

Panajotis Kondylis

**DIE ENTSTEHUNG
DER DIALEKTIK**

–Klett-Cotta–

Die Entstehung der Dialektik

The coming into being / genesis of (the) dialectic(s)

Eine Analyse der geistigen Entwicklung
von Hölderlin, Schelling und Hegel bis 1802

An analysis of the intellectual-spiritual development (evolution, unfolding)
of Hölderlin, Schelling and Hegel (up) to / until 1802

Von / By

Panajotis Kondylis / Panagiotis Kondylis

Klett-Cotta, Stuttgart, 1979

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

ΠΑΝΑΓΙΩΤΗΣ ΚΟΝΔΥΛΗΣ

Η ΓΕΝΕΣΗ

ΤΗΣ ΔΙΑΛΕΚΤΙΚΗΣ

*Ανάλυση τῆς πνευματικῆς ἐξέλιξης τοῦ Χέλντερλιν,
τοῦ Σέλλινγκ καὶ τοῦ Χέγκελ ἕως τὸ 1802.*

ΜΕΤΑΦΡΑΣΗ: ΛΕΥΤΕΡΗΣ ΑΝΑΓΝΩΣΤΟΥ

ΕΠΙΣΤΗΜΟΝΙΚΗ ΕΠΙΜΕΛΕΙΑ: ΓΙΩΡΓΟΣ ΞΗΡΟΠΑΪΔΗΣ

ΠΑΝΕΠΙΣΤΗΜΙΑΚΕΣ ΕΚΔΟΣΕΙΣ ΚΡΗΤΗΣ

ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΟ 2026

For G. T.

καὶ ὁ προστιθεὶς γνῶσιν προσθήσει ἄλγημα

ΕΚΚΛΗΣ. 1,18

and he that increaseth knowledge increaseth sorrow.

(King James version, 1611)

Table of contents

Foreword

Chapter I

Tübingen Axiomatics and its sources

1. Introductory observations	17
2. The dualistic thought structure in early Schiller	22
a) Anthropological and cosmological dualism as a defence against materialism and immoralism	23

Foreword / Prologue

The thesis pertaining to the history of philosophy of this work can be summarised / summed up as follows. The dialectic(s) by Hegel (Hegel's dialectics), having become known and since then connected with his (Hegel's) name, comes / came into being on/in regard to the foundation / basis of a monistic world view, or else, of an (association, union) philosophy (of unification), which, for its part, absorbs / absorbed (into itself) strongly monistic approaches of the late German Enlightenment and simultaneously feels / felt compelled, forced to intensively confront, deal with the questions, problems as regards the theory of knowledge raised, posed, posited, set, put by Kant and Fichte. This (association, union) philosophy (of unification), and indeed in a comprehensive and systematic form, is the product of Hölderlin's autonomous, independent, self-reliant, self-contained intellectual (thought) endeavour, effort in the years 1795—1799. Schelling, informed about the new path taken by his friend [[i.e. Hölderlin]] at the end of 1795, undertook or else discovered (detected, spotted, discerned) himself, in / on the roundabout path of his personal confrontation with Fichte, the questionable, doubtful (association, union) philosophy (of unification) in the years 1799—1802, in order for it (the said (association, union) philosophy (of unification)) to simultaneously be converted, transformed, transmuted into a programmatically conceived construction resting / based on the/a schema of triplicity. Hegel's contribution to the formation, development of this first, but groundbreaking, pathbreaking, pioneering, revolutionary form of (the) dialectic(s) must be considered as minimal, if one would want to accept such a thing/thesis at all. Because his (i.e. Hegel's) Frankfurt writings represent and constitute an explication and application of the principles of Hölderlinian (association, union) philosophy (of unification), whereas / whilst his earlier Jena(ean) treatises receive(d) the version of the same Schellingian (association, union) philosophy (of unification) formed, developed in the meantime / meanwhile. Hegel's autonomous, independent, self-contained, self-reliant philosophical development, which also had important consequences for the form of (the) dialectic(s), begins only/first after 1802, and indeed with the decision that the absolute / Absolute is knowable or else the substance / Substance is the/a subject / Subject – a decision, which means/signifies the/a break with the common conviction of Hölderlin and Schelling, which Hegel likewise, also shared, that the absolute / Absolute is unknowable or

knowledge or else/and thought is (are) per definitionem separation and abstraction.

The essential new points of this thesis are three (There are three essential new points in this thesis). First of all, the unity, uniformity, consistency and consciously systematic character of Hölderlin's philosophical thought is described in detail / extensively, so that his influence on Schelling and Hegel can be / is made understandable in detail, but also can be shown in its whole depth. Secondly, against the widely dominant assumption of a turn / change of course by Schelling after 1803, the, -despite all more or less important shifts in tone-, existing continuity of his intellectual-spiritual development (evolution) is asserted – a continuity which not least of all goes back / is reduced to the striking, conspicuous, noticeable structural similarity which exists between Hölderlin's (association, union) philosophy (of unification) received by Schelling or else Hölderlin's newly discovered (association, union) philosophy (of unification) and his (Schelling's) later "positive philosophy" (the great common denominator is the thesis of the unknowability of the absolute / Absolute or else of the immanent, never to be overcome, transcended, surpassed negativity of thought). And thirdly, contrary to the unanimously prevailing, dominant, ruling, albeit differently justified, founded, perception, view that Hegel's thought is characterized by organic continuity, a radical break in its development, evolution is ascertained, identified.

This new thesis arises / results from a process ((methodical) procedure) which is new in a double, dual, twin regard. First, all texts of all three friends and jointly/commonly philosophising thinkers are analysed i.e. as an intellectual-spiritual unity, and indeed at the same time chronologically and systematically. Also, the thinkers, who influenced our heroesⁱ positively or negatively, from Schiller, Rousseau and Jacobi up to Kant and Fichte, are treated in excurses / digressions, which are supposed / ought to shed light on / illuminate the deeper contexts / interrelations pertaining to the history of ideas and [[relevant]] philosophical interrelations / contexts. It is obvious that with such a method(ological) option, choice, the/a confrontation, discussion, debate with (regard to) the sources must have the absolute primacy, priority, precedence, even though for (vis-à-vis) all important positions or else counter-positions in the older and newer secondary literature, a position is taken mostly directly, but also indirectly. Secondly, the sought-after, desired philological completeness, which even / also makes the relatively great, large extent, scope of this work unavoidable / inevitable, means / signifies no coming to a standstill at / in the philological process ((methodical) procedure) or else at / in the ascertainment of commonalities with the help / on the basis of identical (homonymous, conforming) passages. Rather, textual comparison occurs primarily

structurally, i.e. by (means of), through the form-related, formal processing of / working on the thought (intellectual) construct, which must / necessarily emerge(s) from a certain thought (intellectual) style. This structural way of looking at things here enables, makes possible for the first time detailed comparisons between texts like for instance Hölderlin's Hyperion and Hegel's Frankfurt Sketches or Shelling's later Jena Writings and Hegel's early Jena treatises. Previous / Former approaches to such comparisons hardly, barely remain fertile, productive, because they are restricted / limited above all to the indication of (selected) passages (already sought out) without i.e. studying structurally textual totalities as intellectual / thought totalities.

