

Panagiotis Kondylis

THE OLD AND THE NEW

GODHEAD (DEITY, DIVINITY)<sup>i</sup>

© 2025-2026. TRANSLATED FROM THE GREEK 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.<sup>1</sup> 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 problem<sup>ii</sup>. 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 division, distinction, separation, differentiation, expansion, dilation between the conceptual structure of a world view and its

---

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

content becomes easily perceived, understood, when we ponder, consider two combatant religions<sup>iii</sup>. 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)<sup>iv</sup>. 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<sup>v</sup> 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<sup>vi</sup> 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 psychological 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-polemical<sup>2</sup>. 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

---

<sup>2</sup> 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-HAHHAHAHAHAHA!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!].

the Renaissance<sup>vii</sup> and in the Enlightenment<sup>viii</sup>, 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<sup>ix</sup>), 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<sup>x</sup>, Augustine<sup>xi</sup>, Joachim Floris<sup>xii</sup>, Otto von Freising<sup>xiii</sup>) and presented concepts which were initially Judeo<sup>xiv</sup>-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 / anymore<sup>3</sup>. 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

---

<sup>3</sup> 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*, 2<sup>nd</sup> improved ed., Tübingen 1958. Cf. E. Topitsch, *Sozialphilosophie Zwischen Ideologie und Wissenschaft*, Neuwied 1961, p. 235 ff..

intellectual-spiritual tendencies,<sup>4</sup> 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 deontology<sup>5</sup>. 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

---

<sup>4</sup> 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 14<sup>th</sup> until the 19<sup>th</sup> 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.

<sup>5</sup> 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 16<sup>th</sup> up to the 18<sup>th</sup> 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).<sup>6</sup>

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

---

<sup>6</sup> 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 ethical / 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<sup>xv</sup>. Already the great quarrel, fight, dispute, contest in the womb / bosom of Scholastic theology of the 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> 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<sup>xvi</sup>. 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”<sup>xvii</sup>, 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<sup>xviii</sup> : 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 ideas<sup>7</sup>. 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.<sup>xix</sup>

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

---

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

it from the point of view of its supporters.<sup>8</sup> 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,<sup>9</sup> we have here a schema which satisfied demands of the world view of atheistic humanism as to its basic, fundamental points. For a scientific analysis, the ascertainment is significant that this schema, as it was outlined by the left-wing Hegelians, is characterised by a full, complete, total parallelism between its metaphysical and its political-social limb (leg, branch, part, arm), making clear the inner relation(ship) between deicide and revolutionary socialism. Indeed, the road towards the greater and final, last revolution opens solely, only when it is certain that man can take his historical destiny / destinies into his own hands<sup>xx</sup>. And the certainty, again, arises from the extermination of the most powerful and oldest of all the sovereigns, rulers, lords, [[i.e.]] of God. Just as at the metaphysical level the competition between

---

<sup>8</sup> 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.]]

<sup>9</sup> 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.).

Over Here / This World and Over There / That World is ended with the abolition of the Over There / That World<sup>xxi</sup>, so too in the social-historical field, the competition of sovereigns, rulers and subjects, the ruled is ended with the extermination of the former<sup>xxii</sup>. The dualistic structure is abolished both in cosmology as well as in history, and in its place goes a monistic structure (this monism is the legacy, bequest of Hegelianism). And further still, the monistic structure dominates at the anthropological level too, since fully liberated man / man liberated on all sides is not tortured / afflicted anymore by the old dichotomy between (the) spirit and (the) flesh, body, private person and citizen, producer and consumer etc.. We see here with how much consistency one and only (one sole) perception embraces all the levels of the Is, shaping, crafting, moulding them with the same mould. But the consistency is not primary, but derivative, because the same structural correspondences characterise –with other content and other signs / symbolism, as we have said– the old dualistic metaphysics. Atheistic humanism is formed by fighting it (the old dualistic metaphysics) and by reversing it, that is, in a continuous negative contact with it. Negative contact means, signifies, denotes, nevertheless, negative determination. And this consists not only in the radical reversal of the opposing world view, but also in the need for new metaphysical (anti-)decisions to be taken.

God is dethroned, deposed and Man is (en)throned, History becomes Universe and Man(,) [becomes] Creator<sup>10</sup>. This is the most drastic answer of the New

---

<sup>10</sup> The narrow / close connection of political and metaphysical decisions was absolutely conscious / in the consciousness / awareness of the revolutionary humanists and was formulated repeatedly and express(ed)ly. I quote some typical testimonies. The young Engels describes with rhetorical elation the putting / setting aside of God as the precondition for the restoration of the unity –of the monistic structure– of the world and of man, that is, for the viewing of human History as a self-contained, self-sufficient Universe: “the nightmare, which weighed on our chest, has gone... All the fragmentations, all the fears, all the divisions disappeared. The world is again a whole, self-contained and free“. The new “holy” is “the self-consciousness of humanity”, true philosophy is the philosophy of world history: “this is the highest Revelation, the Revelation of Man to(wards) Man” (see the pamphlet / leaflet: *Schelling und die Offenbarung*, 1842, in Marx – Engels, Werke, suppl. vol., part b, Berlin 1967, pp. 219-221). Exactly three decades later, Bakunin formulated epigrammatically the same idea, at / with which he had ended up at the same time / epoch with Engels (he (Bakunin) also heard in 1841

