

CESARE PAVESE

A selection from

Il mestiere di vivere

(= Italian = *The craft (profession, job, trade, occupation) of living*)



INTRODUCTION - TRANSLATION

Panagiotis Kondylis

[[Unfortunately, P.K.'s selection of Pavese's texts has not been included with this introduction owing to the inordinate amount of time needed to locate and or translate the relevant excerpts into English]]

Translated by C.F., ©, January, 2019, from the Greek: Κονδύλης Παναγιώτης, «Εισαγωγή» (= “Introduction”), στο *ΤΣΕΖΑΡΕ ΠΑΒΕΖΕ. Έπιλογή από τὸ Il mestiere di vivere*. Εἰσαγωγή-Μετάφραση Παναγιώτης Κονδύλης, ἐκδ. Στιγμή, Ἀθῆναι, 1993 (α' ἀνατύπωση (= 1st reprint) 2004), pp. 7-20.

Main Title Page in Greek:

ΤΣΕΖΑΡΕ ΠΑΒΕΖΕ

Ἐπιλογή ἀπὸ τὸ
Il mestiere di vivere



ΕΙΣΑΓΩΓΗ-ΜΕΤΑΦΡΑΣΗ
Παναγιώτης Κονδύλης



στιγμή

ΑΘΗΝΑ * 2004

INTRODUCTION

IN A(N) (DELICATELY) ELEGANT analysis, where the historical change and transformation of the way of life in Western societies is researched (investigated), Richard Sennett talked about the contemporary “tyranny of intimacy”. The phenomenon arises in that dual (double, twin) process, in accordance with which the more mass forms of life predominate and prevail, so much the more the masses themselves fragment (break up) into individuals (atoms) loosely connected with, and or indifferent to, one another (loosely connected and or indifferent as between one another); then, the public sphere backtracks (retreats) or collapses, the dividing line between public and private space is erased (wiped out), and not only does politics leave off (i.e. desist or refrain from) the classical concept of (the) common interest and of (the) common benefit/good, in order to be identified (equated) openly with various (diverse) and conflicting particular aspirations of partial bearers,¹ but also the behaviour of individuals loses its supra-personal meaning and footing (foundation, basis), its supra-personal – that is independent of the peculiarity (idiosyncrasy) and of the dispositions of each and every respective person – form, in order for it (the said behaviour of individuals) to constitute, in the first

¹ (Translator’s footnote. Absolutely nothing to do with P.K.): = what’s commonly known today as “identity politics”. P.K. would never have called it – quite rightly from a strictly scientific point of view – “identity politics”, because all people have identities (socially/group-referenced/referential and personal) since identity interweaves with power as a social-ontological/anthropological constant, so per definitionem, all politics is identity politics. Similarly, e.g. with “social media” – all media is/are social, so...

place, the expression precisely of peculiarities (idiosyncrasies) and of dispositions. Since directness and spontaneity are sought more or less demonstratively, the formalities of (the) social convention (pact, contract) are put aside, of established and sanctioned politeness and civility (courtesy, nobleness, nobility), and the privateness or privacy (seclusion) of one person threatens to trample or encroach on and gobble up (engorge) the privateness or privacy (seclusion) the other (another) person; in other words, the private sphere, the personal psychical-intellectual(-spiritual) field, is not confronted and dealt with in principle as an enclosed or fenced shrine (temple, holy place, place of worship, mosque), which one ought to approach with reserved (guarded) steps, with the awe of discretion, but more likely (rather) becomes perceived as an open track and conducive to the self-unfolding (or self-development) and the most frequently melodramatic self-presentation of the emotional and sentimental needs, and of the inmost (intimate) aspects of each and every respective other side. This game is played, of course, as a rule, in the name and under the aegis of the ideologem(e)s of the consumeristic hedonistic society, of mass myths regarding the transcendence of “alienation (estrangement)”, of “distance” and of “loneliness”; nonetheless, this influences its (the said game’s) course and its outcome to a minimum, as anyone who has learnt to observe what takes place around him knows. The vectors and the curves of intra-human (i.e. inside/within humans) relations have not changed or been transformed since the time when warmth (passion, fervour) in private has been (is) sought massively, continuously and blatantly (ostentatiously, flashily), just as politics did not change since the time it decided to appear in the name of “service towards man”. We can indeed ascertain that the “tyranny of intimacy”, since it begets (gives rise to) counterbalancing mechanisms, which together with tyranny, aggressively also deny (inter)related intimacy, raises and erects in one of its later/subsequent phases, new walls around souls now doubly frail and suspicious (leery) – the “tyranny of intimacy”, is accompanied and

supplemented by the self-tyranny of the personality concentrating (in) on itself to the point of inaction and indifference towards its social surrounds, or by the narcissistic personality, which flourishes and thrives after the catalysis, i.e. demise and abolition, that is to say, privatisation, of the public sphere.²

