

"Liberal Democracy"

- [Home](#)
- [The Political and Man](#)
- [The Philosopher and Pleasure](#)
- [The Philosopher and Power](#)
- [Utopia and historical action](#)
- [The multi-dimensional Enlightenment](#)
- [16th and 17th century utopian constructions](#)
- [Montesquieu and the Spirit of the Laws](#)
- [Marx and Greek antiquity](#)
- [Power and Decision](#)
- [Science, Power and Decision](#)
- [Planetary Politics after the Cold War](#)
- [The Political in the 20th century](#)
- [The German Sonderweg](#)
- [Carl Schmitt's 'Political Theology'](#)
- [Theory of War - Summary Notes](#)
- [An Unfortunate Exchange](#)
- [Answers to 28 questions](#)
- [Answers owed and due](#)
- [Thoughts and Sayings](#)
- [Quotes and longer citations](#)
- [Introduction to Chamfort](#)
- [Introduction to Lichtenberg](#)
- [Introduction to Rivarol](#)
- [Introduction to Pavese](#)
- [Melancholy and Polemics](#)
- [Fotis Apostolopoulos In Memoriam](#)
- [blank page](#)
- ['Panajotis Kondylis' by Reinhart Koselleck](#)
- [Thinking in and of the Decision by Volker Gerhardt](#)
- [blank page 2](#)
- [Introduction to Machiavelli](#)
- [The coming into being of dialectics](#)
- [The European Enlightenment](#)
- [The new-times critique of metaphysics](#)
- [Conservatism](#)
- [Theory of War](#)
- [The decline of the bourgeois thought and life form](#)
- [Translations and Miscellany](#)
- [blank page 3](#)

- [blank page 4](#)
- [Translator's Page - Prelude](#)
- [Translator's Page](#)
- [blank page 5](#)
- [blank page 6](#)
- [Readers' Page](#)
- [blank page 7](#)
- [blank page 8](#)
- [blank page 9](#)
- [Not related to PK's writings - only for Rhomioi](#)
- [Important Announcements](#)
- [A Dialogue between I and S on Positions](#)
- ["Liberal Democracy"](#)
- [Further Articles of Interest](#)
- [Further Articles etc 2](#)
- [Further Articles etc 3](#)
- [ATTACKS ON SITE and FINAL THOUGHTS](#)
- [FINAL THOUGHTS 2](#)
- [FINAL THOUGHTS 3](#)
- [FINAL THOUGHTS 4](#)

Disclaimer: Nothing within this page or on this site overall is the product of Panagiotis Kondylis's thought and work unless it is a faithful translation of something Kondylis wrote. Any conclusions drawn from something not written by Panagiotis Kondylis (in the form of an accurate translation) cannot constitute the basis for any valid judgement or appreciation of Kondylis and his work. (This disclaimer also applies, mutatis mutandis, to any other authors and thinkers linked or otherwise referred to, on and within all of this website).

EVERYONE MUST OBEY THE LAW

NO NORMATIVE-POLITICAL-IDEOLOGICAL COURSE OF ACTION OR PROGRAMME IS BEING SUGGESTED WITH REGARD TO ANY MATTER WHATSOEVER, EVER

[[MAKE SURE YOU STUDY "CONSERVATISM AS A HISTORICAL PHENOMENON" ON THE CONSERVATISM PAGE!]]

[[RED ALERT!

ALERT! ALERT! ALERT!

RED ALERT!

FIRE! FIRE! FIRE!



