

Panagiotis Kondylis

THE OLD AND THE NEW

GODHEAD (DEITY, DIVINITY)ⁱ

© 2025 TO WHENEVER. TRANSLATED BY THE BARBARIAN IDIOM BARBARIAN IDIOT KRAZY MAN

These observations seek to shed light from another standpoint the examination of the problem which M. Markidis (Markides) nicely discussed starting with a book by E. Fromm.¹ At its methodological epicentre the attempt, endeavour to determine, define a certain conceptual structure is found, and to describe a uniform unfolding of its internal logic in fields seemingly, ostensibly irreconcilable between themselves.

I begin with the thesis that the conceptual structure which characterises a world view (world theory) or ideology is, as a rule, unconscious in the bearers, carriers of that same world view or ideology and can wonderfully, incredibly well answer, react to that world view or ideology, with which the first / former world view of ideology is (found to be) in a struggle of life and death. The conceptual structure of a world view is, in other words, independent of its specific, concrete and – conscious in its bearers – content, that is, of the answer it gives to a or b cosmological or praxeological problemⁱⁱ. This independence of the conceptual structure of a world view reflects, mirrors in reality the rule, dominance of its unconscious part on the conscious part – a dominance which, in the area of the historical action of men, humans, entails the submersion of their conscious efforts, endeavours inside the labyrinthine mechanisms of the heterogony of ends. The expansion, dilation (vertical bar) between the conceptual structure of a world view and its content becomes easily perceived,

¹ See *Σημειώσεις (Notes)* 12, Νοέμβριος / November 1977, p. 41 ff..

understood, when we ponder, consider two combatant religionsⁱⁱⁱ. Even though every world view considers another world view erroneous, fallible, wrong –as to content– and combats, fights it, nonetheless, both world views, as conceptual structures, present those features which characterise the phenomenon “religion” generally: the separation of the world in an invisible Over There / That World and a visible Over Here / This World, the subjugation, subordination, subjection of the second/latter to the first/former, the justification of the -on each and every respective occasion- acts of the representatives of the/a religion by means of reference to the first/former (Over There/That World) etc. etc.. Every one of them / world view apprehends and differently defines the Over There / That World and the Over Here / This World, every one of them derives, draws, sources different normative principles from the former (Over There / That World) and invokes it (the said Over There / That World) in a different manner – however, all these differences do not impede, obstruct the identity, sameness of their conceptual structure, which, nonetheless, must remain unconscious to the supporters, followers of both [[antithetical world views]], if they do not want to lose their essential world-theoretical and psychological support, prop, that is, the missionary sense of their uniqueness, singularity. Since, however, this sense, seen from the outside and relativised thanks to its comparison with the corresponding sense of other world-theoretical factions, proves to be false, “ideological”, the mortal struggle of the two sides arises in the final analysis not so much from their differences as much as from their similarity : the unconscious commonality of their conceptual structure, forces them to (come to a) clash for the possession of the same space, area, realm (which becomes all the narrower, the more the two of them project themselves / are self-projected as absolute, that is, mutually exclusive truths), whilst the conscious difference of the content is of use as an ideological weapon, that is, as the means of the intensification and legitim(is)ation of both enmity as well as of the dominant claims on each side.

This position, thesis can be accepted by many relatively easily for as long as it seeks its examples in dead or half-dead religions. However, oftentimes the most obstinate, stubborn denial awaits it when it is extend to recent historical data, facts, factual contexts and seeks to show the possibility of the existence of identical conceptual structures no longer between two religions, but between the traditional metaphysics of a religious texture and that ideological-political current, stream which has as its confessed, avowed purpose, end, goal the liberation, emancipation, freeing of man / humans not only from social, but also from metaphysical bonds, fetters (intertwined with the social bonds, as purported, said)^{iv}. It would not be correct to presume, hypothesise that this obstinate, stubborn denial is due in the first place to some inability at abstractive, abstracting and abstract(ed) thought, even though in the second of the above-mentioned cases (i.e. of the ideological-political current seeking the liberation of man from social and metaphysical bonds), things are, *also* from a purely logical point of view, more complicated. If, that is, in the case of the struggle between traditional religions the distinction between conceptual structure and content sufficed for our analytical purposes, goals, ends, now we must take into account / consideration the additional difference between the signs : the atheistic denial, negation, refusal of traditional religion comes to the historical forefront with reverse signs compared to / as regards those of its opponent, rival, adversary, something which undoubtedly constitutes a new element in relation to the previous situation, when the opponents, rivals, adversaries, despite all their differences, held common theistic signs. It is obvious that this additional logical complication makes more difficult the distinction between conceptual structure and content, giving to ideological thought^v the opportunity to better hide its true face –since now scientific analysis needs to also pry, jimmy, lift off a second mask before revealing it (i.e. the said true face)– and, [[with the said ideological thought]] fortified behind the radical difference of the signs, to deny, refuse / denying, refusing the