Within this framework (In this context), it would be possible for the (a) sociologist to locate (pinpoint) the causes (reasons) for which texts like Cesare Pavese's diary were read a lot in post-war Europe. Indeed, never previously in the history of literature was the revealing (of otherwise normally confidential) secrets of a purely private texture (composition or nature) found at the (epi)centre of general attention, from narratives related to the sympathies and antipathies between more or less notable and outstanding authors, up to the detailed recounting of events and various kinds of storytelling in respect of sexual activity or inability. Change vis-à-vis the literature regarding confession (confessional literature) of preceding (antecedent, prior) epochs (eras) was drastic: if in Augustine, the open description of personal life had as its world-theoretical backdrop the Christian perception and view of sin, and as its aim, the transcendence of sin and of liberation; if in the autobiographical works like that of Goethe, the history of the subject is presented in its permanent interweaving and interaction (or mutual influence) (interplay, alternating (changing) effect) towards the public sphere, whereupon the formation of personality essentially coincides with the consolidation (and acceptance) of the separation between the

² (Translator's footnote. Absolutely nothing to do with P.K.. **DO NOT READ THIS! I AM STARK RAVING MAD!!!**: this means you dumb-fuck FULL-SPECTRUM ZIO-LOBOTOMISED SATANIST FUCKSTICKS AND EVIL PEOPLE OF HELL, that "psychological" states and problems exist in all societies, and a society in which the REPRESENTATIVES OF SATAN – PARTICULARLY JOOS (Jews, Satanists, ZIOs), WHEN SEEN AS TO GROSS ELITE-LEVEL DISPROPORTIONALITY AND PRIMITIVE SECRET SOCIETY NETWORKING – tend to dominate,... such HATE-FILLED FILTHY-DISGUSTING-ZIO-JOO-SATAN-MAMMONISED societies of TOTAL HATE AND ZIO-RACISM particularly against Christians and WHITES visit all sorts of psychological and other atomising-massifying-alienating-etc. psychological and related mayhem and HATE and HATRED and ZIO-JOO EVIL upon people who only two or three or four generations ago were living through their ancestors in much more patriarchal ("fascistic") but community-oriented and less-monetised(-SATANISED-MAMMONISED) societies. But the JOO-ZIO-SATANIST will eventually pay, because one day ***THE MEN WILL ARRIVE***, INCL. THE APE MEN, who will slaughter the MAMMONISING FLEA-VULTURE-PARASITICAL ZIO-SATANISTS and EAT ALL OF THEM, and say "YUM!" whilst they are doing all of that munching and eating...

public and the private aspect (viewpoint, standpoint, view of things) – now, the study with pleasure, and in depth, of the conjectured innermost areas of the soul or, more as a commonplace (more tritely), of the inner sancta (sanctums) of the bedchamber, i.e. bedroom, becomes, as it were, an end-in-itself. Literature and literary criticism (critique) to a great degree (extent, percentage of literature and literary criticism), satisfy, at their own level and for their own public, the same needs which, at another level and for a public much more massive [[as in a mass society]], illustrated magazines providing and moulding (creating) titillating (pieces of) information regarding the life of stars and one hit wonders, satisfy. But not even the voyeur, nor the exhibitionist ought to any longer be ashamed and to hide themselves: the demise and abolition (catalysis) of the separation between public and private sphere, the privatisation of the former (public sphere), has precisely the eclipse, i.e. abolition and disappearance, of similar reproaches (censures, (kinds of) blame) and culpabilities ((kinds of) guilt(s)) as an upshot or aftereffect.