In terms of genre, this work belongs to the dinosaurs of textual scholastic scholarship, which flourish, thrive, prosper in Alexandrian timesⁱⁱ, in order to die shortly thereafter / afterwards. Nevertheless, its ambition remains, via results pertaining to the history of philosophy, to provide an insight into the process of the coming into being / genesis of philosophemes of a certain type, which were (had / have been) decisive, determinative for the / a previous, former philosophical tradition. It will be shown how a systematic thinking as the rationalisation of a basic / fundamental stance or decision (is) gradually crystallises (crystallised), and indeed in endeavouring / striving to argumentatively defeat counter-positions. It will moreover be described how, in the course of this, the interweaving of Is and Ought in the thought of the philosophising thinkers is reflected / expressed in the ontologisation of postulates of a normative-moral character, which, as it were, represent and constitute the axis around which the existing system revolves. The inclusion of the existential situation of the thinkers concerned in the understanding / cognitive analysis is near, close to / obvious in such a way of looking at things and must lead to the discussion of psychological and sociological factors. This indication of the concrete situation / position, in which fundamental / basic stances are moulded, shaped, formed, is supposed / ought to refute, confute, prove wrong, falsify the widespread, far-ranging / wide-ranging equation, equating, identification of the basic/fundamental stance or else decision and chaotic imponderability and incalculability. Basic / Fundamental stances or else decisions can be at least partially explained genetically both with psychological-sociological means as well as be pursued, followed, tracked purely logically-structurally in their intellectual unfolding, development. Because, once present, a basic / fundamental decision has its logic, which, seen in terms of form, is subject / subjugated / subordinated to the laws of the logic in general. Also, / Even under the above-mentioned method(ological) presuppositions, therefore, that which one, -

assuming / presupposing the higher logicity of philosophy-, is accustomed to call / usually calls / names “philosophical analysis”, is not neglected / does not come up short. But what lies beyond the possibilities of (“philosophical”) logic is exactly the founding, establishing, substantiation, giving of reasons, justification of (for) the content of the basic / fundamental stance or else decision — and that is what mattersⁱⁱⁱ. We shall see that fundamental / basic principles like “all / everything is good” or “all / everything is rational (reasonable, sensible)” were *constitutive* for the thought of the founders of (the) dialectic(s), and I can hardly, barely imagine that someone would want to seriously make such theses out / appear to be not decisions, but for instance “discoveries”^{iv}. The reader will judge, evaluate how far these general thoughts, considerations, reflections, deliberations can be confirmed by our text(ual) analysis. In any case / After all, the validity, soundness of the results pertaining purely to the history of philosophy summarised at the beginning is independent of whether the above-mentioned considerations, thoughts, reflections, deliberations are considered / held to be / regarded as correct, well-aimed or else taken into consideration / account or not.

The -in the narrower sense- social-theoretical side of the early work of Hölderlin, Schelling and Hegel is treated in this work marginally / peripherally / on the margins / in the periphery / at the fringes. This happened not only for understandable (space, spatial) reasons (as regards space), but above all for the reason (in respect) of the conviction gained, won in the course of a long exposure to (association with) these texts, that the birthplace, place of birth of the dialectical structures lies not in the social-theoretical [aspect, dimension], but in the metaphysical [aspect, dimension]. I could prove that social-theoretical perceptions of our heroes, seen structurally / in terms of structure, can be deduced, derived from the schema of their metaphysics and follow the latter in its occasional modifications. This proof could in the framework / context of this work, overlooking / disregarding some examples, not be provided thoroughly / extensively enough, because the complete, full, total understanding of the aforementioned perceptions presupposes clear and (social-historically founded) concepts (founded in terms of societal history in respect) of conservatism, liberalism and democracy^v, which, for their part, require, demand, necessitate, call for investigations of a(n) entirely, totally, completely different kind than those undertaken here. With very few exceptions, the philosophical discussion of recent years, which, as is (well-)known, almost exclusively referred to Hegel, has been characterised by conceptual unclarity in (regard) to this central question / problem [[of social history]], and because of this / accordingly, it, despite valuable / worthwhile contributions in detail / as to details (individual / in-part aspects), does not

provide the self-evident foundation of / for further research. That the lack in a concrete first-hand education, culture, formation pertaining to the history of society sometimes makes up / constitutes an important source of inspiration of / for philosophers active in social theory / the theory of society(,) should be known at least to non-philosophers^{vi}.

The assertion (claim) of the primacy of metaphysics in the dialectical thought structure does not stand / is not in any contradiction towards / vis-à-vis / with regard to the indication of the meaning of factors pertaining to the history of society and psychological factors for its (i.e. the dialectical thought structure's) coming into being / genesis. Above all, the neo-Marxist interpretation rests / is based on the confusion of the (right, correct) ascertainment of the influence of social-political factors on the kind of thought / mindset of the post-Kantians with (regard to) the (false) assumption that this would have first or primarily, mainly developed, formed in the field of social theory. Against that, it is valid to say / On the other hand, it must be argued that impulses, impetuses, which in the final analysis / ultimately are of social-political origin, at least in the philosophical (or for instance in the theological) area, realm find expression / manifest themselves / are reflected not primarily or not necessarily in autonomous and autarchic positions pertaining to the theory of society / soci(et)al theory, although their objective social-political relevance often flows into / end (up) in social-theoretical statements, propositions. Our thesis, that dialectics is a metaphysical construction, does not therefore at all aim at a brave defence of the philosophical spirit of the nobility against its supposed, presumed degradation, belittling, downgrading, disparagement, depreciation, devaluation by the proof of its multifarious, multiple, many-faceted social dependence – and yet / nevertheless it is to / must be assumed that the way in which the above-mentioned thesis is justified, substantiated here will not satisfy precisely those who indeed flirt with Marxism as long as they believe they are hearing the voice of their own heart in its emancipatory message, but who try, attempt to somehow go around / circumvent the strict sociological aspect and aspect critical of ideology of the work of Marx, since precisely in it (i.e. Marx's work) they scent, smell, sniff a danger / risk for "philosophy" as emancipatory theory with a claim to absolute truth (cf. footnote, p. 187 [[German ed.]], below). — It will be asserted, claimed, contended here, in any case, that the individual and social constellation in which the dialectic comes into being / is born, initially pushed for / towards the sketching, outlining, planning of a metaphysical schema, and that the opinion, statement, comment on each and every respective occasion vis-à-vis questions, problems pertaining to the theory of society / social theory or social-political questions, problems took

place or else corresponded structurally to it (the said schema) from the point of view of this schema. Said otherwise / In other words: certain concrete situations make the primacy of the metaphysical before / over / vis-à-vis the social-theoretical, i.e. that which pertains to the theory of society, in the ideational realm, area very likely, probable, although this area, realm in itself — at least for profane, secular eyes — belongs to the social and not to the metaphysical (dimension, sphere). This is actually not new, and no Marxist would dispute, contest that exactly this was / had (has) been the case with (regard to) the great theological or metaphysical systems of the pre-industrial past.