IT IS FROM THE PASSAGE BELOW, QUITE CLEAR
NOW, THAT IN SCIENTIFIC CONCEPTUAL
ANALYSIS, WE HAVE:

1) A DESCRIPTION AND EXPLANATION OF A SOCIAL PHENOMENON AS IT INITIALLY EXISTED AND AS IT DEVELOPED IN ITS VARIETY OF FORMS AS TO ITS CONTENT (E.G. "DEMOCRACY" IN ANCIENT GREECE WHICH META-DEVELOPED ALL THE WAY INCL. THROUGH THE EKKLESIA OF THE DEMOS, THE COMMONS, ETC. UP TO THE END OF THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE (cf. Contogeorgis, and the Two Studies by P.K. on Marx in regard to pre-industrial and pre-exchange value/capital-usury dominated society (i.e. in regard to agrarian-based use value society in the Ancient Hellenic and later (Roman-)Orthodox world (incl. the non-Hellenic Orthodox world in all its variations and with all its own distinctive Slavic and other features more generally), and other scattered references by P.K.);

2) A DESCRIPTION AND EXPLANATION OF AN IDEAL TYPE (WHICH OF COURSE IS NOT AN ENS RATIONIS, IT DOES REFER TO THE REAL WORLD, BUT IS REINFORCED OR INTENSIFIED REALITY OF DISTINGUISHING/DISTINCTIVE FEATURES (DIFFERENTIA SPECIFICA) IN REGARD TO OTHER IDEAL TYPES OF E.G. SOCIAL FORMATIONS AND POLITIES (E.G. "MASS DEMOCRACY" AS OPPOSED TO "OLIGARCHIC BOURGEOIS LIBERALISM" AS OPPOSED TO "SOCIETAS CIVILIS"/(LATE) FEUDALISM);

AND

3) A DESCRIPTION AND EXPLANATION OF CONCEPTS REPRESENTING IDEOLOGIES (E.G. FRENCH REVOLUTION-ERA AND TODAY'S USE OF "DEMOCRACY", AND ALSO TODAY'S USE OF "LIBERALISM" AND "CONSERVATISM", WHICH CAN AND

OFTEN HAVE LITTLE OR NOTHING TO DO WITH ACTUAL DEMOCRACY, LIBERALISM AND CONSERVATISM - even when they were in their final-stage historical forms which had some sort of content-related connection with reality as the real social organisation of a real society - BUT HAVE EVERYTHING TO DO WITH POLEMICS, OBFUSCATION, IDEOLOGISATION[[, INCL. SATANIC CIRCUS MONKEY GROSSLY DISPROPORTIONATE ACCUMULATIONS, CONCENTRATIONS AND CRYSTAL(LISATION)S OF WEALTH AND POWER THROUGH PRIMITIVE SECRET SOCIETY (MOB OR MAFIA-LIKE) NETWORKING (CONTROL) "BEHIND THE SCENES", WHICH, SAY, IN COUNTRIES OTHER THAN THE USA, UK, FRANCE, GERMANY, AUSTRALIA, AND THE USA'S OTHER (PART OR FULL) VASSAL STATES, WHICH ZIO-USA MORE OR LESS CONTROLS THROUGH "SATANIC CIRCUS MONKEY" EMBASSIES AND THE BIG MILITARY AND DOLLAR STICK BEHIND THE EMBASSIES, ETC., HAPPENS THROUGH RULING COMMUNIST OR OTHER PARTIES, AND OR CLIQUES AROUND "STRONG MEN" ETC., AND WHICH COULD OR PROBABLY - FOR CONCRETE HISTORICAL (GEOPOLITICAL, ECONOMIC, SOCIAL-POLITICAL) REASONS, AND NOT BECAUSE OF SOME KIND OF "MAGIC" - AMOUNT TO (AT LEAST UNTIL NOW IN HISTORY) A WORSE POLITY AND STANDARD OF LIVING FOR MOST PEOPLE ON AVERAGE, BUT NOT NECESSARILY ALWAYS, THAN THOSE COUNTRIES IN THE ZIO-USA SPHERE]].)