Returning to Pavese, let us begin with the reminder that the delineation of a sociological framework does not substitute, i.e. replace, any kind of aesthetic or psychological analysis. Within the same sociological framework, various ethical, moral, aesthetic and psychological magnitudes can be activated, moved at a very different height and crystallised in very unequal constructs, since beyond (on the other side of) every hermeneutic (interpretive) construct, the singularity (uniqueness) of individualities and of specific (concrete) conjunctures remains undiminished. Thus, although everyone lives in circumstances of the “tyranny of intimacy”, all those who exercise it (“the tyranny of intimacy”) differ from all those who suffer it and are afflicted by it; all those who live it as being self-evident (differ) from all those who investigate it as a phenomenon by tracing the intertwining(s) of its social manifestations with anthropological data; all those who simply drown or are fed by this (= it =

“tyranny of intimacy”) (differ) from all those who seek ethical and aesthetic ways out by inseminating (impregnating, fertilising) corresponding talents (gifts) and by enriching the world of thoughts (ruminations) and of forms. The reader will easily verify in which of these antithetical categories Pavese must be classified (put in order) – more precisely: Pavese as the author/writer of his diary. The existential situation and the subjective self-consciousness, which he (Pavese) uses as motive and cause, are also obvious: here we do not have to do (i.e. we are not dealing) with a balanced and settled personality after years of apprenticeship and learning and wanderings and meanderings, like Goethe’s hero, [[with]] a well-formed and well-shaped personality precisely thanks to the clear distinction, the wise counterbalancing of subject and of object, of the individual and of the social element; nor is it a question of someone who is trying to build (a) bridge(s) towards others whilst militating together with them for (in favour of) the achievement of supra-personal goals (ends or purposes), for the reforming of the public sphere. On the contrary, this sphere’s priority is not recognised at all; all those who claim (the said priority) are confronted and dealt with, with disbelief and suspicion, as ideologues and power-hungry (people); in the best of cases they are considered to be blissful within their naivety. However, detachment from naivety, and together with that, from great collective goals (purposes, ends) is paid, at least for anyone who does not have power claims in this sector, with involvement and embroilment in a thick net of doubts and (kinds of) hesitance(s), ambivalences, mixed feelings and tergiversations (equivocations and (up to) changing sides), which are reinforced and intensified precisely because their (re)solution or their blunting cannot but be sought next to others (other people (and or goals)), equally tangled in the same net. Thrown into and limited, restricted, confined within its privateness and privacy, accepting its privateness/privacy as fated and fateful, the existence is obliged not only to pose all its questions from the beginning, without the possibility of recourse to tradition, to the Revelation of religion or to the Reason

of History, but also (is obliged) to form and shape its relations with others without the mediation and intervention of mutually accepted, more or less commonplaces, which in every permanent, and permanently bearable (tolerable, livable), friendly contact, possess and occupy the position of a protective neutral zone and sanctuary (refuge), when on the horizon clashes and conflicts crop/pop up (appear).³

Relation(ship)s of existences, excluded and shut (out) in a radical privateness (privacy): this is Pavese's great theme (topic, subject matter). He does not dissect, nonetheless, these relations with the tranquility or irony from above which characterises the approach of other important, great and significant aphoristic authors (writers of aphorisms), but with the passion and the insistence (persistence), with the mania, of the wounded and scorched (burned), who wants to know *what* is whatever pains him and from *where* it comes. What and who is the Other, who from afar gives the impression and image as armoured and unassailable (immune), free from whatever we feel inside us as making us uncertain and impotent, whereas as long as we approach and draw closer to him, we see him to be parsed and broken down in the same bundle (packet) of desires and fears? Why does the final ascertainment, that we seem so much alike, not beget (engender, generate, give rise/birth to) trust and friendship, but rather suspicion and enmity?⁴ And why do enmity and hate (hatred) often not bring

³ (Translator's footnote. Absolutely nothing to do with P.K.): so, we have gone way beyond a Tönnies-like "community vs. society" situation, to a massified-urbanised-atomised mass-democratic society – in the Italian context – under fascism.

⁴ (Translator's footnote. Absolutely nothing to do with P.K. **DON'T READ THIS! I AM TOTALLY INSANE!!!**): and this in Pavese's case concerned (exclusively or mostly) Italian vis-à-vis Italian in the 1920s to the 1940s. Just imagine what one could say about the Alienating Other such as the Mohammedan and or (Anomic) Black African and or the JOO (that most disgusting of Primitive Secret Society and Lying ANIMALS) – of course here we are talking extremely GROSSO MODO (grossly generalising etc.), there are always a myriad of exceptions, and yet the massification and atomisation and urbanisation and secularisation which occurred from say c. 1750/1800 to c. 1920/1950 was a real social phenomenon, which has now meta-developed and morphed into today's FULL-SPECTRUM ZIO/USA LOBOTOMY "multi-cultural, die-verse" insanity. It won't end well for what remains of the West. Things are NOT looking good no matter what the ZIO-JOO animal or his stooges in the mass media and mass entertainment and "academia" say. [[And by the way, when one walks into one's local post office and sees depictions of five "Great/Legendary Australian Children's Authors" staring at them, three or four of the five obviously being JOO FILTH (and much uglier than Jack Benny-like smiling with their absolutely DISGUSTING, REPULSIVE, ULTRA-UGLY FOUL rat/weasel/