identity, likeness, sameness of the conceptual structure with that of its opponent, rival, adversary. Precisely the ideological-world-theoretical positioning begets, generates, gives birth to, therefore, the stubborn, obstinate denial, about which we spoke above, and not some primary, primordial inability for logical-analytical thought (this inability exists, of course, but it is secondary; it is created because thought works, labours exclusively as an organ of a certain ideological-world-theoretical positioning and, although in this role it can concoct, contrive elaborate and wonderful, wondrous, miraculous, admirable rationalising constructions, nevertheless it is disabled, crippled, infirm, an amputee^{vi} when it is called to see things from another point of view). In simpler words : atheistic humanism tries to present itself as a substantial innovation, novelty, which marks a new –the final, concluding, conclusive– epoch of human history as a process of self-awareness, self-knowledge/knowledge of oneself and self-realisation/self-actualisation, and, to argumentatively found its loud-mouth, big-mouthed claim, it invokes and stresses the –really, in actual fact substantial– differences of content and signs between itself and its traditional opponents, rivals, adversaries, ignoring or denying the –in my opinion in practice decisive– identity, sameness of the conceptual structure between its own theoretical schemata and those of the old metaphysics and ethics. I would like to stress, highlight here certain basic points of this identity, sameness, after first making a general historical recollection / reminding ourselves of history in general.

As we have said, the inability of arriving at, or the denial of, the ascertainment of common elements with the opponent, rival, adversary is a necessary psychical precondition for the enthusiastic conducting of the struggle against him (the opponent, rival, adversary). The deeper the content of a world view takes root in its long-term and short-term polemical needs, the less, naturally, is it ready, prepared, willing to recognise that certain fundamental conceptual

structures are shared with the opponent. The belief, faith of a world view in the uniqueness, singularity of its (a world view's) mission is not only reinforced, strengthened, made (much) more stable, but in large part is also formed, shaped, schematised thanks to the conviction that the opponent expresses –and indeed consciously, so that he appears to be subjectively dishonest (crooked, unethical)– the/a more dreary, grievous, bleak perspective as regards man / humans. The goal, end, purpose of a combative world view is not, consequently, the scientific understanding of the opponent, but rather his / its / the opponent's over-simplified presentation in a way which justifies the relentless, unsparing fight against him / it / the opponent. A series of historical investigations, research has shown that concepts, which in our daily, everyday language, linguistic use suggest the ultimate collapse, exhaustion, debilitation, fraying, fall, depression, slump, subsidence of social man / humans (e.g. “the Middle Ages”, “feudalism” etc.) were born / came about / arose and held sway, dominated, ruled without the slightest empirical-scientific knowledge of their object; their function was exclusively ideological-polemical². Schematising the multiformity of the history of ideas, we can say that the New Times sought their self-justification in the as far as possible more intense underlining of their opposition (not so much historical as ethical opposition) to the Middle Years, the “Middle Ages”. The new light seemed to be still brighter and warmer by donating, giving as a gift liberation, emancipation, freeing from the kingdom of gloom, darkness, duskiness, sombreness. The very same expression “New Times” did not arise, pop/crop up in some attempt at the scientific periodisation of European history, but as a(n) axiological / value-related term, which went about its way to stress / stressed, at the same time presupposing, the identity, sameness, likeness : new = ethically, morally better, more progressive. When in

² See the article “Feudalismus” by O. Brunner, in : *Lexikon der Geschichtlichen Grundbegriffe*, edited by O. Brunner – W. Conze – R. Koselleck, vol. 2, Stuttgart 1975, p. 337 ff.. Already Pareto [[1848-1923]] derided, viewed with irony liberal rationalist historians that they treat, deal with “feudalism” like theologians treat, deal with Satan (*Trattato di Sociologia Generale*, Milan, 1964, § 212) [AAAA-HAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!].