The wish to make out of (the) dialectic(s) an exception (exceptional case) springs from ideological needs / requirements. For the Marxists, it was (has) always (been) a theoretical annoyance (irritation, offence) that (the) dialectic(s) saw / caught sight of / espied / perceived the light of day precisely within that much-lamented German “misery”, whose ideological superstructure, in accordance with the orthodox schema, was (exactly) not allowed to shine (precisely) through / by means of progressivity, progressiveness and modernity. Did the “algebra of the revolution / Algebra of the Revolution” smell of the Tübingen Stift^{vii} (to remind us of Nietzsche) or else was the leader of liberation none other than the priest of the absolute spirit, “turned upside down / made to stand on his head” (the admitted boldness of the act lay exactly in the paradox of the situation) and hastily dressed in a red robe? During the theoretical predominance of German social democracy, the / this embarrassing (painful, awkward, distressing) question / problem was displaced by the far-reaching, wide(spread), extensive, to a great/large extent convergence, approximation, drawing near(er) of Marxism to positivist(ic)-scientist(ic) positions(;) but / however it (the said embarrassing question / awkward problem) had to be posed / asked / put / posited / set / addressed acutely as soon as the rediscovery of the Hegelian roots of Marx's teaching(s) / doctrine(s) / theory(,) accompanying / which accompanied the existentialist movement(,) became apparent / announced (manifested) themselves. Lukács saw / recognised / had insight into and comprehended the theoretical dilemma, that the progressiveness, progressivity of (the) dialectics in the Marxist sense could be of service only through / by means of the proof of its coming into being / genesis, not merely out of a “progressive” positioning / stance, but above all out of / from the confrontation with the most modern question formulations. This task, job, mission was particularly urgent, imperative, pressing, compelling, exigent after 1933(,) when important aspects of (the) Hegelian body of thought / intellectual corpus / ideas was threatened / in danger of being “usurped” by national-socialistic or else right-wing

tendencies; Marcuse's rescue of Hegel / the saving (salvaging) of Hegel by Marcuse, undertaken simultaneously with, and independently of, Lukács, bears witness to / is evidence (testimony) of this^{viii}. For the general ideological function and importance of this deduction, derivation of (the) dialectics from / out of "the greatest achievements of its time", the fact is most eloquent that it ((the) dialectic(s)) (though/admittedly: reduced to its existential component) found entrance, access, acceptance as the only / sole / single of all (intellectual) accomplishments (achievements, feats, performances) (in/of thought) of – otherwise treated / handled with suspicion or else contempt – neo-Marxism in the Orthodoxy of the Eastern Block too / as well.

We cannot here investigate (examine, explore) the reason for which the neo-Marxist interpretation in [[its]] various / different variations owes its spread(ing) in the course of / over the last few / recent years, so that it could even tamper with, captivate (bribe, corrupt) the irresistible persuasiveness of fashion / the fashionable. It is also not worth going into its (the neo-Marxist interpretation of dialectics') source-based/related foundation / founding, especially since even Lukács's warmest friends have never publicly praised, extolled his philological conscientiousness, scrupulousness. To underline / emphasise is only an elementary — albeit / even though obviously, apparently not generally as such known — fact^{ix}. When the insight of the young Hegel into the contradictions of capitalist(ic) society is vaunted, praised and its fertility, fruitfulness for (the) dialectics is asserted, then namely it is not taken into consideration / account that the young Hegel's explications, explanations concerning this —((what is) meant here are the – for the coming into being of (the) dialectics – critical / crucial years 1798—1803, in which Hegel represents perceptions, views as to social theory / the theory of society, which, for instance, his Bernese^x political convictions structurally and in terms of content precisely contradict — something, though, which closely / narrowly interconnects with the in the meanwhile radical philosophical-metaphysical reorientation carried out / undertaken / executed (in respect) of his thought)— to a great / large extent / for the most part are a(n) takeover, taking over, undertaking, modification or further development of commonplaces of the noble / aristocratic-conservative critique of early capitalism. Lamentations, Complaints about the industrial division of labour or else about "mechanical work / labour" in regard to the consequences of the "essence / substance / nature / character of man"; warnings about the appearance of a proletariat dangerously splitting, dividing, splicing social unity and pity, compassion with (regard) to / for its (the proletariat's) fate/lot; resisting / resistance against the general, not only estate-based / class

differences, but allegedly also the “vital / living / vibrant / exuberant variety, diversity” of leveling legislation, which must be connected with an also united-impersonal bureaucratic state apparatus: all the basic / fundamental motifs of this critique of culture / cultural criticism(, which is) still so explosive, volatile today under the most diverse circumstances / various signs (types, kinds), is thus (can) already (be) found in J. Möser and then in Novalis, A. Müller and Fr. Baader (to stay/remain/mention (with) Germans only), and originally, initially represent and constitute an ideological sublimation of the power position / position as regards power or else of the power claim of the patriarchal landowner, who feels threatened in his existence by the dissolution of *societas civilis* by (means of / through) the modern state on the one hand, and modern industry, on the other hand. This early organicist(ic) conservatism had dissolved, broken up still / even before the death, dying (out), perishing of the nobility (aristocracy) as a socially relevant group (and indeed forever: today’s / present-day attempts to revive it (i.e. the said organicist conservatism) as a programme spring from a particular kind of intellectual-spiritual coquetry amongst apologists of the right wing of liberalism^{xi} and are not to be taken at (their) face value). Their argumentative arsenal remains since the time / age of Restoration^{xii} freely available and was in certain situations also/even used by the radical-democratic or else socialistic movement^{xiii} for its own anti-capitalistic purposes, ends, goals (I recall / recollect / remind ourselves only of the influence of Carlyle’s critique of capitalism on the young Engels), which, though, by no means implies that its meaning in this regard was constitutive, although it can be easily be seen / it is easy to see which / what form the ideal of the folk / popular / national community, the perception of the unified, united natural man / man of nature and, and not least of all, the historicist approaches intertwined with all this have taken within the intellectual-spiritual construct of Marxism(,) next to / alongside / beside in part radically heterogeneous elements. The striking, conspicuous, noticeable commonalities pertaining to the critique of culture / cultural criticism between Rousseauism and organicist(ic) conservatism in the 18th century are exactly a harbinger, precursor, herald, presage of the above-mentioned later appearance (occurrence, phenomenon) — and the same constellation can *mutatis mutandis* also explain the “understanding” which some modern “conservatives” would like to offer (bring) to the critique of culture / cultural criticism of the New Left. However, as just indicated, these conservatives are all too closely entangled with the industrial bourgeoisie to be able to raise the long-buried and rotten, decomposed, moulded flag/banner of (the) *societas civilis* again/anew. The original / initial noble/aristocratic-conservative critique of culture and the interconnected / interrelated with that plans, designs, outlines, sketches of an “organic

community” on a new basis are accordingly / because of that nowadays / in our times mainly spun / woven further by a politically homeless intelligentsia, whose utopian dreams or else concrete ambitions have no prospects of realisation either in the framework of late capitalism or in that framework of real / actual / extant [[Soviet/Chinese etc.]] socialism. So strange (odd, weird, bizarre) — and so instructive (informative, educational, salutary) — can the fate (destiny, lot) of ideas be.