the current mass-democratic prejudices, biases and wishes, we shall ascertain what a similar observation entails: that after the legal and social consolidation of the equality between/of human individuals as separate and autonomous individuals, after the panegyric, i.e. [[also]] festive and universal proclamation or declaration of human rights, no harmony comes about automatically and no stable equilibrium, but rather (the) clashes and conflicts are continued on the basis of factors and differences [[which are]] coalescent (connate, inherent) with, or in, the psychical-biological hypostasis and existence of humans, but also of human groups. The near future will show if clashes and conflicts of such a texture (composition or nature) will reproduce on a world scale the intensity of primordial (primaeval, primitive) and elemental existential contradistinctions and confrontations. Pavese's penetrating psychological analyses indicate (imply, intimate), in any case, that the elemental and the primordial (primaeval, primitive) [[elements or dimensions]] exist and act inside of every human relation(ship), inside of every private and social situation, regardless of institutional and cultural regulations (adjustments, adjusting(s), tuning(s), configurations, calibrations).⁶

If now, the public sphere was fragmented and broken into pieces and the collective connective webs became frayed, if privateness (privacy) became external fate and the inner law of existence, if existence is encountered friendlily (i.e. in a friendly manner), or inimically, with (regard to) other existences only inside the territory of privateness (privacy) – this does not in the least mean that everyone does and thinks the same things, and that everyone exhausts their psychical energy in skirmishes (spats, arguments) and in wars of extermination, in theatrical self-exhibitions and in – indifferent to third parties –

⁶ (Translator's footnote. Absolutely nothing to do with P.K.): so today in much of the West, we have the incessant attacks on pofterised or pansified white men, who in toto, "deserve" what they are getting for letting things spin out of control, and for POWER-HUNGRY horrific JOOS and disgusting militant-feminist He-women and other FREAK-homos and the mentally ill et al. leading society to almost certain CHAOS and or APE ANOMIE and the ARRIVAL OF THE MEN, who'll almost certainly be APE MEN, with or without a desire to restore and or impose ORDER and NATURE as in NATURAL ORDER.

pleasures and calamities (disasters, woes). In other words, even if everyone does the same (things), at any rate, they do not all remain at/with the same (things); in some people, the activity which we have become accustomed to characterise as “spirit(-intellect)” finds its sanctuary (refuge, shelter) and its fertile nursery (garden). It is not certain what this obstinate duration of intellectual(-spiritual) activity means for the happiness or unhappiness of societies in their totality; here its (the said obstinate duration of intellectual(-spiritual) activity’s) consequences seem probably ambiguous (equivocal). However, are not also, like this, presented as ambiguous and equivocal to the life of the individual – in finding unbearable certain truths – that one would on occasion prefer the unconsciousness of the animal, the blinkers of the faithful (person), or even the heartlessness and mercilessness of the hardened and callous (person) too? Pavese has at every turn (uninterruptedly, incessantly, endlessly) before his eyes (i.e. before him) the two (both) sides as well, of this ambiguity and equivocalness; he knows how fragile the “spirit(-intellect)” is in its totality, however, he knows also that its (the “spirit(-intellect)’s”) fragments can constitute autonomous (independent) crystals and precious (valuable) scintillae (scintillas, specks, particles). Their knower, collector, moulder and crafter has the privileged possibility of seeing from the outside his own existential texture (composition or nature) and situation, as well as the texture (composition or nature) and situation of others, to scrutinise and illuminate it (the said situation) and above all to objectify it, by detaching and unfixing it thus from himself, whilst lightening, alleviating and or neutralising its weight.