" ... The lack of absolute theoretical coherence (cohesion) and the almost unlimited multiformity (great variety/diversity of form) in regard to individual points, in accordance with time and place, do not constitute the

characteristic feature of conservative theory, but rather the natural concomitant of the historical life of all the great political –and not only political– ideologies. For the knower of the international history of liberalism and of democracy or of socialism, the multitudinous variety or diversity of their forms from country to country, and we can say, from decade to decade, does not constitute a secret. Inside all of that, however, certain fundamental perceptions, views and stances, which justify the unified comprehension and presentation of each and every respective ideological phenomenon, remain discernible. Thus are things also as to conservatism, however, this can become apparent and manifest only when its (conservatism's) historical content is determined and defined clearly, and in this way an end is put to the arbitrary use of the concept, at least in scientific analyses." From "Conservatism as a historical phenomenon", p. 61 of the Greek journal/periodical *Leviathan* 15 (1994) = *Konservativismus*, pp. 18-19.

THERE CAN BE A GREAT DEAL OF OVERLAP BETWEEN 1 AND 2 ABOVE, AND EVEN SOME OVERLAP BETWEEN 1 AND 3, IN THE SENSE E.G. THAT ACTUAL HISTORICAL DEMOCRACY HAD A STRONG IDEOLOGICAL ASPECT AT THE TIME OF ACTUAL HISTORICAL DEMOCRACY'S EXISTENCE, SINCE AS WE KNOW FROM THUCYDIDES, DEMOCRACY CAN AT LEAST IN PART "SORT OF, KIND OF" BE THE RULE OF ONE MAN.]]

"LIBERAL DEMOCRACY"

If you're interested in concepts and science, this website on a number of pages - apart from P.K.'s own comments (usually in passing) I've translated thus far -, refers to such matters.

Given that terminology in academic and or popular usage has its own history, including history as polemical use, and given that (both serious and risible-clown-like) political scientists and commentators of all sorts - from experienced journalists to politicians and journalist-hacks/ imbeciles-propagandists, will use whatever vocabulary "is going" in order to "communicate to the people" and betwixt themselves, there is absolutely no point in arguing over which is the "correct definition" of a term or concept and trying to get others to use your own definition -

whether it is epistemologically and scientifically (much more) useful or not. [[If I'm not mistaken, "liberal democracy" was popularised during the Cold War (or even slightly earlier) as opposed to (Soviet-)Communist/Fascist/National-Socialistic "totalitarianism" - the latter is also a problematic term just like "liberal democracy" because e.g. how can a regime be "total" and yet still have opposition spring up (e.g. those opposed to both Stalin and Hitler during their reigns), and then come undone after defeat in war or by the machinations of Beetroot Head? - And no-one is saying that for most people a "liberal democracy" is not a much better regime to live under in terms of personal freedoms etc. than a "totalitarian" regime - it's just that things in reality are not *that* Black and White/Good and Evil and in terms of Science, there needs to be much more detailed investigation and conceptualisation... in regard to all Grey Areas... ALL AREAS... incl. the social-historical-political circumstances of the regime in question... and once such investigations are undertaken, "totalitarian" regimes may not seem *that* "Evil" and "liberal democracies" may not seem *that* "Good and Innocent"... because *everyone* has their reasons and all regimes are relations of forms of **POWER-IDENTITY - LIKE IT OR NOT!]]**

What I can repeat again here is that P.K. showed how "human rights" don't exist in practice given that there is no world state providing and enforcing them - all that exists are "civil rights" within specific states and rights *called* "human rights", and likewise, when doing his macro-historical sociological ideal-typical comparisons wherein the differentiae specificae of every social formation are highlighted, the notion of "liberal democracy" is absolutely nonsensical, and