Times to the question which, as we have said, racked, tormented them from their beginning until the 19<sup>th</sup> century: how is it possible to set / put aside God without nihilism ensuing. The solution of atheistic humanism provides, in terms of theory, both / the two of them<sup>xxiii</sup>. We saw, however, that it is in a position to do it only given it reverses, overturns the old metaphysics at all its levels and, negatively determined by the latter, outlines and presupposes a new, monistic metaphysics, since this here monistic metaphysics can set / put aside the Over There / That World in the old sense, that is, God, setting free / emancipating /

---

Schelling's lectures, teachings, which Engels comments upon in his pamphlet, leaflet, in Berlin), in a text which was first published only six years after his death. Here we read: "if God exists, man is a slave; however, man can and must / ought to be free; consequently God does not exist" (*Der Gott und der Staat und Andere Schriften*, ed. S. Hillmann, Hamburg 1969, p. 71). Richard Wagner, comrade-in-arms with Bakunin at the roadblocks of Dresden (1849), used analogous phrases which proclaimed, promised the deification of man (see the excerpt in the book by K. Hildebrandt, *Wagner und Nietzsche im Kampf Gegen das Jahrhundert*, Breslau 1924, p. 44). Precisely then was Wagner influenced by Feuerbach, the prophet, as is known, of the new Anthropology, which was predestined to displace the old Theology. On account of this significance of Feuerbach, it is not coincidental / accidental that the first radical critique against the new Anthropology from a scepticist-relativist point of view is formulated as a criticism / critique of him. We find it in M. Stirner's work, *Der Einzige und sein Eigentum* (1845), who, since he insists on the abstract character of the concept of Man, by virtue precisely of which the latter (Man) becomes an ideal able to replace God, concludes "Man as the Subject of human History complements, supplements, completes the circle, cycle of Christian perceptions" (see the newer ed. of the work ed. by A. Meyer, Stuttgart 1972, p. 410. Cf. p. 269, 271, 371). Beyond the analytic(al) critique by Stirner, in the same epoch other voices were also heard, which considered the process of the replacement of God by Man as ineluctable, unpreventable, inevitable, irresistible, but not also a precursor, harbinger of a new freedom. This sceptical disposition echoes in the two renowned, famous lines from "Abel and Cain" by Baudelaire: "The sons of Cain ascend to heaven / and bring God crushing down to earth" (Race of Cain, ascend to heaven, And cast God down upon the earth! — William Aggeler, *The Flowers of Evil* (Fresno, CA: Academy Library Guild, 1954) + Race of Cain, mount to the skies And down upon the earth cast God ! — Kenneth O. Hanson, *Flowers of Evil* (NY: New Directions, 1955) + Tribe of Cain, ascend to heaven, and throw God down to earth. — Francis Scarfe, *Baudelaire: The Complete Verse* (London: Anvil, 1986)) (cf. "The journey", VI, second from last / penultimate stanza).

It is of interest that the theoreticians of the counter-revolution had already since earlier / from beforehand pointed out the correspondences between political and metaphysical decisions, which became conscious in the minds / came into the consciousness, awareness of the revolutionary faction at the time of its maturation, ripeness, reaching adulthood. In Bonald's treatise, *De la philosophie morale et politique du 18 siècle*, written in 1805, the parallelism of radical democracy and atheism is stressed ("one could name the democrats atheists of politics, like the atheist Jacobins of religion too"), conservatism and theism, constitutional liberalism and deism (see *Oeuvres*, Paris 1819, vol. X, p. 104 ff.). This examination of the problem is presented with particular emphasis in the main work of the Spanish noble(man) and politician, perhaps of the most consistent theoretician, theorist of anti-socialist(ic) dictatorship, Donoso Cortés (it was also published in the critical, crucial middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century -1851- with the title *Ensayo sobre el catolicismo, el liberalismo y el socialismo considerados en sus principios fundamentales*). Exceptionally clear, lucid is the criticism, critique which he exercises in respect of the contradictions -metaphysical and political- of bourgeois liberalism, whilst, in contrast, he considers the only worthy and consistent opponent to be revolutionary socialism, which in his eyes is equated / identified with atheistic humanism (see the German ed. of the work with the title *Der Staat Gottes*, in a transl. and ed. by L. Fischer, Karlsruhe 1933, p. 189 ff., 222 ff.). In the age, epoch, era of the "possessed / demons / devils", the inner bond between Revolution and Atheism was already a commonplace.

enfranchising and absolutising, respectively, the Over Here / This World, that is Man. Atheistic humanism now exclusively concentrates / focuses its attention on this Over Here / This World. Anthropology, in this way, constitutes its theoretical field par excellence, that is, the field where it (atheistic humanism) can be tracked, detected, scanned, traced better than anywhere else, even though / if the extent / degree to which atheistic humanism, arising itself from metaphysical decisions and housed, sheltered, roofed under a monistic-atheistic metaphysics, has received and maintained, preserved, in a latent or obvious form, the conceptual structures of its opponent. We have already referred that the structural features, characteristics, traits, attributes of the old religious metaphysics can be summarised / synopsised as follows: the Is is separated into an invisible Over There / That World and visible Over Here / This World, the second / latter (Over Here / This World) is subordinated, subjected, subjugated to the first / former (Over There / That World) and the acts of all the respective representatives of the world view are justified by being referred to the first / former (Over There / That World). In this way, the sanction(ing) (permission, support, encouragement) of the meaning of life, of the axiological scale / value-scale and at the same time the sovereign claims, which, as we (have) also observed above, are necessarily interwoven both with the defence, advocacy of the meaning of life, as well as of morality, ethics, morals which goes/go to give / give(s) to this meaning its concrete, specific content, sanctifying, consecrating, hallowing in parallel certain social relations, is secured. Our problem is concretised / specified, therefore, in the question : is it possible to recognise again / re-recognise this conceptual structure in atheistic humanism and in its political movement, that is, in revolutionary socialism?

