

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.

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..

ALL END-NOTES ARE BY THE KRAZY MAN BARBARIAN IDIOM BARBARIAN IDIOT

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.