The indication of / reference to the early conservative origins / provenance of Hegel’s critique of capitalism does *not* mean that Hegel (above all after 1803) was a conservative in the sense of A. Müller or [[as]] Fr. Baader (remained [[a conservative]]), but only that his anti-capitalist(ic) theses in themselves were not capable of founding, establishing any “progressivity” of (the) dialectic(s) in the sense of the Marxist schema of the ascending, ascendant, rising, soaring motion, movement of history. This optical illusion comes into being only because noble / aristocratic conservatives and socialist(ic) anti-capitalism are confused with each other on account of the commonality of some leitmotifs, themes. But also conversely, Hegel’s historical legitimisation of the new bourgeois society^{xiv} by no means suffices / is sufficient for the interpretation of the coming into being and the structure of (the) dialectic(s). Those researchers inspired by neo-Marxism, who insist on the central relevance of (the) political economy for Hegel’s thought, are indebted to provide / owe an explanation / explication of / for the fact that no approaches to a dialectic(s) can be found in the early classics of this science [[of political economy]]. If political economy and (the) dialectic(s) belonged together structurally, thus such approaches to dialectics should have been present. However, (the) dialectic(s) was introduced to / brought into (the) political economy first by the Hegelian Marx, and Hegel, for his part, utilised his intellectual-spiritual loans from this latter political economy inside of a framework / context which came into being independently of it (i.e. (the) dialectic(s)). One could reply, retort that only (pre)occupation / dealing / being concerned with it (i.e. dialectics) had opened for him (Hegel) his eyes to (the) new soci(et)al developments and consequently dynamicised (made) his thought (much more dynamic). But this does not yet clarify / make clear the reasons why Hegel (at least after 1803) affirmed this development (under certain important preconditions), whilst / whereas others, who knew A. Smith just as well and even earlier than he / Hegel did, partly remain with / insist on their original rejection of the new, and partly transform themselves from its (the new’s / what was new’s) followers into its foes / enemies. (Pre)Occupation / Dealing / Concerning oneself / Engaging with (the) political economy does / is not, therefore, in itself suffice / sufficient for

the explanation / explication of the / one's *stance, opinion* on its object, i.e. the new bourgeois society (it should be noted in passing that this ((pre)occupation / dealing / concerning oneself / engaging with (the) political economy) was not a groundbreaking, pioneering achievement of Hegel's; A. Müller wrote at the time with regard to the great popularity of A. Smith amongst the reading public, that in Germany the situation was (things had become) similar to Kant's (situation), of whom the poets of the *Xenien*^{xv} had said: "(for) one sole/single rich man feeds so many poor people!"). In Hegel, the legitimation of the new bourgeois society occurs, takes place, ensues, follows on the basis of an already existing, present theodicy with implications pertaining directly to the history of ideas. Also, because the legitimation of the (what is) bourgeois (element, phenomenon) was undertaken not least of all with means from (the) pre-bourgeois thoughts / intellectual world / ideas, it remained highly ambivalent.

In regard to the history of ideas, this work must start / begin / commence in *mediis rebus* (in the middle of things). Certain important points, which had to be / were necessarily referred to (referenced) here (the coming into being and function of the dualistic thought / intellectual structure in the Enlightenment in general and the strong monistic tendency in the late German Enlightenment, in particular; the structure of the Enlightenment concept of nature as the interweaving of Is and Ought; the anti-intellectualist(ic) character, attribute, trait, pull of the Enlightenment and accordingly / through that the determined, conditional, conditioned character of its rationalism; the sense, meaning of the rehabilitation of sensoriality (sensuousness, sensuality (as regards all the senses, not just sexually)) and the systematic meaning, signification of the question / problem / issue of the relations between spirit and sensoriality, and indeed in regard to the question, problem, issue of (the) norm(s)), can be satisfactorily discussed only inside (of) a conceptual reconstruction of the European Enlightenment. I hope to be able to soon present such a reconstruction, and that is why I have restricted, limited myself here to the absolutely necessary suggestions, allusions, indications, hints. Perhaps it is / will be helpful to the reader to know that these suggestions, allusions, indications, hints are the results, outcome(s) of research and not for instance unverified, unproved generalisations.

The following text offers the slightly shortened, and supplemented with a few notes, comments, remarks, version of a work, which in the summer of 1976 was completed and was accepted in the Winter Semester (October-March) 1977/1978 by the philosophical faculty / Faculty of Philosophy of the University of Heidelberg as a dissertation. I have to thank Dr. F. Horst, whose fine remarks, comments, observations made this text readable, Mr. Charitakis

for much / multiple technical help in / during the completion, finalisation of the manuscript and not least of all the German Academic Exchange Service for the grant(ing) of a two-year scholarship, stipend and a printing cost subsidy. My particular, especial thanks, thank you I owe / goes to Prof. Dr. / Professor W. Conze, who encouraged (promoted, fostered, facilitated, furthered) the publication of the / this work.

Chapter I

(The) Tübingen Axiomatic(s) and its sources

1. Introductory comments / remarks / observations

The aim of this chapter is the description, depiction of a dualistic thought structure, under whose aegis, influence the earliest intellectual-spiritual efforts, endeavours by/of Hölderlin, Hegel and Schelling, as well as the ideas / body of thought they acquired in all of the(ir) various respective forms, stand. The function and the specific texture, composition, constitution, character of this thought structure will arise, ensue in, during the course of our analysis. Its origins, provenance pertaining to the history of ideas, whose complete explication, explanation actually, really, genuinely needs, requires a reconstruction of the European Enlightenment, however, can only be suggested, alluded / pointed to here^{xvi}. First of all it must / is to be stressed that this dualistic thought structure by no means can be identified with the thought of “the” Enlightenment, if by / under Enlightenment we want to understand not for instance — abstractly — a moral(ist)(ic)-emancipatory ideal, but — concretely — the contradictory great variety of European spiritual-intellectual currents of the 2nd half of the 17th century. As a thought structure, it exists next to / alongside other thought structures / others, whose most consistent variations do not shy away from materialist(ic) or spiritualist(ic) monism. In order to be able to elementarily comprehend this constellation, we must bring to mind the revaluation or else rehabilitation of sensoriality / the senses, which was carried out / executed / performed as an emancipatory act in the struggle against Christian asceticism, without of course restricting, limiting, confining ourselves to the area, field of morality, morals, ethics; also in the neuralgic (i.e. critical, crucial, central) field / area of anthropology, research gradually shows the biological conditions of the spiritual-intellectual texture, composition, constitution of man / humans, whilst the science coming into being of history, for its part, is increasingly interested in the interrelations, contexts between cultural phenomena, occurrences, appearances with factors like the climate, race,