At first glance, the / our answer is negative. Atheistic humanism abolished precisely the invisible Over There / That World, the prop, support of the old metaphysics; how is it conceivable, plausible, possible, after the radical

abolition of the Over There / That World, for the dimension, dissociation, divergence of Over There / That World and Over Here / This World with all its social concomitants, accompaniments, upshots, outcomes to come into sight / pop (crop) up ? Thus argue at least the supporters, followers of atheistic humanism, denying or ignoring the difference between conceptual structure and the content of a world view, adhering / sticking to, persevering with, that is, to the sophism, sophistry par excellence of ideological thought. From the setting / putting aside of the old Over There / That World they document / conclude based on evidence the setting / putting aside of every Over There / That World – in other words : because they themselves loaded onto their opponent all the responsibility for (hitherto) slavery (until now), they conclude that their victory means by definition the arrival, advent, coming of freedom. And the other way around / conversely : just as they exclude by definition that their victory can mean a new slavery, in the same way they exclude by definition that their victory over the old Over There / That World (as content) can mean the birth / genesis of a new Over There / That World (as content), and indeed as the bearer of sovereign, dominant, ruling claims. Nonetheless, the birth / genesis of this latter (new Over There / That World (as content)) is in practice and logically ineluctable, unavoidable, inevitable. Already the struggle against slavery, that is to say, against the opponent, is not able to be justified ideologically except only with the invocation of values, which, since until now they remained unrealisable on account of, as it is said, the predominance, rule, sovereignty of this opponent, they constitute an Over There / That World, something which its (the Over There / That World's) realisation (and this means : its tangible reality) is still simply desired and imminent. The struggle looks to victory, victory is re-posed / placed again in the future and with it (victory) the realisation of the new values; the dimension, dissociation, divergence of (the) Over There / That World and (the) Over Here / This World comes into sight / pops (crops) up, in this way, already in the perspective of time, in the competitive confrontation gloomy,

dismal, sombre, cheerless, tenebrous, dark, murky present and brilliant, shining, bright, glorious future. It is, at the same time, a logical dimension, dissociation, divergence too, since, as we have said, the opponent rebuts, refutes, confutes, opposes in terms of a world view / world-theoretically by means of / through the invocation of (still) unrealised values<sup>xxiv</sup>.

The connection of the –owing to organic polemical reasons– dimension, dissociation, divergence of (the) Over There / That World and (the) Over Here / This World with the critical / crucial anthropological examination of the problem / problem examination<sup>11</sup> now arises, ensues automatically, since the champions, advocates of atheistic humanism primarily accuse, blame the(ir) opponent of/for the violation of human dignity and logic – in other words: of / for the “alienation / estrangement” of human nature. We come, thus, to the ascertainment of the dimension, dissociation, divergence of (the) Over There / That World and (the) Over Here / This World precisely in that area / realm, which for atheistic humanism is exclusively and only (the) (human) Over Here / This World, emancipated, liberated, freed from every (divine, godly) Over There / That World. Because it is logically self-evident, axiomatic that the protest(ation)s or complaining, nagging, grumbling, self-pitying, complaints about the perversion or “alienation / estrangement” of human existence solely

---

<sup>11</sup> The central significance, importance, meaning of anthropology for the tendency we are examining appears in works like those of E. Fromm, *Marx's Concept of Man*, New York 1961. Fromm stresses that Marx did not share in / sympathise with absolute sociological relativism, nor did he accept that man is born as a blank slate / tabula rasa, but rather saw him as an entity biologically and psychologically fixed. He also stresses that Marx separates this general human nature from its specific expression in every culture / civilisation, at the same time dividing, distinguishing, separating, differentiating, dilating, expanding its (human nature's) stable drives, urges, impulses from its variable drives, urges, impulses (*op. cit.*, p. 24 ff.). The significance, importance, meaning of these positions, theses for our analysis is obvious. [[KRAZY MAN ADDS THAT “PUT THAT WAY”, WE HAVE A SCHEMA GENERAL ENOUGH TO ENCOMPASS P.K.'s FUNDAMENTAL (ANTHROPOLOGICAL) POSITIONS IN *MACHT UND ENTSCHEIDUNG / POWER AND DECISION* (1984), EVEN THOUGH MARX DID NOT ARTICULATE THEM AS SUCH, WITH HIS ESCHATOLOGICAL UTOPIANISM AND CLASS-BASED NORMATIVISM-DETERMINISM CLOUDING THE MANY PROFOUND SOCIAL-SCIENTIFIC ASPECTS OF THE BEST PARTS OF HIS THOUGHT. OF COURSE, SUCH AN “ANTHROPOLOGICALLY-BASED” EXAMINATION OF MAN NECESSARILY WAS COMPLEMENTED AND PERFECTED BY THE OBSERVATIONS MADE AND CONCLUSIONS DRAWN IN *DAS POLITISCHE UND DER MENSCH / THE POLITICAL AND MAN* (1999) WITH A MUCH MORE COMPLETE CONNECTION BEING DESCRIBED AND EXPLAINED BY P.K. BETWEEN THE ANTHROPOLOGICAL, THE HISTORICAL, THE SOCIOLOGICAL AND THE SOCIAL ONTOLOGICAL.]]