[[1]] A first form of this intellectual(-spiritual) activity is analytical and at the same time generalising. It starts from the material (subject matter) which the daily, as a rule afflictive and painful experience of relations between isolated (solitary, lone) existences offers, and from observation to observation, penetrates into the fundamental anthropological magnitudes, into the central

constants of human behaviour. Whatever to the flippant (frivolous) glance (look, glimpse) appears as a nonsensical whim(sicalness) (peculiarity, oddity, quirk, caprice, vagary), transitory explosion or excusable, tolerable smallness, with the suitable (appropriate) (kinds of) deepening(s) and reductions, is revealed as a symptom of a dispersed and unable-to-be-uprooted appeal for recognition and imposition, (a symptom) of an appeal which by no means necessarily relates to the pursuit of the possession of an institutionally vested, i.e. protected-by-law political-military dominant authority, but rather most commonly seeks to unfold and be satisfied inside the private sphere with the acquirement (obtainment) and the exercising of power on the soul of each and every respective interesting Other – and indeed with the most different means: intimidation (menacing) and enticement (seducement), flattery and bedazzlement (sensationalism, making an impression), mercy and self-pity/compassion. Under this prism (From this perspective/angle), the microcosm of privateness (privacy) is enlarged and widened (extended, broadened, expanded), giving the macrocosm of history, since also both (microcosm and macrocosm) are governed and dominated by the same forms of behaviour, they are irrigated by the same psychical-biological sources. Something ostensibly strange thus happens (takes place, occurs), but quite easily explained logically. Retreat into privateness (privacy) was accompanied by severance (abscission) from history as the space of diachronic publicity (publicness) – and now thought regarding the texture (composition or nature) and the fluctuation or wavering of private existence brings us again to the supra-personal motive (driving) forces of history. However, it is a matter of two very different perceptions of and views on history. As a part of the public sphere, history is a collective work and a common responsibility, it is evolution (unfolding, development) and progress; as something psychologically consubstantial (identical in substance) with the private sphere, history constitutes, conversely, a return and recycling of the same subjective factors, as much as also its material aspects change and are

transformed. In the first case, we find ourselves in the history of Condorcet and of Hegel, the second (case) brings us back to the consideration and way of looking at things of Thucydides, but also of the two great Italians: of Machiavelli and of Pareto.

However, the fable (old wives' tale) that history constitutes an equally unbreakable, albeit much wider, cycle (circle) as much as life too inside privateness (privacy), does not suffice; it (the said fable) is excessively theoretical. Even whoever also at the level of theory has reconciled himself completely with historical and personal fate (destiny), needs a strategy which looks far into the future, and an elastic, flexible tactics as regards living and living well. [[2]] The second great activity of the intellect(-spirit) has, therefore, a practical direction, it is oriented, from inside more partial and more general experiences and ascertainments, towards the finding (discovery, digging up) of a technique or set of skills in respect of (for) living and in respect of (for) living together [[with others]], towards the gradual fixing of a personal system of adaptations and of balances (equilibria), of concessions and of (various kinds/ events of) conquering(s), give and take, where prudence weighing up things – forced many times to appear opposite or against others as unwelcoming and hostile [[forms of]] becoming entrenched, as coldness and or hardness (i.e. harshness) – has the decisive say. This system fulfils its destination when it provides a more permanent armour, which excludes as much as possible unpleasant surprises and renders superfluous the wasting (expending) of psychological energy, panic-stricken defence and instinctual reactions. What is sought here is not “happiness”, but the safeguarding of the prerequisites (preconditions, presuppositions) of self-respect and of creative work. To the extent where the existential contradistinctions and confrontations, their causes and their concomitants (resultants, aftermaths, corollaries), are seen from the outside and are objectified, no-one ever ceases to participate in human deeds,

actions, events and mishaps (adversities, calamities, misfortunes), however, one senses parallelly that one leaves behind oneself a more or less chaotic engagement in, and dealing with, a lot of things, the infertile (barren) and time-consuming sentimentality (emotionalism) of one's youth, and moves forward (proceeds) with the certain volition of maturity. Age (The passing of the years) brings, or at least would have to be obliged to bring, maturity, and together with that, loneliness; but the loneliness of the mature person differs essentially from the loneliness of the immature person; it is silent and comprehensive ((all-)encompassing), not vociferous (blatant) and empty. Whoever secures such a loneliness has won autonomy too, he remains many-sided/many-sectional and whole even if he has become cracked on many sides. The occupation (profession, job, trade, craft) of life/living, the *mestiere di vivere*, cannot be exercised better inside the given circumstances and conditions; if you reach (make it) up to there, you have already managed to do and achieve very much (a lot).