economy etc.. However, materialism, turning out to be / resulting as an extreme possibility for the rehabilitation of sensoriality, the senses, and whilst even appearing in a nihilistic^{xvii} form during the Enlightenment, seems, however, to endanger, put at risk all / everything that most leading spirits, intellects, minds understand as new values to be defended / worth defending^{xviii}. Progressive / Advancing insight into the dependencies of the spiritual-intellectual on the sensorial / senses, which was first of all used as an argument against theological spiritualism (or as its caricature planned, sketched out, outlined designed with polemical intent), now seems / seemed to be turning against its dedicated, devoted advocates: because without freedom of the spirit or else of the will / volition, talk of morals, morality, ethics must / necessarily lose(s) its concise, succinct sense / meaning. In (regard to) this dilemma, the dualistic thought / intellectual structure comes into being, of which here the talk is / which we are talking about here (we shall see the fundamental difference between this dualism and the consistent Kantian dualism / one below). Its representatives cannot renounce, forego, do without, abstain from the rehabilitation of sensoriality / the senses because they are not ready, prepared, willing to capitulate to “bad, evil, wicked”, i.e., church(-based)-traditional Christianity or else to let the emancipatory message fall, go silent, cease, die away, subside or to ignore the (various kinds of) knowledge of the new science. On the other hand, however, they may not / cannot / ought not lapse, fall into, succumb to lurking materialism when they do not want to confirm, validate, acknowledge, verify, affirm, corroborate the main / chief / principal argument of (the) conservative theologians, [[since]](:) the new position logically leads to the abandonment, relinquishment, abandoning of spirit(-intellect) *and* morality, morals, ethics. Spirit(-intellect) or else morals, morality, ethics and the rehabilitation of sensoriality, the senses or else the rejection, denial, refusal of asceticism must, therefore, simultaneously be rescued, saved, salvaged. Logical contradictions, i.e. a continual, continuous conflict between sensoriality, the senses and the spirit-intellect (between the causal and the normative, between Is and Ought) are the result of this endeavour, effort, whereby / in relation to which the question/problem, issue, matter of being directly or indirectly is converted, transformed into a question/problem, issue, matter of value(s).

An attempt^{xix} at the overcoming, surpassing, transcending of the logical oscillation, vacillation of this dualism in a monistic direction is now undertaken in the (late) German (late) Enlightenment, and indeed with the help of a more or less free interpretation and fusing, amalgamation, merger of Shaftesbury, Leibniz and Spinoza. Here a radical optimism

is connected with the rehabilitation of sensoriality (the senses) inside of a metaphysical synthesis, which in stands / is / finds itself under the sign, aegis of faith, belief that all / everything in the final analysis / ultimately is good or else / and rational, reasonable. In it / this metaphysical synthesis, the task (what was sought) was to interweave the spirit as the bearer of the (what is) normative (element) and sensoriality (the senses) as the bearer of the causal (element) with each other in such a manner that the latter (sensoriality / senses) would (not) represent and constitute not only no (any) adversary, opponent, antagonist, foe of the former (spirit), but precisely, exactly the vehicle for the realisation of its (the spirit's) postulates. In this way(,) the prevailing, predominance of the (what is) normative (element, sphere)(,) or else the conclusive victory over materialism and nihilism under / in accordance with the complete consideration of the basic, fundamental Enlightenment principle of the rehabilitation of sensoriality (the senses), i.e. under / in accordance with the use of the most modern spiritual(-intellectual) equipment, is supposed (ought) to be secured (protected, assured)^{xx}. All that had to, obviously, come / boil down / amount to a soaking, saturating, steeping, impregnating of the (what is) causal (element, dimension) by the (what is) normative (element, dimension)(,) or else a spiritualisation of the (what is) sensorial (element, dimension) (the senses). The decisive role, which the “all (everything) is good” in the first formation, development of the consistent (combining, unifying) philosophy (of unification, uniting, merging, fusion, coupling, bringing together, consolidation, association, federation) had been / was played by (means of) / through Hölderlin, as well as its/his reference, connection, (point of) attachment, recourse to Herder, who until then represented, supported in metaphysics and the history of ideas most clearly, lucidly, evidently this monist(ic) (re)solution, precisely at the same time, leaves, as our analyses will / are still to show, no doubt as to the central meaning, significance of this constellation pertaining to the history of ideas for our problem. The general determination of the position, location, site, habitat pertaining to the history of ideas is, though, only the beginning, start, not the anticipation of wider, extended, extensive investigation, research. Because the (unifying) philosophy (of unification), especially in the / its dialectical form, does not crystallise / is not crystallised as the direct and conscious takeover, acceptance, taking over and further development, evolution, unfolding of existing, existent (pre-Kantian) monistic approaches, but – after Kant's and Fichte's imposing, formidable, huge, enormous, monumental, vast, mighty presence, appearance, manner, occurrence and the connected with that putting forward, promotion, placement at the beginning, prioritisation of the problem of (the theory of) knowledge – in (as) a highly complicated spiritual-intellectual situation. It remains,

however, in the course of this [the case], that the (unifying) philosophy (of unification)(,) or else (the) dialectic(s)(,) starts, begins, commences with the / a decisive turn towards monism, and that entitles us to place at the beginning, put forward, prioritise, promote (the) research, investigation of the texture, composition, constitution, nature and function of the dualist(ic) thought structure. Because only against its (the said dualistic thought structure's) background does the mentioned turn towards monism gain, win, earn its – in terms of the history of ideas and of logic / logically – specific contours^{xxi}.