have meaning then / at the time, if it becomes accepted, that there exists some kind of stable, fixed essence, substance as a subject (in the Aristotelian sense) of “alienation / estrangement”, an essence / a substance which can be thought / conceived of / understood in a pure situation / state, that is, free from its “alienation(s), estrangement(s)”. Behind the everyday, daily empirical reality of the “alienation(s), estrangement(s)”, stands / there is, therefore, a fixed and hyper/supra-empirical (essence / substance) —(at least in the sense that it still has not been able to unfold visibly and tangibly, palpably in the role of the main shaper, moulder, former of social life)(— essence / substance). The “alienated / estranged” Over Here / This World of man appears to be woeful, beggarly, piteous only in its contradistinction to its uncontaminated, uninfected, unpolluted, undefiled, pure Over There / That World, which is used as the absolute measure of comparisons and references. The theoretical subordination (subjection, subjugation) of the first / former (Over Here / This World) to the second / latter (Over There / That World) is now undertaken / carried out / executed with the following syllogistic mechanism: *it is presupposed* that the ontological texture, the nature of man must be defined not on the basis of the Over Here / This World of its visible “alienation(s), estrangement(s)”, but rather of its invisible, that is, historically (still) unfulfilled, unconsummated ideal Over There / That World. Praxeology / The way people (should, ought to) act and the axiological scale / value-scale are compiled, put together on the basis of the Over There / That World; the “alienated / estranged” Over Here / This World, empirical man, must be cured / made healthy in accordance with diagnoses and recipes which are inferred, deduced, derived deductively from the ontological definition of the uncontaminated, uninfected, unpolluted, undefiled, pure Over There / That World, of “true” human nature<sup>xxv</sup>. This ontological source of ethical / moral deontology is in a self-evident manner / fashion / way ethics, morals, morality itself / themselves and good; being and Ought, reality and wishful thinking coincide in this way of thinking / thought, just as in every ideology too

/ as well, by definition and in their (very) beginning(s) / at their starting point. The structural parallelisms with theistic metaphysics in this way become even more obvious, unmistakable. Just as atheistic humanism loses its essential meaning, if it does not presuppose good and logical human nature, so too theistic metaphysics becomes ideologically weak, powerless, strengthless and in practice ineffective, if it does not accept the goodness, benevolence, kindness and wisdom of God<sup>xxvi</sup>. For its (theistic metaphysics') purposes, ends, goals, that is to say, the existence of God does not suffice; an omnipotent, all-powerful, but "bad, evil" God (who is logically equally powerful, strong as a "good" one / God) could never constitute the / an ontological source of a deontology – and precisely the deontology is the, in practice, decisive point, since its imposition and observance, maintenance, keeping in accordance with the interpretation of the more powerful / stronger [[interpreter]] consolidates relations of dominance / dominant authority / sovereignty / domination / supremacy. The same parallelism also appears from another perspective: just as the by definition good God remains uncontaminated, uninfected, unpolluted, undefiled, pure, untainted, even though the world created by Him / him is dipped, submerged, drowned, soaked, drenched, flooded in sin, thus, good human nature also remains more or less unharmed, until its time comes, even though the historical world, this [[being]] a creation of man / humans too, is ruled / dominated by "alienation / estrangement" or "evil/the bad".

The identity, identification, equivalence, equating of the conceptual structure between / (in respect) of theistic, classical metaphysics and atheistic humanism appears, therefore, in a positive sense / positively, on the one hand, from the division, distinction, separation, differentiation, expansion, dilation of (the) Over Here / This World and of (the) Over There / That World, and on the other hand, in the definition of the Over There / That World in accordance with the criteria of ethical, moral deontology. We ascertain the same identity,

identification, equivalence, equating negatively / in a negative sense, if we consider, ponder, think about, reflect upon (the fact) that both perceptions face / confront, albeit in a different way, manner, mode, the same logical difficulty in relation to the explanation of the provenance, origins, origination, source, descent, emanation of “evil / the bad”. The how / How a “good” human nature fell into “evil / the bad”, and indeed very often with undisguised, overt liking [[for “evil / the bad”]], is for the theorists, theoreticians of atheistic humanism equally unexplained, unexplainable as it is for theologians<sup>xxvii</sup>, who, in any case, besides, for centuries suffered, toiled, floundered with the founding of a convincing theodicy; the justification of / giving reasons for evil / the bad in a world created by an all-good, most merciful, most gracious God is (exceedingly) arduous, troublous, difficult (to the full / maximum). The militant, combative followers, fans, adherents of atheistic humanism overcome, conquer, get over, surmount, vanquish, if not logically, at any rate, psychologically, the difficulty by frequently denying to consider their opponents as full humans and by holding, keeping in that eclectic, selective way / manner the Idea of Man [[as / to be]] immaculate, spotless, lily white. The same also [[applies to]] / with theologians : by loading all that is bad, evil on the machinations, machines of the Devil, they forget that he also “fell from (the) angels”<sup>xxviii</sup>. Precisely the inability at [[giving, furnishing]] a satisfactory interpretation of the fall leads in both cases, out of instinctual reaction, to the denial of the inclusion of the opponent in the definition of the ideal and together [[with that]] to the hope of paradise.<sup>12</sup>