[[3]] Just as theoretical reconciliation with personal and historical fate (destiny) opens the road of practical (philosophical) perceptions (wisdom in respect) of life, so too also does this (practical wisdom in respect of life) here sweep and clean(se) the terrain (ground, soil, territory) for a third activity of the intellect(-spirit), which for Pavese is paramount (supreme, most high) as to quality (character, nature), and, decisive inside the struggle for the bridling (reining in) of life. It is a matter, of course, of (the) aesthetic act(ion) (activity), and indeed not simply for [[the purpose of]] aesthetic insight (foresight) or pleasure, but, as it is meant in the case of the creative artist, for [[the purpose of]] aesthetic production. The work of art – here: artistic discourse ((the) artful word(s)) – constitutes the uppermost (supreme, paramount) objectification, that is to say, the most trustworthy (reliable, dependable, credible) guarantee of the transcendence of torturous states of being a part (or: of torturous partial states of

(phenomena in) existence), of the painful, dolourous transitions and or vacillations of the existence in its co-existence (living together, co-habitation) with other existences. Such states of being a part, and, transitions (vacillations), provide simply the vital, living (experiential) matter or material of the literary work, however, they never hold it back, just as also, to recollect Aristotle, a heap (pile, stack) of stones and (timber) beams do not make a building on their own, even though the building is not but made up (comprised, constituted) of these stones and (timber) beams. As objectification, the literary work is in its distinguishing or distinctive (as in pertaining to *differentia specifica*) concept (a) *form*, and cannot at all fulfil its cathartic function if it is not meant by definition as (a) form; if the experience (of living and life), in its conceptual contradistinction towards (i.e. *vis-à-vis*) (the, a) form, was not by itself (of its own accord) something chaotic and blurry (confused or clouded), then the artistic form would be superfluous, the poem would have been written before it was even grasped and comprehended *as* a poem. Poetic activity is the moulding, shaping and creating of form(s); morphic(-form-related)-plastic ability (i.e. the ability to create, mould and shape form(s)) is independent of any kind of experiences (of living and life) whatsoever, even though it (the said morphic(-form-related)-plastic ability) forms and shapes experiences of living and in life. Pavese repeatedly and (linguistically-literarily) eloquently clarifies this fundamental point of aesthetic theory, which is so often misunderstood by various poetasters, not having other provisions or equipment (supplies, accouterments) than “feeling, emotion and sentiment”, in/by forgetting André Gide’s full, rich and pithy (concise, succinct) saying about the relationship between beautiful feelings (emotions and sentiments) and bad literature, and in disregarding (ignoring) [[the fact]] that “feelings, emotions and sentiments” and “experiences (of life and living)”, as of (i.e. as regards and due to) their psychological texture (composition and nature), differ from man (person) to man (person) much less than what each and every respective bearer of them

(feelings, emotions, sentiments) imagines; very different, is only the morphic(-form-related)-plastic ability of every person.⁷ However, Pavese proceeds further afield from (i.e. as to) the absolute putting forward of the morphic (i.e. form-related) side of literature. It (This form-related side of literature) broadens (widens, extends, expands) the same concept of experience (of life and living), by releasing and freeing it (the concept of experience) from the usual one-sided (unilateral) attachment to phenomena of the affect, and by enriching it both with thoughtfulness as well as the *paideia* (*education*) of the artist. The conscious encounter with the intellectual(-spiritual) world, and with the means pertaining to style and register of another creator from any area whatsoever –artistic, philosophical, religious, historiographical– equally constitutes an “experience of life and living”, and can equally constitute a stunning and electrifying (shocking) “experience (of life and living)”, as much as any positive or negative existential contradistinction and confrontation with an individual or a group. And it (i.e. the conscious encounter with the intellectual(-spiritual) world and with the means pertaining to style and register of another creator from any area whatsoever) contributes (leads), to an extent analogous with the idiosyncrasy (peculiarity) and with the presuppositions (prerequisites) of the individual, to the formation and the clarification of that world view which governs and