Despite / Notwithstanding the prioritised / priority / of prime importance consideration of the dualistic thought structure, the title of this capital contains the word “axiomatic”, which does not suggest, refer to / allow the conclusion of logical difficulties and weaknesses, but rather (to, of) clear positions. The contradiction does not, however, lie in our (re)presentation, depiction, but in its object. Our young heroes indeed (had) made, took (taken) the unambiguous decisions in which their axiomatics consist(s) : they took a position / stance (advocated) for / in favour of “union” against “separation”, (for / of) the “living” against the “abstract” and “dead” etc. etc.. Yet these decisions remain first of all, in terms of content and logically, vague (indefinite, indeterminate); for their own articulation, they (our heroes) make use of / use a(n) (existing, already found, discovered) body of thought / stock of ideas, thoughts (found from beforehand), which is not or not completely, entirely adequate for them. From the tension, intensity, strain, stress between the monistic approach supporting, bearing the axiomatics and the dualism that nevertheless tenaciously persists, asserts itself, the Tübingen writings and sketches, plans, outlines are nourished, fed, nurtured. This tension, intensity, strain, stress can be comprehended, understood if / when we strictly distinguish, differentiate the level of our analysis from the reality in which the seminary members, students, borders (the student residents of the (Tübingen) Theological School's dormitory) live and weave (i.e. act). The dualist(ic) thought structure / structure of thought only exists ideal-typically / in terms of the ideal type at the former level (of our analysis) and emerges, stands out, comes to the fore, becomes evident, appears in / during the hermeneutic attempt, endeavour, effort to(,) meaningfully / in terms of meaning(,) reconstruct as far, much as possible the (what was) handed(-)down / passed(-)down [[body of ideas]] (inherited) as regards / pertaining to the history of ideas(,) in order to be able to understand it. Hegel and Hölderlin did not, however, make their own / appropriate the aforementioned Enlightenment current in some kind of reconstruction, but simply fused, amalgamated, merged with the same Enlightenment current. They (Hegel and Hölderlin) did not stand sovereign and at a distance

(distancing themselves) vis-à-vis it (the said Enlightenment current of thought), but they assimilated, absorbed the same Enlightenment current in the contradictoriness and singularity, one-sidedness, uniqueness of its appearance, namely in its reality and concreteness. They did not distil it out of a fictive, fictitious overall table [[as a compact, orderly arrangement of facts, numbers, or words in parallel columns and rows]], but they came to know (learnt of) it in innumerable, today hardly, barely reconstructable, incidents, events, occurrences, doings, facts and occasions, reasons, causes, opportunities of elevated, superior or ordinary daily life, and indeed as a life form / form of life, which gave answers not only to purely intellectual-spiritual, but at the same time to personal questions, problems, issues in (with, under) (a) more or less intellectual-spiritual investiture, accoutrement(s), equipment (the stylisation of behaviour vis-à-vis other(s) (people), the needs of young men struggling, fighting for recognition, dreams about the future always, evermore in (inter)relation with one's own contribution to their moulding, shaping, forming etc. etc.). Exactly this lack of distance, or else, of theoretical clarity from the very beginning vouched for / guaranteed that depth of experience, adventure, which later will serve as the foundation, basis of (a) theoretical (pre)occupation, work, job, activity, employment, engagement, pursuit, business, namely as inflamed, ignited, aroused, flared up, enthusiastic personal interest. Since now the depth and the fragmentary character of the appropriation of the *Zeitgeist* / *zeitgeist* (i.e. spirit of the times / age) (constructed in its totality, wholeness, entirety and generality, universality only retrospectively!) go hand in hand / accompany each other, and in fact (they) mutually, reciprocally determining (determine) each other, thus, so, in this way, the contradictoriness of the intellectual-spiritual construct, which springs, emanates from the, its first contact with the currents of time, is highly, exceptionally probable, in fact natural. The whole scope, significance, range, extent of the problem is still not exhausted, however, with that. Because the possibility remains open that the contradictory appropriation of first of all scattered, dispersed, dissipated, diffused, diverted, dispelled or loose, relaxed, slack, lax, fluffy elements connected with one another of a(n intellectual) circle (of thought(s), ideas) could correspond with actually, really existing, present logical contradictions inside of the same (intellectual) circle (of thought(s), ideas). (The) psychological-sociological / Psychological-sociological(, history-of-ideas-related and philosophical-systematic) way of looking at things, consideration, contemplation (pertaining to the history of ideas, which is also philosophical-systematic,) could then be brought under / would then have a common denominator.

2. The dualistic thought structure / structure of thought in early, premature Schiller

Now I would like to show that the indicated, above-mentioned, hinted-at dualistic thought structure (structure of thought) determines / determined the early work of Schiller and the very first intellectual, thoughts/ideas-related, conceptual attempts by Hölderlin and Hegel. The wide-ranging, extensive, far-reaching (structural) similarity (in structure) of the thought in these texts may, nevertheless, not be understood as mere literary influence. Because the thought structure, with which we are here dealing, rests / is based upon a fundamental, basic contradiction, and one could not meaningfully assume, accept that the young admirers of Schiller would have consciously, and only for the sake of their idol's will, appropriated (made) a contradiction (their own); that considered, deliberated, pondered, thought-about, thought-over relationship to(wards), with a literary source is therefore lacking, missing, in which someone closely examines and scrutinises (investigates, studies, explores and proofs, checks, examines, considers, tests, verifies, audits) another person's (written(-down)) thoughts (written down) in order to adopt what seems, appears to be valid, cogent, solid, sound. Rather it is a matter here of a spontaneous agreement or else appropriation of the style of thought / thought style, whereby / in relation to which the influence of the model, example in accordance with (a) philological criteria, measures, standards, yardstick(s), benchmark(s) is undetermined, indefinite, but all the deeper (for it). The reasons for this commonality, common ground, mutuality can best be explained when we call to mind, remember, visualise, fully realise that in Schiller, just as / exactly like in the seminary members, students, borders (the student residents of the (Tübingen) Theological School's dormitory), the psychologically-sociologically determined contradictoriness of the appropriation of the Enlightenment spirit intersects with its (the Enlightenment's) really existing logical contradictions. The contradictoriness of the appropriation exists in the fact that (the) thought on the basis of the same pathos, i.e. the same personal, to-be-explained psychologically-sociologically experience of the intellectual-spiritual problems of the time(s), age turns its attention to elements, aspects whose logical compatibility, consistency is, by far, smaller, slighter, lesser than the force and the unity of the experience, experiencing bearing, supporting, underlying thought, thinking. A(n)(,) on (some) occasion(s)(,) / sometimes Dionysian affirmation (approval) of life motivates in the young Schiller the rehabilitation of