Atheistic humanism which comes from the school of Hegelian historicism attempts, tries, undertakes to circumvent, get around similar difficulties by

---

<sup>12</sup> The examination of the problem of the definition of the opponent, in a way, manner, mode in which his / the opponent’s extermination, obliteration is justified morally, ethically too, was wonderfully presented by R. Koselleck in his recent treatise : »Zur Historisch – Politischen Semantik Asymmetrischer Gegenbegriffe«, in *Poetik und Hermeneutik*, VI, Munich 1975, p. 65 ff.. The historical basis of his analysis is constituted by the antithetical pairs : Greek-Barbarian, Christian-Idolator and Human-Subhuman.

stressing the historical and social formation of human nature. This process has, of course, the ideological advantage that it covers up / over, conceals, hides under the “anti-metaphysical” language of sociology and political economy the structural parallelisms above with classical metaphysics,(;) in reality, however, it more so regurgitates, ruminates (upon), rehashes, chews over our central problem rather than solving it. Classless society, whose necessity sociological and econom(olog)ic(al) analyses exactly want to demonstrate, is logically impossible, if it does not become accepted that humans are, if not actively / in activity, at any rate, potentially / in potentiality, social and rational (in the ethical, moral sense of the term), that is, free, liberated, released – under certain, at least, circumstances, conditions – from the drive, urge, impulse of dominating, ruling, prevailing over others on a large, great, grand or small scale, with / in this or that way, manner. Without (the) at least potentially “good” human nature, the kingdom of freedom cannot be strengthened, reinforced, fortified, consolidated; since, however, the advent, arrival, coming of the latter (kingdom of freedom) is considered by the eschatological historical construct(ion) of Hegelianism and of Marxism as necessary and inevitable, the acceptance of “good” human nature becomes equally necessary and inevitable, which only this (acceptance of “good” human nature), anyhow / in any case, ethically and logically justifies both the accusation of “alienation / estrangement” as well as the revolutionary struggle for its (alienation’s, estrangement’s) definitive, conclusive lifting, abolition, cancellation. The historical element does not blunt, dull, therefore, the difficulties which we have pointed out, but rather fulfills an ideological function which it had already discharged, accomplished, fulfilled in Herder and in Hegel. The forms of “alienation, estrangement” are taken (seriously) here from (the) (a) historicist way of looking at things, consideration, contemplation (seriously) and are classified in a(n) ascending, rising scale consisting of the various stages of History. The ideological intention is for it to be shown that History leads to

freedom from inside “alienation, estrangement” itself : what could resist freedom, if the same element which militates against / opposes it, that is, exploitation and “alienation / estrangement”, (gradually) leads (stage by stage), but with mathematical certainty, to it / this (freedom) – if capitalism itself makes socialism necessary ? Historicism is deep-down / basically of use not to scientise, scientificise (the) theory regarding / about human nature, but rather precisely to show that the successive phases of “alienation / estrangement” are in reality steps towards the realisation of this nature. Being and Ought, reality and wish are confused again here as well, because also again an Over There / That World is presupposed, an end of History, towards which historical movement, motion leads, willingly or not. At the end of History, that which for today’s observer constitutes the temporal Over There / That World coincides with that which constitutes the Over There / That World of today’s “alienated, estranged” (hu)man, that is, his “true” nature.

The historicist position of atheistic humanism contends, asserts, claims, maintains, moreover, that in the realm, kingdom of freedom human nature will realise itself like it (atheistic humanism) has in the meantime / meanwhile been enriched by the culture, civilisation which was born in (the) previous historical stages: here it (the historicist position of atheistic humanism) sees the ulterior, further, ultimate meaning of these latter previous historical stages and the gain, profit, benefit from (the) already overcome (conquered, got over, surmounted) sufferings, trials and tribulations<sup>13</sup>. How much idealistic metaphysics is hiding behind (the) so-called, supposed, ostensible, professed, alleged scientificity of historicism, about which we are talking, is shown precisely at/on this point. Cultural values and human virtues or skills, aptitudes, (kinds of) adeptness

---

<sup>13</sup> It is a matter of the transfer(ence) of the Hegelian theory of *Aufhebung* [sublation] to (the) historicised anthropological examination of the problem / problem examination: the totality, which stands, is at the end of the dialectical course, maintains, preserves, having at the same time surpassed their unilateralism, (the) elements of the latter (unilateralism).

