To reverse G.L.’s question : why (do we) not do that, but rather do its opposite / antithesis ? G.L. regards this phenomenon an “innate and unsurpassed contradiction in the history of cognition,

comprehension, understanding” (p. 87 – without exceptions ? if (there are no) exceptions (do not exist), what form does this contradiction take in his own thought ? if he belongs to the exceptions, with which logical or non-logical means did he get over / surpass / overcome the contradiction ?) – and, nevertheless, it appears / seems that he resents, frets, expresses discomfort (dysphoria) as to why things are as they are<sup>xxix</sup>. Displeasure with something means, signifies, nonetheless, (an) axiological / value-related preference of its opposite. An axiology (half-)hidden backstage, in the background, on the sidelines pulls the strings of G.L.’s argumentation. Is and Ought, reality and wishful thinking are for him a pair / pairs which he looks at / views with eroticism, sensuality, voluptuousness. Whoever, however, does not separate, segregate ontology and deontology, not only does he not ever free / rid himself of logical weaknesses, shortcomings, deficiencies<sup>xxx</sup>, like those we ascertained in G.L.’s text, but rather he will also necessarily sometime / at some point (stage) reach the logic of the final, ultimate, end reduction – not with / in our, the methodological, but with / in the “inquisitorial” meaning / sense<sup>xxxi</sup>.





---

to me as you would be to Him / Them / should be as part of the People / Nation” etc.. The issue of the overcoming of the scarcity of goods and hedonistic consumption as a point of consensus for a collectivity is a separate, though not unconnected, matter, pertaining specifically to (Western) mass democracy, following bourgeois oligarchic liberalism, which followed *societas civilis*. Of course, by ZIO-2026, mass democracy is producing mass surpluses of goods in not a few parts of the “Third World” too, but that’s “a story for another time and place”, given that this P.K. essay dates from ZIO-1979.

<sup>xiii</sup> P.K. is making a clear distinction here between relations of power which affect or reach into the social whole / the whole of society from those “at the top” and those relations of power which can be found at all levels of the so-to-speak whole-of-society power pyramid, including well down in the “power pyramid hierarchy”. Without keeping this in mind, the overlap between terms used in English, i.e. the Krazy Man barbarian idiom, barbarian idiot tranz-leision, can be confusing.

<sup>xiv</sup> I.e. cases of visions which came to power / became dominant “without coming to power / becoming dominant”.

<sup>xv</sup> Because the retarded ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID and or ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-ZOMBEE-STOOGEE seeking ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-JOO-TOPIA where only JOOZ, KIKES AND YIDZ live, and everyone else dies, wants to eliminate the inimical half of the social relation, which simply can’t be done, even if it is dormant and or silent for up to long periods of time.

<sup>xvi</sup> All this discussion on forms of power, power claims, rationalisations, ideology, Over There and Over Here , Is and Ought (mentioned at the end of this essay / treatise) etc. etc. etc. goes straight to the content of *Power and Decision* (1984).

<sup>xvii</sup> There’s a difference between objective reality and ideational, thought-of, conceived reality in the mind only.

<sup>xviii</sup> Circa 1964 to circa 1979.

<sup>xix</sup> P.K. praises the good/positive, in terms of scientific observation, side of Marx’s thought in a number of his texts, but more than elsewhere in *The invisible chronology of thought. Answers to 28 questions* (1998).

<sup>xx</sup> I.e. against atomistic degeneracy.

<sup>xxi</sup> The scientific point of view.

<sup>xxii</sup> P.K. is being funny here with regard to the ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID and the ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-ZOMBEE-STOOGEE.

<sup>xxiii</sup> Anyone who is not a ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-ZOMBEE-STOOGEE knows how ridiculously ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-PSYCHOPATH-OVER-THE-TOP the ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-RAT-RODENT-PARASITES are and or can be in their quest to confuse the shit out of everyone and or to be the “rool da world, master race” of ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-VOMIT-EXCREMENT-FAECES-DUNG.

<sup>xxiv</sup> In a non-normative, value-free, value-neutral manner.

<sup>xxv</sup> 1883-1950. Here we are not defining intellectual so broadly (i.e. as opposed to a manual labourer, peasant, farmer, proletarian et al.) as to encompass scientist.

<sup>xxvi</sup> This is nothing other than ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-retardation connecting Nietzsche necessarily with ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-ZOMBEE-STOOGEE “master race, rool da world” Adolf, which I took part in with comrade Stalin, coz dat waz da correlation of forces *den* for us and our purposes. Obviously, it won’t do for P.K..

<sup>xxvii</sup> 1885-1971, the once upon a time very famous amongst “intellectuals” ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID. Moreover, it would not surprise me at all if Schumpeter was a ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-LIZZARD-ENTRY-IST of “Czech” and or other background(s).

<sup>xxviii</sup> Visions, like anything which ends up in relations of power in the objectively real world, can (though not necessarily) end up in mass blood-baths, regardless of religious, “left-right”, “rights of man / human rights / dee-mok-ra-see / freedom / liberty” and other signs, symbolism.

<sup>xxix</sup> Whatever the case may be, there is no “thing to do” which is not a decision made by man, i.e. which is not the product of man’s thought and action (thought does not act externally, man as a whole acts externally “having thought about it” internally (and leaving aside the issue of “gut / knee jerk / instinctive” reactions, which P.K. covered in *The Political and Man*), from the scientific point of view, which in turn has no preference for or against anything man does.

<sup>xxx</sup> In relation (also) to objective reality, which never ever fully conforms permanently with man’s hopes, dreams, desires, norms, ideals, utopias, visions.

<sup>xxxi</sup> And since humans cannot live just as scientific observers, they must posit and follow / “chase” values, norms etc. and they must be “inquisitors” and everything else associated with normative action, and cannot be as humans just the scientific, non-normative, value-free, value-neutral method.