sensoriality (the senses); from the same source, however, stems, emanates, arises also (the) moral enthusiasm, ardour, exaltation, elation, since the beautiful sensorial (senses) turn(s) exactly against (the) ugly, hideous, nasty clerical morality^{xxii}. But with that, we come to the problem of the freedom of the will and the possibility of a morality / morals, ethics in general (at all), through / by which, whereby the broad philosophical horizon, also pertaining to the history of ideas, is opened up / reveals itself. For these reasons, the attempt seems to me justified to attach, apportion, attribute to Schiller's early work an, as it were, ideal-typical relevance (in respect) of / to the Tübingen thought, thinking of Hölderlin and Hegel, whereby / in relation to whom our procedure / method / process fortunately need not be applied in an overly abstract manner(,) since the early Schiller represents and constitutes not only the ideal type, but also an important immediate, direct source of that thought (albeit (even if/though) by no means the sole, single ((such) source)). Moreover, Schiller appears to be the suitable, appropriate starting point on account / because of his decisive role in the imparting, conveying, transmission, arrangement, mediation of the new optimistic anthropology and above all of a new intellectual-spiritual atmosphere and stance in Germany, in particular among(s)t / inside of / within (the) youth / young people. In Nietzsche's highly, exceptionally telling, well-aimed words : Schiller "discovered a class of listeners (an audience), which until then / that time had not been taken into consideration (account) ; he found them in the(ir) immature, unripe stages of life / years, in the German maidens (girls, lasses, females) and youth (striplings, saplings, young men, adolescents). With his poetry (poems), he catered to (corresponded with, addressed) their higher, nobler, more tempestuous, stormy, turbulent, tumultuous, albeit vague, stirrings, impulses(,) their fondness (pleasure, lust, joy, delight, appetite, desire) for / as regards the sonorous ring (clink clank) of moralising words . . . in keeping with / according to (in accordance with) the passion, fervour, vehemence and partisanship (passionate and partisan nature) of that age group, he had, achieved, gained, won a success that gradually came to exert a beneficial effect, influence on (/ favourably influenced) (the) more mature ages, age groups, generations as well (too) : Schiller had in general made (the) Germans younger" (Human, all-too-human, II, Nr. 170)^{xxiii}.

a) Anthropological and cosmological dualism as (the/a) defence (protection) against materialism and immoralism

It would be pointless, futile for both early medical-philosophical treatises by Schiller

(“Philosophie der Physiologie [The philosophy of physiology]” and “Versuch über den Zusammenhang der tierischen Natur des Menschen mit seiner geistigen [Attempt at / regarding the interrelation of the animal, bestial nature of man with his intellectual-spiritual nature]”; the latter appeared in print (the (printing) press) in 1780) to be examined, tested, inspected, studied, scrutinised, proofed as to / regards their scientific validity (soundness), scientificity.

**ALL FOOTNOTES ARE BY P.K., EXCEPT FOR [III], WHEREAS DA ENDNOTES
ARE KRAZY MAN TIME STUFF ...**

ⁱ I.e. Hölderlin (1770-1843), Schelling (1775-1854) and Hegel (1770-1831).

ⁱⁱ This time, though, I would not at all be certain of centuries of ZIO-USA as "Rome" is to follow circa 1979. Back then (starting in the fourth century B.C.), the multi-ethnic society was based on every ethnicity retaining its distinct identity based on distinct descent / race and distinct culture, whereas today the ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YIDZ of the ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-SYNAGOGUE OF SATAN via ZIO-USA and ZIO-JOO-ROPA-CHANNEL want to ethnically cleanse and genocide everyone out of existence under the ruling ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-EXCREMENT-FAECES AND VOMIT, and China, Russia, India and others are not accepting that.

ⁱⁱⁱ Obviously, P.K. had formulated the basis for his *Power and Decision* (1984) by circa 1975-1977-1979, i.e. the time of his doctoral dissertation which became this book.

^{iv} This goes to the core of the ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID modus procedendi. As a rat-rodent-parasite, the ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID takes / steals whatever it can from others (including ideas, not just money) and then does its "dialectic" of taking up positions on all sides of the social-political spectrum to lead everyone into a state of submission to the filthy, absolutely disgusting inbred, incestual rat-tunnel vomit-faeces ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID where the ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-ZOMBEE-STOOGIE believes that under the CAVE FILTH OF THE ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID, and with the "discoveries" of the ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID (e.g. Einstein, Freud as "authorities" etc. – when they're just ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YIDZ full of ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-BULLSHIT), "all is good" and "all is rational", and that means for piss-weak and retarded tribes: OVER. DEAD. ZIO.

^v Meaning here mass democracy. Cf. endnote iii, above, in regard to mass democracy, conservatism and liberalism and *Conservatism* (1986) and *The decline of the bourgeois thought and life form* (1991).

^{vi} This is P.K. taking a side-swipe and having a larf at "post-modern" "philosophers" and other ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID AND OR ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-ZOMBEE-STOOGIE "I deconstruct everything except for ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-power" "deconstructionists".

^{vii} The **Tübinger Stift** ["Stift" = pin, pencil, tack, crayon etc. + seminary, diocese, abbey, monastery, cathedral chapter, collegial body, institution, foundation]] is a hall of residence and teaching; it is owned and supported by the [Evangelical-Lutheran Church in Württemberg](#), and located in the university city of [Tübingen](#), in South West Germany. The Stift was founded as an [Augustinian monastery](#) in the [Middle Ages](#). After the [Reformation](#), in 1536, [Duke Ulrich](#) turned the Stift into a seminary which served to prepare [Protestant](#) pastors for Württemberg. To this day the scholarship is still given to students in preparation for the ministry or teaching in [Baden-Württemberg](#). Students receive a scholarship which consists of boarding, lodging and further academic support. Some of the well known "Stiftlers" are the astronomer [Johannes Kepler](#) and his associate, statesman [Hans Ulrich von Eggenberg](#), the poet [Friedrich Hölderlin](#) who had as roommates the philosophers [G. W. F. Hegel](#) and [Friedrich Schelling](#) (although the latter was five years their junior), the theologians [David Friedrich Strauß](#), [Johann Albrecht Bengel](#), [Friedrich Christoph Oetinger](#), [Ferdinand Christian Baur](#) and [Eberhard Nestle](#), and the philologist [August Pauly](#). The curriculum included two years of philosophical studies and three years of theological studies. The teaching staff imparted a traditional type of education, applying strict discipline and considerable censorship on the students' readings. Nonetheless, during Hegel's tenure, students privately had access to the 'forbidden' texts of [Spinoza](#), [Kant](#) and [Voltaire](#). (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/T%C3%BCbinger_Stift)

The point P.K. is making here is that objective reality has never been or happened fully in accordance with Marxist or other ideological interpretations of that reality.

^{viii} Question : is this just another massive ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-GANG-BANG-FUCK FEST like Sanchez torking to Johnson and Ritter ? Answer : Yes, it is. Further Question : is there any way for Krazy Man to live in a world without the ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-EXCREMENT-VOMIT-FAECES being there everywhere ? Further Answer : Yes, by getting in a time machine and going back in time at least a thousand years, and even then, unless one just sits quietly in his village, you'll encounter at the very least ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-LIZZARD-ENTRY-ISTS. In other words Krazy Man is not just JOO-ED, he's also ZIO-FUCKED ? Yes, that's the case. That's what The Fall means, IDIOT!!!

^{ix} The ideologue regurgitates the same old shit again and again and again. Outcome : boredom and nothing (of substance) is ever contributed to understanding.