the Renaissance^{vii} and in the Enlightenment^{viii}, next to / alongside / beside the Middle Years / Middle Ages, an idealised antiquity was added, with a goal, an end, a purpose which was again polemical (that is, to show that the Middle Ages were in reality decadence, decline, decay and not by chance permanent human fate, destiny^{ix}), then a triadic philosophical-historical schema came about, arose, which in forms of different modes (Lessing, Herder, Condorcet, especially Hegel and Marx) appropriated the theological perception of historical evolution (Orosius^x, Augustine^{xi}, Joachim Floris^{xii}, Otto von Freising^{xiii}) and presented concepts which were initially Judeo^{xiv}-Christian in a systematic secular form. The details of this process have already been pointed out, highlighted by scientific research and they do not need to occupy us here any longer / anymore³. I observe only that with the acceptance of a – as of descent, provenance and essence – Judeo-Christian eschatological schema pertaining to the philosophy of history, precisely in their endeavour to be legitimised vis-à-vis traditional Christianity and “the Middle Ages”, the smug, self-important, self-complacent New Times gave the first important, significant confirmation of our thesis, that there can exist a commonality, community of conceptual structure, despite all the radical difference of content. The schema pertaining to the philosophy of history remains structurally the same, only that now it is not of use in showing, demonstrating, proving the happy, felicitous solution to painful, baleful, afflictive, aching historical antitheses with the Second Coming of God, but rather with the kingdom of human Reason.

I come now to the second confirmation of my thesis, which constitutes the main theme / topic of these notes. A general preliminary observation is necessary here. The New Times, that is, the representatives of their ruling

³ Fundamental for this problem examination is K. Loewith's book, *Weltgeschichte und Heilsgeschehen*, Stuttgart 1953. Also significant is the treatise by the Protestant theologian R. Bultmann, *Geschichte und Eschatologie*, 2nd improved ed., Tübingen 1958. Cf. E. Topitsch, *Sozialphilosophie Zwischen Ideologie und Wissenschaft*, Neuwied 1961, p. 235 ff..

intellectual-spiritual tendencies,⁴ found themselves in need of summoning – unconsciously, but effectually– conceptual structures of religious origins, provenance precisely in their double / dual / twin struggle to put / set aside the theological way of looking at things as to its content without, however, on the other hand, falling into nihilism, that is, into the rejection / denial of every ethical / moral deontology⁵. On the contrary, their iconoclast(ic) disposition was fed by the conviction that they themselves could put in the place of the old system of values an even better and anthropocentric one / system of values. The demolition / bringing (crashing) down of the theological world image left such a great gap / vacuum (such) that only / solely intensive work in the cosmological sector / area, above all, however, in the sector / area of values, could fill it / the said gap / vacuum. This work was absolutely necessary for two narrowly interwoven between them reasons, which both of them, again, have to do with the, always primary (primordial), polemical needs of a world view or ideology. First of all, (the) theological reaction against the new ideas rested / was based preferably / by (as a matter of) preference on the argument that the latter (new ideas) sooner or later would guide / drive things to full / complete ethical / moral relativism, since the putting / setting aside, sidelining of God, that is, of

⁴ When we speak / talk of the New Times or their representatives, it is obvious we are making an abstraction in order to isolate certain elements which from our point of view appear to be fundamental. The multiformity of the tendencies which are housed (roofed, accommodated, placed) under the common –for us– denominator ought not (to) be forgotten, just as it ought not be forgotten also when we are talking in an undifferentiated manner about traditional metaphysics or theology, in which all the significant / important problems of modern / newer thought, -discussed under / in light of the most different metamorphoses-, are rediscovered / found again. Nonetheless, the common denominator is scientifically legitimate, valid and can be documented (and proven) on the basis of the classical texts of the New Times [[In 1977/1978, P.K. had not published his two great “general” histories of ideas, published in 1981 and 1983 (Greek) / 1990 (German), but I’m quite sure he had already formulated more than just their contours given his research into the “dialectic”]]. Although, therefore, our abstractions are insufficient when it is a question of the specific, concrete interpretation of both the infinite multiformity of intellectual-spiritual production from the 14th until the 19th century, as well as of a or b thinker as an individual phenomenon, nevertheless, the pointing out of / to the general directions is possible today, because the process is / has been complete(d) and we are surveying / reviewing it (the said process) in its totality / entirety.