of course never used. This obviously in and of itself does not invalidate Mearsheimer's basic thesis of his 2018 book (as far as I can tell from the brief excerpts I've read) that there are no realistic prospects whatsoever for a "liberal world order" of no war and "human rights for all" - that is the position which one can discern directly or (very) indirectly from studying all the greats of political theory and political science (Thucydides, (the best of Aristotle (see *The Political and Man*)), Machiavelli, Hobbes, Spinoza, Clausewitz, (parts of) Tocqueville, (the "good bits" of Marx), Weber, Aron (notwithstanding the Frenchman's "flirting with pacifistic Utopianism" re: Clausewitz), Carr, Morgenthau, Kennan, Bull, Waltz, et al. (it goes without saying that all the classics can teach us a lot, from Socrates/Plato, to Montaigne and Montesquieu (Ferguson, A. Smith), to Kant and Hume, to Pareto, Durkheim and Simmel, to Mackinder and Mannheim, et al., et al., et al. - the "problem" is to know what "to do" with the classics...) - and not

to mention studying all of world history (as much as possible!) and P.K.'s books incl. *The Political and Man, Theory of War, Planetary Politics..., The Political in the 20th century,...*).

What it does mean is that in accordance with P.K.'s strict macro-historical ideal-typical comparative schema, we have, as far as Western Europe is concerned (with the USA "appearing" somewhere between a late stage 2) morphing into its own, in part, kind of, early stage 3) (without a significant social welfare state before FDR) - see immediately below), three main social formations, post-ancient world:

1) Societas civilis ("feudalism") of relatively fixed hierarchies, law (customs, etc.) derived and handed down from (peoples' conceptions of) and in the name of God, rural-based societies, (big landowning) aristocracies and monarchs/princes etc., feudal privileges, etc., etc., etc. (say: c. 1000 A.D. and earlier, to c. 1500),

2) Oligarchic bourgeois liberalism - grosso modo (don't forget these are ideal types and don't cover all specific/concrete particularities, exceptions and the like, which must be studied re: specific times and places by historians, etc.) - of looser but still quite firm and solid hierarchies, state power controlling monarchs and or feudal interests more so than in the past, more social mobility compared to previously - but not "(very) fluid" social mobility, with a rule of law (in theory for (nearly) everyone - but generally no "universal" social-welfare state - notwithstanding some real-world exceptions in rudimentary form) determined by a much wider elite than in *societas civilis*, including people from trade, business and (later) industrial, professional strata, castes and classes, parliament, etc., but still with an emphasis on the patriarchal family and fairly limited cross-class mobility, eventual artistic harmony deriving from periods of artistic/representational "tumult and even chaos", etc., but with increasing

massification, urbanisation and secularisation (say: c. 1500 but esp. c. 1700/1800 to c. 1900),

[[

This excerpt from the second study of P.K.'s German booklet on Marx (pp. 61-63), also helps understand what liberalism is in historical context:

"Marx explains this incurable theoretical inadequacy of Aristotle so that "Greek society rested or was based on slave labour; that is why for its basis, Greek society had the inequality of men and of its labour force. The secret of the expression of value, the equality and equal validity of all labour(s), because and in so far as they are human labour in general, can only be deciphered when the concept of human equality already possesses the firmness of a popular prejudice. That is, however, only possible in a society wherein the commodity form is the general form of the product of labour, that is, also the relationship of men with one another as commodity possessors is the dominant social relationship."i[i] Marx sets here basically the model of economic and political liberalism, which constructs society in terms of theory on the basis of the representation and notion of a market, upon which the individuals appear in principle equal and equivalent producers, in order to exchange their products with one another, against the model of ancient society, in which the in principle inequality of men is accompanied by the closed agrarian economy and consequently by the precedence of the use values over exchange values.