⁷ (Translator’s footnote. Absolutely nothing to do with P.K.. **DON’T READ THIS UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCES!!! I’VE GONE INSANE!!!**): this is roughly what I’ve said elsewhere at www.panagiotiskondylis.com that the greats are great because they stand out for the way they present a theme or themes (and or interpretation, variation on a theme, etc.) which has or have at its or their core been already covered anyway. Why e.g. 8 or 9 or 10 or whatever it is Satanic Circus Monkey JOOs have won Nobel Prizes for Literature and only 2 Greeks and not 20 Greeks or 40 Italians or 60 Hispanics, has absolutely nothing to do with objective criteria regarding literary quality (because there cannot be objective criteria re: matters of form and of subjective Taste), but everything to do with SATANIC CIRCUS MONKEY EVIL-DEVIL PRIMITIVE SECRET SOCIETY NETWORKING CONNECTED WITH A LONG HISTORY IN INTERNATIONAL BANKING, FINANCE AND TRADE OF THESE ABSOLUTELY SICK AND DISGUSTING JUDAS-DEVIL-EVIL-“THE WHOLE WORLD REVOLVES AROUND US” ZIO-SATANISTS OF GROSS OVER-REPRESENTATION AND GROSSLY DISPROPORTIONATE ACCUMULATIONS, CONCENTRATIONS AND CRYSTAL(LISATION)S OF WEALTH AND POWER. Han Man and or Ape Man and or Some Other Man is going to have to deal with these SICK, ULTRA-UGLY (SUBJECTIVELY SEEN AS A MATTER OF TASTE) MENTALLY TOTALLY FUCKED-IN-THE-HEAD “chosen, special” ANIMALS (THE HORROR, THE HORROR, THE HORROR OF THE ZIO-SATANIC FLEA-VULTURE-CANCEROUS-PARASITICAL (ELITE-LEVEL) JOO (JEW, HEBREW)) – the most disgusting human group ever know in the History of Humankind, i.e. Mankind – otherwise, they’ll probably lead the world to nuclear wipe-out via ZIO-USA if sanity does not prevail within the ZIO-USA elites, deep state, etc..

dominates the aesthetically crucial processing of (the) affective raw material, its (this affective raw material's) ginning (i.e. removing of seeds) and its sieving. Because behind every presentation of “experiences (of life and living)” (in the current narrower sense of the term), – voluntarily or not (wanting or not wanting to) (i.e. inevitably), knowing or not knowing (i.e. irrespective whether one knows or not) –, a preliminary tacit (silent) clear-out (i.e. getting rid of unwanted things), a putting in order, classification and a hierarchisation is carried out on the basis of an axiological (a value) scale (a scale of values), that is, a certain consideration and way of looking at the world, is found. Even the declaration or proclamation that in the name of pure “experience (of life and living)” everything else is put aside and excluded, suggests (intimates, indicates) a world-theoretical stance which does not flow and result from any “experience of living and life”, but rather is attached to a decision to hierarchise in this way, and not in that way, the data (facts) of the world.

Pavese's concern regarding the aesthetic problem of form brings him close to the great representatives of modernism, whereas he goes his separate and own way (or parts company) with regard to the vanguard and so-called “post-modernism”, which essentially repeats that vanguard's motifs.⁸ But with all great contemporary aesthetic tendencies (trends), Pavese shares (in) the programmatic severance of the aesthetic element from the ethical (element), of “beauty” from [[what is considered to be]] “good”. The reverse programmatic connection of these two elements (the aesthetic/beauty element and the ethical/good (as opposed to “evil”) element), as they flourished for about three centuries [[say, c. 1550/1600 to c. 1870/1900]] within the framework of bourgeois culture (civilisation) and of the bourgeois theory of art, presupposed the distinction (differentiation, separation) between public and private sphere, the priority of

⁸ (Translator's footnote. Absolutely nothing to do with P.K.. **DON'T READ THIS UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCES!!! I'VE GONE INSANE!!!**): Fucking **LEGEND** = Pavese. Who can stand all that GROSSLY DISPROPORTIONATE ZIO-JOO POST-MODERN SHIT, CRAP, EXCREMENT, FAECES? **DEATH TO SATAN!!!**

the former vis-à-vis the latter and, consequently, it entailed the loading or charging of art with pre-eminently (above all) public duties, that is, with an ethical/moral mission. The collapse of the public sphere – when personal “self-realisation” is announced as the supreme social goal (end, purpose),⁹ – is accompanied by the full retreat of the ethical (moral) element vis-à-vis the aesthetic, and at the same time, (a full retreat) from the radical restructuring or rearrangement of the latter (aesthetic) element. The aesthetic element is privatised, that is, it retains its public character only to the extent where (to which) private existences deluge, inundate, flood and overwhelm the public space (area). Existence is aestheticised to the extent/degree to which it is privatised – its (existence’s) aestheticisation has the ambition of covering the world-theoretical and psychological void (vacuum, gap) which was begotten/born (which arose) with its de-publicisation and its de-ethicisation/de-moralisation.¹⁰ If, and to what extent, the void (vacuum, gap) is covered with success, constitutes, this as well, a personal issue (matter), which cannot be definitively and conclusively judged (adjudicated) in the public space (area), since this does not constitute anymore but a permanently and perpetually