⁵ The concept “nihilism” can be used without a(n) axiological / value-related hue, tinge, tone, complexion, in order to state the thesis / proposition that all values are relative and that human life is without objective meaning. Polemically-axiologically, ideologies use the same term, in order to reproach the / one’s opponent with the destruction of the foundations of dignified human life. In this text both meanings of the term are used; the context / surrounding text shows which meaning is suggested, connoted on every / each occasion.

metaphysically sanctioned / ratified values, logically entailed that man determined as to place and time, that is to say, relative and mutable, variable man as a plaything / victim / fodder, would remain the measure of all (useful) things. That / The fact that today, -since the logical and historical weaknesses, shortcomings of newer / modern rationalism have by now appeared / made their presence felt (known) from enough / a number of sides / points of view, many (for good or bad / ill – that is not being examined here) are reseeking / seeking again metaphysical (points of) orientation(s), validating, ratifying, attesting, confirming, sanctioning thus / in this way, if not the correctness, at any rate the practical meaning / significance of the theological argument-, is an indication which permits / allows us to appraise / evaluate how much resonance that (i.e. the reseeking of metaphysical orientation(s)) had from the 16th up to the 18th century, when the game was still relatively open. Whoever is familiar with texts of that epoch / era, knows how the classical representatives of more modern rationalism wage / are waging (fighting) a bifrontal / two-front / bilateral struggle (fight): against the theological opponent *and* –with no less vehemence, severity, intensity– against all those who show themselves to be disposed to draw from the putting / setting aside of (the) God (of theology) and the concomitant, accompanying, attendant, associated, consequential primacy of Man (of anthropology)-, sceptical / scepticist(ic) or nihilist(ic) conclusions. Machiavelli, Hobbes and La Mettrie were fought / combated first of all by proponents / champions of the new rationalism, who saw their new world view exposed irreparably, whilst / whereas theologians and their all kinds of intellectual-spiritual fellow travellers malevolently considered such extreme cases as the tangible validation of their predictions and as the revelation of the ethical quintessence of the new currents, streams (we must understand the poisonous polemics of Marx-Engels against Max Stirner with the same

criteria).⁶

The (reason) why (as to) such a seemingly, ostensibly contradictory development / course of events was inevitable, we [[can]] understand if we unfold, develop the second of the two reasons which we implied / alluded to / insinuated above, which deep down is only a generalised formulation of the first (reason). Every consistent world view (world theory) presents its own axiological / value-related scale as the only correct / right one / axiological scale, i.e. as the only possible guarantee of / for dignified human life. The / One's opponent is accused, consequently, not as someone who seeks an organisation of life on the basis of a new and different, albeit worse, scale of values / value scale, but as someone who in the short run or over the long term will destroy the very same foundations of social life; he is stigmatised, in other words, as a nihilist and unethical person / immoralist, and his promises, proclamations are regarded as (a) tactical manoeuvre, manoeuvring or as benevolent, well-intentioned illusion / (self-)deception. By reproaching each and every respective opponent with the fault of nihilism, the representatives of a world view act from their point of view correctly, both from a theoretical point of view (since they themselves possess the one and only truth), as well as from a practical-tactical point of view. Because they feel / become aware with

⁶ For Machiavelli's historical fate, see my bibliographically documented observations in the Introduction in *Works*, vol. A, Athens 1971, p. 155 ff.. S. I. Mintz's philologically complete, full, whole and most instructive, as far as the argumentative style of similar quarrels, conflicts, disputes is concerned, *The Hunting of the Leviathan*, Cambridge, 1962, describes the ethicological / ethics-related / moralistic outcry, uproar which Hobbes raised / brought about in his epoch / era. For La Mettrie, again, it is worth reminding that he was characterised not by the "reactionary", but by the "most left-wing" perhaps amongst the Enlightenment philosophers. "Gross / Crude, but dangerous sophistry", "logical chaos and chaos of hyperbole / exaggeration", does Diderot consider that work which later Sade saw as his teacher and precursor (see *Essai sur les Regnes de Claude et de Neron*, in *Oeuvres Completes*, ed. J. Assezat, III, Paris 1875, p. 217). Precisely the disposition which inspires Diderot against La Mettrie moves / sets in motion Marx-Engels's pen against M. Stirner, see *Die Deutsche Ideologie*, Berlin, 1960, p. 107 ff. [[not, at first glance, primarily from the point of view of ethical disorientation, but more so from the point of view of the social / class whole against individualism (at first glance / on the surface of things)]]]. It is characteristic that for the greater part of the work, it's not the "idealists" who are lambasted / fulminated against, but rather the "nihilist", even though the end / goal remains to reveal / revealing Stirner's nihilism as a form of idealism. However, in that way, the central problem which Stirner poses is not solved but circumvented / stepped around [[because Marx-Engels have their own (non-nihilist (with "nihilism" meant in the scientific sense of no meaning / no action)) normative / ethical / moral agenda]].