Precisely, the wakeful and alert sense of the contrast and opposition between the liberal-capitalistic and the ancient Greek model – a contrast/opposition which interrelates most closely with the fundamental historical contrast/opposition between industrial and pre-industrial society – allows Marx to avoid a very common, widespread mistake, i.e. to deduce new times political democracy from ancient democracy. Certainly, Marx knows that the ideological invocation of idealised democratic models from antiquity played a considerable role in the social-political struggles of the New Times (and in particular at the time of the French Revolution);ii[ii] on the other hand, however, he does not take ideological positions at (their) face value, and he distinguishes the apprehension of the historical past, as it

is determined through these or those ideological positions, from the concrete structure of authority as dominance (domination, rule, ruling (holding sway) over others) in a society, which does not exist anymore. That is why the revival of antiquity and of ancient democratic models appears as a gigantic masquerade, especially, as Marx writes, history only repeats itself as comedy. Such resurrections of antiquity were supposed to confer authority, gloss and grandeur, something which later proved to be a prosaic bourgeois social and life perception, or, a concrete form of dominance; precisely because they (the said resurrections of antiquity) were also superfluous when this latter (concrete forms of bourgeois dominance) found its own language and its own historical style. Marx, by looking – from this sober point of view – at both antiquity, as well as at the new-times republican-democratic cult of the same (antiquity), had no difficulties in classifying – with regard to the exploitation of surplus-labour – the Athenians καλὸν καὶγαθόν (= the beautiful(, noble) and good) in the same sociological category as the Etruscan priesthood, the civem romanum (= Roman citizen), the Norman baron or the American slaveholder of the 19th century."iii[iii]

iv[i] Loc. cit. (= Das Kapital, I), p. 74

v[ii] See the first pages of »Der 18. Brumaire von Louis-Bonaparte«; cf. the (i.e. Marx's) letter to Lassalle of 22. 7. 1861 = MEW, 30, p. 615.

]]

and

3) Mass democracy, which cannot be a "liberal democracy" because "liberal", in the sociological-political (not merely ideological and/or just "rule of law" - see

below) sense, is a differentia specifica (inclusive of hierarchical class distinctions etc.) of 2) above*, and because mass democracy (of mass production *and* mass consumption) provides for significant state intervention and regulation in the economy (as a kind of "right to hedonistically consume" welfare and "material right" etc.), as well as an abolition of the bourgeois distinction between private and public spheres, in addition to a whole host of "hierarchy loosening", from relatively fluid - macro-historically seen - social mobility to all manner of massified and atomised "freedoms" or "degeneracy" (depending on the observer's point of view and set of dominant values), with urbanisation and atheism (replacing the one mythical silliness of God with the other absolutely lunatic belief in the ultra-ideological dogmatic LIE of the "equality of everyone because everyone is the same", "anti-racism" whilst simultaneously committing auto-racism!!! etc., etc., etc. - obviously for any society to function and have a degree of social

disciplining necessary for Social Order and Cohesion, there must be dominant myths-religions and or ideologem(e)s-ideologies, the question though is which, under what and which social-political-economic-legal-cultural-etc. circumstances, provide the best long-term societal-cohesive "glue"), and the attendant TV/Mass Media "ZIO-LOBOTOMY" getting "out of control" and leading to the potential auto-genocide of white peoples - since everyone and everything is combinable and or interchangeable with one another - incl. by low indigenous white birth rates and mass APE-ANOMIE invasions and Other-worship, etc., as well as mass legal GROSSLY DISPROPORTIONATELY ZIO-PUSHED Third ("Turd") World immigration - obviously P.K. never once used the term "Zio", "Ape", "Turd", "Satan(ist(s))" or other loaded/impolite etc. terms (except occasionally about our Tribe, and again he was absolutely right to do so - the "Zio" business is this Site's literary persona both making a point about GROSS