which were born in specific, concrete conditions, circumstances and clashes, conflicts, that is, inside locally and temporally determined “alienations, estrangements”, are now called upon to play a role –and indeed an important / significant role– in a society cleared / clean(s)ed of all the dung, excrement which nourished the rose (wheel, wreath) of culture, civilisation. The dung, excrement is purified, cleansed, but the rose is conserved, safeguarded, secured. This entitisation, ontologisation, turning into a material (concrete) being / entity of the spirit at the end of Marxist historicism would be impossible if it had not, even (also) with evasions, prevarications, loopholes, elusions (too), presupposed (the) all-sided, whole, total, covering-the totality, entirety-of-sections, rational and good human nature, if Man had not been deified, and if in this way / thus the conceptual structures of classical metaphysics had not been received. It was easy for the sociologist and historian Marx to define man / humans, since first the realm, kingdom of freedom had been guaranteed for him eschatologically as the whole, totality, entirety, sum of its social relations. For the metaphysical and moralist, ethicist, ethicologist Marx, it was, however, inconceivable, unthinkable, unimaginable, that man perhaps is not anything other than the sum, totality, entirety, whole of his so-called “alienations, estrangements”.

I supplement, complement, complete my observations about / regarding the parallelism of the conceptual structure between classical metaphysics and atheistic humanism by underlining that the second, latter (atheistic humanism) can equally well like the first, former (classical metaphysics) be used as an ideological weapon of (the) reinforcement, stabilisation, fixing, consolidation, complete understanding / comprehension and justification of a system of dominance, dominant authority, rule, sovereignty. Solely, Only (the) confusion, –of an ideological nature, texture, character–, between the conceptual structure and the content of a world view (world theory) can beget, generate, give birth to the – from a scientific point of view – naïve aporia, question, query, puzzlement,

bewilderment as to how it is possible for a world view to promise the catholic, universal, general liberation, freeing, emancipation and in practice be / is translated into new (dominant, sovereign, ruling) relations (of dominance, sovereignty, rule, dominant authority). And conversely, the other way around, vice versa: only the logical distinction between the two (aforementioned) elements (above) allows / permits us to understand that, in any case / anyhow usual, common, historical phenomenon. Since atheistic humanism in accordance with its content promises liberation, emancipation, freeing, this means / signifies that not (this) (its) content (of it), but its conceptual structure, allows, permits its use (or its abuse, as its “always betrayed” romantic followers, supporters, adherents say) with the purpose, end, goal of the reinforcement, stabilisation, fixing, consolidation and justification of a new dominance, rule, sovereignty, dominant authority. We have said that the inalienable Over There / That World is of use as a theoretical compass, that is, as a source of deontology for the therapy of the “alienated, estranged” Over Here / This World of human existence. The Over There / That World is the Idea of Man, the Over Here / This World is empirical man. The new dominance, dominant authority, rule, sovereignty rests / is based ideologically precisely on the fact that the dimension, dissociation, divergence of (the) Over There / That World and (the) Over Here / This World, with the simultaneous subjection, subordination, subjugation of the latter, second (Over Here / This World) to the former, first (Over There / That World), allows, permits, justifies and indeed imposes at every moment / at all times the sacrifice of empirical, “alienated, estranged” man to the voracious, ravenous, gluttonous, surfeiter, as we know today, altar, shrine of the Idea of Man. Dominant, Ruler, Lord, Master, Sovereign is whoever at any given time / moment is (sufficiently) powerful, strong (enough) so that he decides bindingly (i.e. in a way which binds others), what the Idea of Man specifically, concretely means, signifies for empirical man, that is, what obligations and duties are imposed on him (empirical man).

The drastic rejection of scepticism-nihilism, that is, the outbreak, growth, peak, spike, flare-up, rush, outburst, ebullition, stressing, highlighting, pointing out, elan, appearance of the meaning of life and the/a value scale / scale of values are here converted, transformed, just as in the old metaphysics (too, as well), on bases of the dominant, ruling, sovereign new world view. Man is that construction which gives the decisions of the new rulers, sovereigns / newly dominant, supra-personal, hyper-personal, unshakeable, unwavering, unfaltering prestige (validity, authority), the same as with those older / in the olden days as regards / in relation to the construct(ion) of God. Man becomes for man a wolf<sup>xxix</sup>.

Whoever would claim, contend, maintain, hold, assert that the acceptance of the Idea of Man by everyone without exception would automatically solve the problem of the deduction (extrapolation, drawing a conclusion) of a likewise generally accepted praxeology and deontology (i.e. the way people should act and the associated morals, ethics, morality) from this Idea would be showing / displaying ignorance of the specific, concrete function of ideas in history. Because, after its / an ideology's universal, general, catholic and definitive prevailing, predominance, an ideology ceases to be a unifying bond (anymore), as it was to a large extent / in great part in the heroic epoch, era, age of the fight against the old world view, and becomes a battlefield where the claims (in respect) of / on rule, dominance, dominant authority are projected in the form of the claim on / (in respect) of its (the said ideology's) "true" interpretation. Hobbes repelled, spurned, beat / fended off, abjured the fundamental position / thesis of the Aristotelian tradition in political philosophy, that is to say, that the harmonious human community / commonality ought to stand / be under the aegis of the Law, posing the inexorable, relentless, unsparing, deadly question : who will judge, who will interpret, who will decide what this Law will