instinctive certainty that no world view which is in reality nihilistic can rule / dominate socially and consolidate its dominance / rule, since no society can live without a system of ethical / moral rules. And what's more / yet: in the circumstances, conditions of culture, that is, of organised society, a translation or idealisation of bio-psychical magnitudes is undertaken (realised) / takes place into intellectual-spiritual or ethical / moral magnitudes. Just as the sexual drive, urge, impulse is changed / transformed into Erotic Love (Eros) etc., thus / in the same way, the instinct of self-preservation (in the wide / broad sense of the term) is interwoven with the position that life has meaning. The denial, negation, rejection of the meaning of life undercuts, undermines –always: in the circumstances, conditions of organised society– the same instinct of self-preservation. The censure, reproach of nihilism is on a social scale active, drastic, potent, efficacious exactly for this reason – and exactly for this reason is so frequently and persistently cast upon the / one's ideological opponent. However, also the opponent knows or senses these correlations; he, therefore, reverses the image and presents himself as the champion, proponent of the “true / real” meaning of life, leaving the role of its / life's foe with the other faction. In this quarrel, dispute, contest, fight, which has been repeated in history a number of times, the element of ruling, dominant claims of every world-theoretical faction plays a central role. Since no-one can exercise social rule / dominance, if he does not enact, institute, decree a system (if not generally accepted, at any rate, generally kept-to / followed, observed) ethical / moral rules, and since such a system presupposes the perspective(,) that human life has meaning, it is obvious that the defence both of the meaning of life as well as of ethics / morality in the narrow or wide / broad sense are essential preconditions for whomever wants to project claims of social rule / dominance (as we shall also see below, moralism and the struggle for social power are magnitudes which are far from necessarily mutually / reciprocally exclusive / all but exclude each other). We now better understand why the newer / modern rationalism in

its fight against (the) old theological rule / dominance, that is, in its fight for social domination by means of its specific, concrete political-social bearers, had to defend both the meaning of life, as well as an axiological / value-related scale, hitting / striking relentlessly / hard at every paralytic nihilism or scepticism which was about to emerge from its own womb, bosom. This was efficacious in the social fight, however the price to pay was the unconscious acceptance of the conceptual structures of the opponent's world view. The old metaphysics had (was) itself born / come into being in the attempt / effort / endeavour to found both the meaning of life as well as the / a scale of values (always: in relation to / connection with specific, concrete ruling, dominant claims) – and whoever does not deny both of these is obliged to appropriate, willingly or not / unwillingly, its conceptual structures, irrespective of whether he rejects its content, paralysing or killing God.

Deicide / The killing of God was carried out / committed over a period of centuries and an even elementary description of its phases would take/lead us very far^{xv}. Already the great quarrel, fight, dispute, contest in the womb / bosom of Scholastic theology of the 12th and 13th century, about whether Volition / the Will or Reason is the main element of (the) divine hypostasis, ends with the binding of God by the command(ment)s / orders of Reason, as this is expressed in Thomas Aquinas's system^{xvi}. God is not allowed / permitted to want something the opposite of Reason, and that means / signifies not only the praising, praise, eulogy of God's intelligence, but also the practical curtailment of His omnipotence. Even though this thesis is later also again called into question / doubt / doubted (and indeed precisely in "progressive" polemics against theologians of Scholasticism – more / the most prominent, renowned examples regarding that are Descartes and Newton), nonetheless, it (i.e. this Scholasticism thesis of God being intelligent as defined by Reason and not omnipotent) is gradually imposed, just as much because it is reinforced in terms