⁹ (Translator’s footnote. Absolutely nothing to do with P.K.. **DON’T READ THIS UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCES!!! I’VE GONE INSANE!!!**): this can only happen, obviously, in conditions of MASS CONSUMERISTIC HEDONISM and under THE FULL-SPECTRUM ZIO-USA-AND PROTESTANT/PAPIST/ATHEISTIC COCK-SUCKING-FEMINOFAGGOTISING-OTHERISING-HATE-FILLED-ZIO-JOO-MULTI-CULTURAL-HATE-LOBOTOMY AND NON-STOP ZIO-HATE BRAINWASHING PUSHING CONSTANTLY THE ZIO-JOO-HATE UNDERMINING OF HISTORICALLY WHITE SOCIETIES SO THAT SATANIC CIRCUS MONKEY PEOPLE AND ASSOCIATED ZIO-SATANISTS CAN WIELD GROSSLY DISPROPORTIONATE FORMS OF WEALTH AND POWER INCL. THROUGH “DIVIDE AND RULE” DEVIL-EVIL (WOMAN V. MAN, BLACK V. WHITE, POOFTERS AND THE MENTALLY ILL AGAINST NORMAL PEOPLE, MOHAMMEDANS AGAINST CHRISTIANS AND SECULAR-ATHEISTS ETC.), AND including HISTORICALLY UNTIL TODAY, VIA BANKS, FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS (FUNDS), CORPORATIONS AND MAFIA-MOB-LIKE PRIMITIVE SECRET SOCIETY NETWORKING OF SATAN’S ARSE-HOLE AND TOTAL ZIO-EVIL-FILTH. THIS IS NOTHING BUT MAMMONISING-MONETISING-SATAN AT WORK. **DEATH TO THE SATANIC CIRCUS MONKEY AND DEATH TO SATAN!!!** ZIO-SATAN-JOO = THE HORROR, THE HORROR, THE HORROR. **STOP INVASIONE!!!**

¹⁰ (Translator’s footnote. **Absolutely nothing to do with P.K.**): i.e. existence’s emptying of a sense of a common collective public sphere and common collective ethics and morals **tied to a historical people or historical peoples**. Note that (elite-level) Jews **caused none** of these social phenomena (which go back to European 18th and 19th century massification, atomisation, urbanisation, secularisation, industrialisation, otherisation, etc.); they, i.e. the (elite-level) Jews just got involved (increasingly) in certain countries, and in particular the USA, to go on to play their GROSSLY DISPROPORTIONATE roles etc., hence “ZIO-USA”.

moving whole and totality of interchanging and alternating (kinds of) privateness(es) (privacy, privacies).

This is, in its broadest of contours (outlines), the world of Cesare Pavese's diary.¹¹ The centres of gravity and its (Pavese's diary's) spreading(s) and dispersions, show how deeply it interweaves with whatever constituted the Western 20th century in its most demonstrative (indicative) intellectual(-spiritual) and social manifestations. But this text is not a simple index of the history and of the anatomy of ideas, it is also a seismograph, a recorder or register of the vibrations of an unusual, and unusually broad, individual sensitivity. Pavese's thoughts (reflections, contemplations, ruminations) on suicide are worthy of a particular or specific psychological and philosophical parley (talk, discussion, negotiation). The act of the person committing suicide (i.e. Pavese) interrupted and at the same time stamped (marked, sealed) them (Pavese' thoughts) – an *act*, which only [[as]] this act reveals (discloses) how seriously and how honestly someone thinks (cogitates, cerebrates, reflects).

Cesare Pavese's diary was published in 1952, two years after his death, by Einaudi editions, and with the title *Il mestiere di vivere* (= Italian = *The craft (occupation, profession, job, trade) of living*). This edition was reprinted repeatedly and was used in the Greek translation.

¹¹ (Translator's footnote. Absolutely nothing to do with P.K.): in other words, P.K. has shown us that Pavese was one of the first major writers to pick up on the massification-atomisation of mass democracy, and show how the more relatively homogeneous public space had begun to be significantly broken up into a relatively heterogeneous space, which now has ended up in competing groups of various loonies – Joos, Faggots, Feminists, Negro “give me everything for free whilst I never work” Supremacists, Mohammedan Terrorists and God knows what else, rather than the more traditional social class distinctions of oligarchic bourgeois liberal society, but when Religion and Race and Ethnos were relatively Homogeneous. Of course, in Pavese's day, what he saw was feminism and micro-psychologism, and not yet the Poofter-Militant Feminist-Negro-Mohammedan-SATANIC CIRCUS MONKEY JOO-FREAKS, but all of that had tentatively started, or was about to “arrive” by the 1970s.