specifically, concretely mean, signify in every case?<sup>14</sup> The battles for / over / about the “true” interpretation of the Idea of Man amongst its followers, supporters, adherents have / had begun already from the time of its (the Idea of Man’s) appearance and in the meantime / meanwhile have taken an intensity at least of the same values as / equivalent (equal) to that battle (in respect) of the struggles between God and God or between Man and God. A sober, staid, clear-headed historical way of looking at things / consideration / contemplation must, therefore, take this idea too / also / as well, just as with all analogous ideas (too, also, as well), not at (its) face / nominal value, but rather see it in its polemical function(ing), in the role of the/a weapon for the overthrow(ing), reversal, overturning, subversion, upsetting of a dominant authority, rule, sovereignty, (form of) dominance and for the imposition of a new dominant authority, rule, sovereignty, (form of) dominance<sup>15</sup>. Naturally, the Platonic lovers of the Idea of Man –Fromm formally, typically belongs to them<sup>xxx</sup>– do not see this function, whose ambition or vanity, vainglory is satisfied by a broad, wide reading public / readership and recognition in (the) circles of fellow craftsmen or of the like-minded. Lenin, Stalin and Mao (and those like them) / The Lenins, the Stalins and the Maos of this world know it (i.e. the said function of a new dominant authority overturning an old dominant authority), however, very well, and historically what counts is how *they* interpret in every case the Idea of Man. Nonetheless, simple theoreticians too / also raise, make, albeit in the masturbatory way, manner, mode of intellectuals (too, as well, also), claims of / on rule, sovereignty, dominant authority, dominance : Whoever protests against “alienation, estrangement” automatically contends, maintains, claims, asserts

---

<sup>14</sup> See, e.g. *De Cive*, XII § 4, *Opera Latina*, II, ed. G. Molesworth, London 1839, p. 288 ff..

<sup>15</sup> At the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, Novalis had seen in precisely this reason, the inability of reconciliation between the theologian and the modern intellectual : “the intellectual is by instinct the foe of (the) traditional clergy(man). The intellectual and (the) clergy(man) have to fight, wage war (against each other) until final extermination from the moment, second, time they appear / project themselves / come into sight / crop (pop) up as separate groups : because both of them battle for the same position” («Die Christenheit oder Europa», in *Schriften*, II, ed. R. Samuel, Darmstadt 1968, p. 515).

that he knows what is good and what is bad, evil for man / humans, and since, obviously, not everyone knows this -(otherwise the announcement, proclamation, communication, notice and the protest, remonstrance would be superfluous)- he pursues for himself the role of the pedagogue and the guide.<sup>16</sup> Directly and indirectly they (the intellectuals / ideologues) perpetuate, make eternal/on-going in this way the game of dominance, dominant authority, sovereignty, domination, rule / ruling over others (i.e.) precisely those who say that they want to abolish it (dominance) – they perpetuate it (dominance) in the name of its (dominance’s) abolition<sup>xxx1</sup>. The old story, history continues / is continued with / in a new form. Because historical processes are determined by a human nature (which is) very different to the schemata of atheistic humanism : that human nature about which Thucydides spoke twenty-four centuries ago, without in the meantime, meanwhile (Thucydides) being / having been contradicted, refuted, belied, gainsaid, proven to be a liar in practice<sup>17</sup>.<sup>xxxii</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> The diffusion, dissemination, spread(ing), propagation which the mythology of “alienation, estrangement” finds today in the circles of intellectuals / intellectual circles is due(,) from a psychological point of view(,) to the fact that it raises the self-esteem, self-estimation of the latter (intellectuals), since it founds in theory their conviction that they are the proponents, advocates, champions of the essence of Man and consequently a social group with a(n) pioneering, avant-garde function etc..

<sup>17</sup> Having described the savage, wild extermination, obliteration of one part, side by the other part, side in the civil-war battles / civil strife / civil wars of Corfu, he observes tersely, frugally, simply : «Καί ἐπέπεσε πολλά καί χαλεπά κατά στάσιν ταῖς πόλεσι, γιγνόμενα μὲν καί ἀεὶ ἐσόμενα, ἕως ἄν ἡ αὐτὴ φύσις τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἦ. . . πάντων δ’ αὐτῶν αἴτιον ἀρχὴ ἢ διὰ πλεονεξίαν καὶ φιλοτιμίαν [[And so there fell upon the cities on account of revolutions many grievous calamities, such as happen and always will happen while human nature is the same. . . the cause of all these evils was the desire to rule which greed and ambition inspire]]» (III, 82, 2 and 8 [[English translation by Charles Forster Smith, Loeb, Harvard University Press, Massachusetts, 1920 / 1998]]).

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

---

<sup>i</sup> «Η ΠΑΛΙΑ ΚΑΙ Η ΝΕΑ ΘΕΟΤΗΤΑ» 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.

<sup>ii</sup> 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.

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

<sup>iv</sup> 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.

<sup>v</sup> 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..

<sup>vi</sup> And so P.K. begins his “Buñuel for philosophers” ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID party fun times / glentia, glendia ...

<sup>vii</sup> Say c. 1400/1500 to c. 1600.

<sup>viii</sup> Say the 18th century, but with the 17th century a very tightly-related part of “all the fun”.

<sup>ix</sup> 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.

<sup>xi</sup> 354-430.

<sup>xii</sup> 1135-1202.

<sup>xiii</sup> 1112-1158.

<sup>xiv</sup> 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.

<sup>xv</sup> 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).

<sup>xvi</sup> 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.