of theory by the constitution of the mechanistic model of natural science, which solely needs a “*primum movens*”^{xvii}, not, however, interventions / intercessions as to its function(ing), as much as it corresponds to/with the perceptions of bourgeois liberalism in relation to the role of the monarch. Just as God is obliged to create the world and to leave it (the world) in its deterministic / necessarily law-based course without getting involved / mixed up in (the) further happenings, so too is the monarch obliged to be constitutional, that is, to guarantee legislated state order without unsettling, deranging, perturbing, upsetting it with arbitrary interventions, intercessions^{xviii} : that is the foundational principle of liberal “political theology”, which constitutes one of the classic(al) examples of the structural parallelism of political and metaphysical ideas⁷. Bourgeois liberalism is therefore restricted, limited to placing, putting God, like the monarch too, in (a state of) honourable discharge (from His duties). The systematic killers of God do not come from its (i.e. bourgeois liberalism’s) ranks, but rather from the ranks of the revolutionary socialist movement, which, *inter alia* / next to other things, completes in a programmatic manner the revolt against the old metaphysics.^{xix}

Our sources permit / allow us to define / determine with precision the chronology of this conscious turn (of events). It is a matter of the period between the Julian / July Revolution of 1830 and the revolutions of 1848, when in France the labouring / working masses stand for the first time with independent, autonomous, self-sufficient, self-reliant / their own ends, goals, purposes at the barricades / roadblocks, whilst in Germany, immediately after the death of the teacher (1831), intense fermentation / debate (unrest, excitement, agitation, tempestuousness, upheaval, turbulence) commences in the circles of Hegelians. The reason why Hegelianism precisely then could develop catalytic forces becomes relatively patent, obvious, plausible, if we see

⁷ See in relation to that C. Schmitt, *Politische Theologie*, 2nd ed., Berlin 1934, p. 62.

it from the point of view of its supporters.⁸ The Hegelian system widened both the concept of History, so that it / this History is equated / identifies with the universe of divine activity; and since History is at the same time by definition human activity, it appeared that divine and human activity coincide, that the Transcendental is abolished and that the human genus / race / species did not have any God to seek and worship apart from its own self. Apart from that, the Hegelian ambiguous, equivocal, evasive equating / identification of the logical and the real was interpreted not as the consecration, sanctification of established principles, but as the guarantee for the realisation of freedom in(side) History and at the same time as the climax / culmination of its metamorphic, mutative, transformative, developmental, changing, growing, progressive, transmutative, unravelling, uncoiling, disentangling, evolutionary course. Even if we disregard, overlook other elements of (the) Hegelian dialectic(s), which made it convenient as a political weapon,⁹ we have here a schema which satisfied demands of the world view of atheistic humanism as to its basic, fundamental points.

⁸ Whether their interpretation of the Hegelian system is valid and in what sense, is a (debatable / questionable) point (of contradiction) in philosophical research. Nonetheless, the solution to / of this problem is not essential for the purposes of our analysis. [[P.K. addressed this matter at least in part in his first major book : 1979 *Die Entstehung der Dialektik. Eine Analyse der geistigen Entwicklung von Hölderlin, Schelling und Hegel bis 1802*. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta. 729 S.]]

⁹ Above all, the Hegelian theory of contradiction was noted with attention / care both by Marx-Engels as well as later by Lenin, who had a particularly acute, keen nose / sense (of smell) for / as regards the political complications, entanglements of philosophical positions (see *Philosophische Hefte*, Berlin 1971, p. 128 ff.).

**ALL END-NOTES ARE BY THE KRAZY MAN BARBARIAN IDIOM BARBARIAN
IDIOT, WHEREAS AS ALL FOOTNOTES ARE P.K.'s APART FROM [!!!].**

ⁱ In : ΚΟΝΔΥΛΗΣ, ΠΑΝΑΓΙΩΤΗΣ, *ΜΕΛΑΓΧΟΛΙΑ ΚΑΙ ΠΟΛΕΜΙΚΗ. ΔΟΚΙΜΙΑ ΚΑΙ ΜΕΛΕΤΗΜΑΤΑ (MELANCHOLY AND POLEMICS. ESSAYS AND STUDIES)*. Θεμέλιο, Αθήνα, 2002, σσ. 51-74. First published in : περ. *Σημειώσεις*, τχ. 13-14, 1978.