DISPROPORTIONALITY in wielding forms of Power by a particularly - **DISGUSTING, ULTRA-UGLY, VILE AND UTTERLY REPREHENSIBLE, FILTHY ETHNIC/RELIGIOUS GROUP** (thus seen as a subjective matter of Taste - have you ever stopped to think how repulsively, disgustingly, offensively foul it is to view So???'s and ??????erg's and many other such Heads day-in-day-out in the mass media?), whilst Israel has **FULLY SHUT BORDERS** and everyone else is told to "do the One World" **ZIO/USA-LOBOTOMY** and **ZIO/USA-ASSISTED femino-faggotised COLLECTIVE SUICIDE**, etc., etc., etc.) (say: c. 1900 until today, though the 1960s and 1970s' cultural revolution signaled that mass democracy had spread - like a kind of **GROSSLY DISPROPORTIONATE ZIO-CANCER** - throughout all of society, beyond the avant-garde, having demolished most of what was morally and ethically official dogma and or the dominant world image/ world view for centuries, if not millennia - e.g. a man is a

male born with a cock (dick, penis), a woman is a female born with a cunt (pussy, vagina), standards of Beauty and Taste were Ancient Greek-Roman and or (mostly Euro- (and or Near-Middle Eastern-))Christian, Marriage is between a Man and a Woman for the purpose of the biological reproduction of the Species (nation, ethnos, (sub-)race, collectivity/group),... and anything else is like or that of a Freak, an Abomination, Abnormal, an Exception, a (very) rare Exception, Contra Naturam, Mentally Insane, etc.).

[[*This gets complicated because mass democracy - which initially was only a Western social formation - is a kind of fusion of bourgeois liberalism and (the notion and forces of) social democracy (incl. under Soviet geopolitical-ideological real-world, realpolitik pressure), with communism and fascism being "extreme ("deviant") forms" of mass democracy. Mass democracy, therefore, refers to the overall social-economic-political-legal-cultural-etc. (inter-)relations and "structures" of society as a whole (massified-atomised-urbanised-secularised-etc.), and "democracy" in terms of society and government as in ancient Greece and its continuation in the Greek world until the 19th century, and "democracy" just from the point of view of government and governance, are other aspects of the the general concept of

"democracy", which warrant very detailed, theoretical and time-and-place-specific attention of their own.]]

**[[Long-term historical causality is a very complicated matter and obviously in the West, Catholics and/or Protestants and/or Secularists/Atheists played the major roles in social transformation from *societas civilis* to oligarchic bourgeois liberalism to mass democracy, with the Jews as such *causing nothing* as such, but particularly from c. 1850 playing a GROSSLY DISPROPORTIONATE (and by no means the only or even necessarily major) role in "pushing and nudging things along" away from white Christianity and white collectivism - and that is why they are SO DESPISED BY SO MANY, including their historically developed, necessary for them and proven method of PRIMITIVE SECRET SOCIETY networking (which many other groups have done and do) in becoming and being in certain countries (USA, UK, France, Germany before WW2, Australia, etc.) GROSSLY DISPROPORTIONATELY inter alia and dependent on time and place - academics, superior court justices, specialist medical practitioners, Mass Media and Mass Entertainment and Publishing Barons-Owners-Personalities, Billionaires, Bankers, Corporate Types, Big Business incl. Pharmaceuticals Players, Big Money Political Party Donors, Government/Foreign Policy Advisors, Israel Lobbyists, etc., etc., etc. - it is really SICK STUFF for a non-Jew with high collective consciousness of his own - Let's put it this way: if in every elite position where there is a Jew in the USA, the UK, France, Australia, etc. there was a Greek, and if Greece had FULLY SEALED BORDERS with ethno-racial pro-Hellene legislation (which it once did, but which has been repealed in recent decades incl. under ZIO-USA and ZIO-EU influence), whilst Israel's borders were open to all the Mohammedan-Afro-Asiatic APE-ANOMIE invasions of HATE, then I, as the Literary Persona, of this Site, would have a totally different view of "Jews"... - think about it, it's not difficult to understand, and most Mohammedans with high levels of in-group consciousness, and switched-on Chinese and Indians (Hindus) et al., would and do think similarly.... the whole issue revolves around Distributions of Power to members of groups and perceptions of both one's own and other groups... and where there are long and strong historical memories...
HAHAHAHAHA!!!!!!!!!!!!... Good Luck with all of that!!!!!!!!!!!!]] {{In other words, given the GROSSLY DISPROPORTIONATE Privilege Jewish Elites have - it is absolutely GROSS e.g. 0.5% or 1% or 2% of the population occupying and or controlling 5%, 10%, 20%, 30%, 40%, 50%+ of certain Elite Positions in certain countries, no Jew should ever talk about "White Privilege" or "The Holocaust" to non-Jews, when more than 200,000,000 innocent people were massacred and or otherwise unfairly killed in the 20th century - and the fact Jews do "stuff like that" is what makes them SO UGLY, SO VILE, SO SICK, SO FILTHY, SO DISGUSTING, to those who Scientifically Observe Human Affairs and are not ZIO-LOBOTOMISED, i.e. "thought-controlled" into Submission to the Forces and Representatives of**