<sup>xvii</sup> 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.

<sup>xviii</sup> 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.

---

<sup>xix</sup> 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..

<sup>xx</sup> The Heterogony of Ends, however, upsets man's delusions of grandeur as "facts on the ground". In other words, the Heterogony of Ends ensures that man will never be God. And hence : TERRENCE MALICK – *THE WAY OF THE WIND* (NOT YET RELEASED (AS OF 2025)) :

Εκκλ. 11,5      ἐν οἷς οὐκ ἔστι γινώσκων τίς ἡ ὁδὸς τοῦ πνεύματος. ὡς ὅσα ἐν γαστρὶ κυοφορούσης, οὕτως οὐ γνῶση τὰ ποιήματα τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὅσα ποιήσει σὺν τὰ πάντα.

<sup>xxi</sup> This does not mean that ideological thought, which can be seen as metaphysical, since it posits something which does not objectively exist, ends. On the contrary, "false consciousness" ideological thought is always dominant.

<sup>xxii</sup> This is behind the ZIO-2025 ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-"NO KINGS" movement. The JOOZ, da KIKES and the YIDZ want the ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-ZOMBEE-STOOGEE to believe that without God and without Kings, Strong Men etc., "everyone will be equal", when in fact in the name of "equality", JOOZ, KIKES and YIDZ will GROSSLY DISPROPORTIONATELY AND VASTLY ASYMMETRICALLY rule by controlling (KONTROL) the economy, the state and culture, whilst dragging society to its complete destruction, i.e. down into the CAVE of ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-ANTI-CHRIST-LISCENTIOUSNESS-ABNORMALITY-ANOMIE AND PERVERSION.

<sup>xxiii</sup> 1) the setting aside of God 2) without nihilism ensuing.

<sup>xxiv</sup> The said values as "the end-game values" / utopia, i.e. the state of perpetual peace and eternal unified rule, are always unrealised / unrealisable for all sides.

<sup>xxv</sup> Note that the atheistic humanism / socialism / Marxism etc. being referred to here, in terms of anthropology, still moved in the pre-post-modern, i.e. modernist / humanist / bourgeois / liberal world. There was no mass-democratic "post-modernist" notion yet, at least not fully developed, of man being surpassed and or replaced by the robot and technology under INBRED-INCESTUAL-HYPER-ORGANISED CRIMINAL-HYPER-MAFIA-HYPER-CONSPIRATORIAL-RAT-TUNNEL-BEHIND THE CURTAIN-ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID "master race, rool da world" control (KONTROL).

<sup>xxvi</sup> This definitely applies to belief in numbers / mass belief, but not necessarily in respect of the Krazy Man who sees God as mysterious, i.e. we can't know everything or even much about God, and as an omnipotent God, He does *whatever the fuck He wants to do*, irrespective of Good and Evil, without having to explain Himself or leave us any sign(s) if He does not want to. At the end of the day, Suffering, Death and Destruction could be interpreted by a Krazy Man as ends by which God wants us to acknowledge his Omnipotence and The Only Real Life as the After-Life of spiritual existence, always in agreement with Saint Apostle Paul / Saul (= a real Jew of Old Testament Jews and not a Synagogue of Satan JOO-KIKE-YID-LIZZARD-ENTRY-IST-TAKE-OVER-INBRED-INCESTUAL-MAFIA-ORGANISED CRIMINAL-HYPER-CONSPIRATORIAL-RAT-TUNNEL-FREAK), separate from this Fallen World under the Anti-Christ, the Devil, Satan, Synagogue of Satan Jooz, Kikes and Yidz.

<sup>xxvii</sup> "Unexplained" from the point of view of scientific observation, which is not in the least "a position one must take" more so than any other position. In fact, the point of view of scientific observation does not have any normative position apart from observing and explaining things to the extent possible in a non-normative, axiologically free, value-free, value-neutral manner, and is hence, as such, of no use to people who "want to live", who at most can draw (some arguments, points etc.) from scientific observation, but can't exclusively live by it, since all living, conscious humans must live with an ethics, deontology, morals, morality which support(s) certain normative positions shared by Friends against at least some of the normative positions of Foes, and this occurs throughout the whole of the Social and not just within the Political as Schmitt erroneously opined. Note that scientific observation is concerned with all relevant facts and absolute logical coherence, whereas normative positions use facts selectively and ultimately don't care about contradictions and logical incoherence (such as evil coming from good etc.) since polemics and polemical "logic" (i.e. the Friend / Foe relation), and or psychological self-contentment, trump all relevant facts and total logical consistency. An example of a normative position is that of the ultimate ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-ZOMBEE-STOOGEE-ZIO-ANGLO-JOO "TUCKA", who maintains that "Christians" would be "un-Christian-like" if they ever turned against and attacked Anti-Christ Synagogue of Satan Jews, who must be kept as ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-ANTI-CHRIST-EVIL-DEVIL-MAMMON-LUCIFER-SATANISTS in **GROSSLY DISPROPORTIONATE AND VASTLY ASYMMETRICAL** POSSESSION OF ECONOMIC-STATE-CULTURAL POWER AND CONTROL (KONTROL), at all costs, completely ignoring the REALITY of "the things / affairs of Caesar" and Clint Eastwood's "deserve has nothing to do with it" to Gene Hackman's "I don't deserve