ⁱⁱ Since we share the same my perspective / your perspective, Friend-Foe, This World-That (ideal) World, my values and or interpretation thereof and your values and or interpretation thereof etc. conceptual structure, then we can go "head to head" when we disagree. If someone e.g. saw everyone as Friends, then he would accept all his Friends positions, including his own death if that's what a Friend wants or Friends want.

ⁱⁱⁱ The point being that every world-theoretical content, which differ between themselves, has the same conceptual structure.

^{iv} An example of this is the JOO, the KIKE and the YID going ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-fruit loop-nuts-ballistic in ZIO-JOO-ES-HEY international relations journals about the partial !!!, only !!!, relativity of values, because JOO-DAS, the sick-fucking crazy-psycho-path in-bred, incestual, ultra-organised criminal, ultra-conspiratorial, rat-tunnel vomit-faeces-excrement can't countenance the possibility that it with its values and normative principles is relative too, just like everyone else, from the point of view of scientific observation.

^v Here a distinction is made between ideological, atheistic thought and traditional religious, atheistic thought, though, since both are forms of "false consciousness", they can also both be called ideological, albeit distinct kinds thereof. In other words, there is descriptive(-explanatory) and non-normative scientific observation / thought and ideological normative thought, whether that relates to a traditional religion or to a political ideology of the post-1789 era, without any need here to look at other ideological forms of thought as in various kinds of "mysticisms", hedonistic-consumerist life stances etc..

^{vi} And so P.K. begins his "Buñuel for philosophers" ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID party fun times / glentia, glendia ...

^{vii} Say c. 1400/1500 to c. 1600.

^{viii} Say the 18th century, but with the 17th century a very tightly-related part of "all the fun".

^{ix} The Eastern Roman position, which in its inability to adapt to the New Times and the steady rise of M-C-M-capitalism-imperialism, which progressively became JOO-JACKED by circa 1800 onwards, meant our death.

^x 385-420 AD.

^{xi} 354-430.

^{xii} 1135-1202.

^{xiii} 1112-1158.

^{xiv} The biblical Jews have absolutely nothing to do with their ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-SYNAGOGUE OF SATAN (see *Revelation*) usurpers, who draw their inspiration from Judas Iscariot (betrayal) and Doubting Thomas (disbelief) – apart from Satan / the Devil itself.

^{xv} A detailed history of ideas relating inter alia to European deicide was undertaken by P.K. in : 1981 *Die Aufklärung im Rahmen des neuzeitlichen Rationalismus*. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta. 725 S. (als dtv-TB 1986; Neuauflage bei Felix Meiner 2002) and 1990 *Die neuzeitliche Metaphysikkritik*. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta. 614 S. (first Greek edition : 1983).

^{xvi} Grosso modo, this is a first major step towards ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-SATANISM because it seeks to remove mystery and omnipotence from God, which in "science" leads to new kinds of false consciousness and ideological thinking with blind worship of ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID phantasms such as "the Big Bang", monkey-ape evolution, the Kost as "special", ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID- ANTI-CHRIST-SATANOCRACIES as "dee-mok-raseez" and other such total ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-DRUNKARD ANGLO-SAXON-GERMAN-PIG-SILLY STOOPID FROG-NONSENSE (e.g. Einstein, Freud as "authorities" / "JOO-NIOOS-EZ") etc. etc. etc.

^{xvii} Conveniently leaving aside questions of what moved the "primum movens" and or how the "primum movens" came about, which cannot be answered logically beyond faith / mystery, since empirically and logically nothing can come out nothing and there is no reason for something to "be there" as in "being there" in the first place.

^{xviii} Of course, liberals, -meant here in their real, true scientific sense pre-dating mass democracy-, forget to add that legislation does not inherently exist anywhere but is also a product of "arbitrariness", i.e. a decision and power, including because it can be manipulated and interpreted by "the well organised" in the bureaucracy, executive, judiciary, legislature etc., which in "the West" means by the ruling ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YIDZ and their ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-ZOMBEE-STOOGES.

^{xix} On the other hand, a new metaphysics (of belief in ideological phantasms) is created with the revolutionary socialist movement at the same time, inter alia, drawing its own utopian millennialism / millenarianism / Chiliasm and critique of culture (against alienation, exploitation, in favour of solidarity, community etc.) from and or with reference to Christianity broadly defined, referred to elsewhere by P.K..