EVIL, THE DEVIL and SATAN...}} [[It is understood that the vast majority of people who live in a mass democracy, including amongst serious political scientists, are not concerned at all about Distributions of Forms of Power which lead to **GROSSLY DISPRORPORTIONATE** Zio-Jewish accumulations, concentrations and crystal(lisation)s of Power at elite level. Obviously, the matter did not interest P.K. either - though he left more than enough "theoretical space" open for anyone who wants to make the observation and investigate the matter further. This site's literary persona has made the observation. And nothing further is being suggested in terms of "a cure or therapy". Every concentration of Power will eventually - one way or another - meet with another concentration of Power. And the Strongest wins. And the Strongest is **NEVER ALWAYS** the same group with the same concentration of Power - no matter how long their "lucky run" lasts.]]
(REPEAT: Science qua science does not and cannot ever choose which are the "preferred values" and the "preferred aesthetics" etc. - so what is "normal" to and in one society, or more accurately to most of a society, incl. society's elites, is "abnormal" in another society. One of the reasons that there is always a level of tension and conflict in society - incl. all the co-operation - is that at some point values clash because people in groups clash, just as they can clash at the individual man-to-man level too. Western mass democracies - so it seems - are entering into "tumultuous times" because the "multi-cultural mix" is not bearing the fruits expected. Similarly, at an international level, you can talk all you want about "human rights" but at the end of the day, Han Man and Hindu Man and Ape Man and ??? Man and Rus Man and Many Other Men say to ZIO-USA, "FUCK YOU, what's in it for me?" And if there is no agreement, then there could be trouble... up to serious trouble. - And that's why serious USA patriots who love their Founding Fathers and their Country like Pat B????nan or Pau? ??aig ???erts or Ro????t W. M????y or J??n Mear????mer, L??e Gol???ein, M????el L??d and many others (notwithstanding all the things they don't agree about as between themselves and all the objections they would raise to my Over-the-Top etc. Assertions, Rudeness and Overall Deliberately Silly Literary Persona manner), and don't want to live in a state of heightened Tribal/Cultural Conflict or even Wars, are very weary about "Save the World, Make the World Like Us with Open Society Open Borders" IDIOCY. Such IDIOCY can only lead to MASS-SCALE ANOMIC DISASTER. It cannot possibly lead to anything else. And as far as White Nationalists and White Identitarians are concerned - no matter how much I or anyone might or might not sympathise with a lot - though by no means all - of your positions and claims, how realistic is it that you are going to get to your Preferred End Point? Seriously, NOW. How realistic is it in terms of the way the real world operates and the way most of the people in the real world think? I suppose the only real answer is "Let's see what happens, to where the politics/struggles lead, what "shocks to the system" befall Western mass democracies (if and when they happen), and