^x Hegel's Bern period is 1793–96. Unless I'm mistaken, he went from "conservative" to "radical" and back to "conservative" – something not uncommon for intellectuals of the eighteenth, nineteenth and twentieth centuries. If I'm making some kind of mistake, sorry, I can't be fucked further researching the matter. I'm not

P.K., I'm a turd and terd – so don't yooz forget dat. Actually, P.K. explains at the end of p. 16 going into p. 17 that Hegel as a conservative in the sense of A. Müller and Fr. Baader, esp. after 1803, is an optical illusion ...

^{xi} As understood by ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-LED/CONTROLLED (KONTROL)-mass democratic ideologues-rhetoricians, given that actual liberalism was over by circa 1900.

^{xii} The Bourbon Restoration was the period of French history during which the House of Bourbon returned to power after the fall of Napoleon Bonaparte in 1814 and 1815. Dates: 6 Apr 1814 – 21 Jan 1830.

^{xiii} 19th century radical democracy and socialism / communism fused into mass democracy (incl. the welfare state) from circa 1900, which then, in turn, had not only its parliamentary, universal suffrage, communistic, fascist / national-socialistic variants, but also variants in the non-“Western” world.

^{xiv} One that is moving towards, or already is aligned with, the Industrial Revolution and the massification of society with a massive increase in trade / commerce, banking-financial services, monetary-Mammon-ification / commodification etc., destroying, along the way, what was left of “feudalism”, in contrast to “burgher” bourgeois society from the (12th /) 13th / 14th centuries, which co-existed with “feudalism” until the 18th century.

^{xv} The poets of the Xenien (or Die Xenien (Greek Xenia "host gifts")) were Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1749-1832) and Friedrich Schiller (1759-1805), who collaboratively wrote these satirical epigrams in the late 1790s as literary weapons against their critics, sparking a major literary feud and shaping German literature. Inspired by Roman poet Martial (1st cent. A.D.), these witty couplets targeted literary mediocrity and rival poets, appearing first in the Musenalmanach [a Musen-Almanach ("Muses' Almanac") was a kind of literary annual, popular in Germany from 1770 into the mid-19th century] and causing a sensation.

^{xvi} See P.K.'s Enlightenment (1981) book for the said complete reconstruction.

^{xvii} I.e. no values, and not meaning “go and destroy” etc..

^{xviii} Those who don't want to live on “the outskirts of town”, have to go with the flow of the mainstream, which in 17th and 18th century Europe, still meant being part of the overall Church “community”, even though “Tolerance” and “Liberty” and “Equality” and “The Rights of Man” etc. were (on the cusp of) making headway.

^{xix} From the second paragraph (commencing “Ein Versuch, das ...” on p. 20) of the first chapter (Kapitel I) of the German text, I've also had the assistance of the Greek translation by Lefteris Anagnostou.

^{xx} We can see here that most of the main drivers of ZIO-ANTI-CHRIST-SATANISM are non-JOOZ from “Western Christianity” (Papism and Protestantism), i.e. all Satan has to do is create “the atmosphere” for his ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-ZOMBEE-STOOGES to do Satan's ANTI-CHRIST EVIL-DEVIL MAMMON-LUCIFER work. Hence the rise of ZIO-M-C-M-CAPITALISM-IMPERIALISM-SATANISM sooner or later was accompanied by, inter alia, “The Scientific Revolution” and “The Enlightenment” and later still ZIO-mass democracy / “post-modernism”, where the ZIO-JOO-JACKING became much more explicit, forceful and widespread such that the masses today (2026) of ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-ZOMBEE-STOOGES, “following the leader”, accept that ANTI-SATANISM is a “problem” and not ANTI-CHRISTIANITY !!!

^{xxi} The JOO, the KIKE and the YID will come up with as many “opposites” and “enmities” and “differentiations” as it so desires to disorientate and or to confuse the fuck out of everyone not a ZIO-SATANIST, I.E. JOO, KIKE, YID OR ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-ZOMBEE-STOOGES, but its monism, so to speak, means that “everything” always flows “back” towards the end/goal of total ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-RAT-RODENT-PARASITE POWER AND CONTROL (KONTROL) under the GREAT ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-RAT-RODENT-PARASITE-ZIO-M-C-M-CAPITALIST-IMPERIALIST-SATANIC-ZIO-JOO-DAS-ZIO-YOO-DAS FUCKING ZIO-JOO-BALL-SATAN OF THE ZIO-SYNAGOGUE OF SATAN ANTI-CHRIST EVIL-DEVIL-MAMMON-LUCIFER-SULPHUR ZIO-JOO-DAS-ZIO-PLANET ZOG JOO, KIKE AND YID.

^{xxii} This is important because at around the time of the French Revolution, Satan, the JOOZ, KIKES AND YIDZ of the ANTI-CHRIST, and their very many ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-ZOMBEE-STOOGES, in times when ZIO-M-C-M-CAPITALISM-IMPERIALISM was on the up and up and up, were, -through ZIO-ANTI-CHRIST-JOO-BALLED-FREAKS like “I was destined for the priesthood, but I studied and practised medicine” Schiller (1759-1805), who overall is a very likable figure in the history of European letters and thought-, saying that the Church and Christianity should not set “the moral compass”, but the senses, beauty, nature ... i.e. SATAN AND THE ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-RAT-RODENT-PARASITE-CAVE DWELLING-DEVIL. Of course, by the time “all of this ended up” in ZIO-JOO-DAS-ZIO-JOO-BALL PLANET ZOG where the masses were ZIO-HEDONISMUS, JOO-DAS-KONSUM ZIO-JOO-ZOMBEE-STOOGES OF MASS LICENTIOUSNESS, PERVERSION, ABNORMALITY AND DEGENERATE DECADENCE, about two more centuries needed to pass ... but they passed, and “The Yellow Brick Road” always starts with small “innocent” steps ... i.e. ostensibly highly likable ANTI-CHRIST SATANISTS like Schiller, who came / descended from up to not so many generations of Lutherans (Luther, 1483-1546).

^{xxiii} This is WOW! POW! KO! KNOCK-OUT STUFF. Here we see a very early “primitive” version at the very beginning of mass society of how “fashion” works – it is youth-based, youth-oriented, it is aimed at “the passions”, i.e. the impulsive nature of teenagers and young people in their 20s, and then, once it becomes “the

thing”, it sucks more and more from the older generations out of Tradition and out of contentedness with “not having it in This World, because we have it in The Other World”. This is exactly what the JOO, the KIKE and the YID took as its model for the ZIO-ANTI-CHRIST-ZIO-HEDONISMUS-JOO-BALL-KONSUM-destruction of all of “The West” centred in ZIO-JOO-LLY-WOOD, ZIO-ADVERTISING, the ZIO-MASS MEDIA, ZIO-MASS-ENTERTAINMENT, ZIO-JOO-NIVERSITIES, ZIO-PUBLICATIONS, ZIO-PRIZEZ etc. etc. etc., given that both ZIO-NOVA had reached maturity and given their “fruits” based on the up to complete overcoming of the scarcity of goods by circa ZIO-1900 and thereafter, especially after ZIO-WW2.