TIME WILL TELL".) [[And a bit of FUN: If Woman complains about Sexism, then she should be told "Who by and large still does all the spade-muscle work necessary for Society to have Infrastructure, Buildings, Houses and Machines etc. to Function (not to mention war)? SO SHUT THE FUCK UP (AND Have children in families with men and do your housework and be good wives and mothers)!". If Black Man complains about Slavery, then he should be told "Who but Whites, Yellows, Browns have also been Slaves, Coolies, Super-Exploited Proletarians in History by the Tens and Hundreds of Millions? SO SHUT THE FUCK UP (AND do some work and stop complaining)!". If Gay Man complains about not being the centre of attention, then he should be told "Who but Straight Men and Straight Women by the Vast Majority can Secure the Reproduction of a Nation, Race, Ethnos, Collective, Group?" SO SHUT THE FUCK UP and DISAPPEAR (i.e. KEEP IT PRIVATE)!". If Mohammad Man complains about not fitting in, then he should be told "Who but Christians, Buddhists and Hindus throughout more than 1350 years of Mohammedanism have been subject to your Continual Invasions, Conquests, Hate, mass direct (by and under the Sword) or indirect ("soft power") forced Conversions, Unending VIOLENCE and EVIL"? SO SHUT THE FUCK UP, AND PREFERABLY, FUCK OFF TOO!". And if Jew Man talks about Pogroms, Massacres and the Holocaust, then he should be told "Who but non-Jew Men from Asia, Europe, Africa and the Americas have not been slaughtered by *the hundreds of millions* throughout the centuries and do not wield GROSSLY DISPROPORTIONATE forms of power at elite level in certain countries? SO SHUT THE FUCK UP! WE ARE TOTALLY SICK OF YOU!" - And if Western society can SAY ALL THAT to those who should be told, Western society might return to some kind of normalcy again, we hope...]]

In the era of mass democracy, which at a planetary level, can and does take many forms, "liberalism" survives as an ideology of "free markets and free trade ending war and uniting the world in peace and under the rule of law", etc..

[["Liberal" just like "cultural Marxism" in the mainstream USA-sense of today - are from a Kondylisian point of view - scientifically-conceptually obfuscationist and inaccurate at best, if not downright STUPID. What is meant is Western mass democracy, because social-historically as explained above "liberal" goes with the oligarchic bourgeois, and, Marxism is the

Reverse-Side of Bourgeois Liberalism and was never an Ideology of ZIO-USA mass-democratic Imperialism or (perhaps more accurately) (ZIO)-USA World Geopolitical and Cultural Relative Hegemony as eventuated since WW2 until today. The fact that "everyone" uses those terms in those ways is a plain fact (arising from (Left-Right) polemics and obfuscation, etc.), and there's nothing that can be done about it. All I can say is that the Kondylisian Macro-Historical Schema is Scientifically far more Fertile and Useful for understanding societies and their major "structural" changes over long(er) periods of time.]]

The above is a very poor and cursory look at the notion of "liberal democracy" (and I've deliberately included a lot of "topics" in such a manner as to mislead you as to what is really important scientifically if you are asleep and not awake) - and is intended only as a basic point of orientation. YOU NEED TO STUDY CAREFULLY both *Conservatism and Decline...* as well as other Kondylisian texts I've already translated, to start to understand all the matters at hand (including many I have not mentioned here),... and I won't have

translated both of the above-mentioned books before about 2040 - if ever...

N.B.: For anyone interested, around mid-way through the Addendum to the Greek edition of *Planetary Politics...* (online in full by about mid-October 2018), there are the following two incredible paragraphs published in 1992!!! (Pay particular attention to where reference is made to the removal of the separations between the various spheres of society in mass democracy as compared to bourgeois-liberal society: hence, why the Literary Persona of this Site has gone "Bonkers" over the Monetisation of all aspects of Life which obviously ties into the generalised ZIO-LOBOTOMY in circumstances of advanced massification and atomisation whereby the Representatives of SATAN wield GROSSLY DISPROPORTIONATE forms of Power in Western mass-democratic society, starting with ZIO-USA... - there might be CRUDE and INACCURATE ways of saying things, but such WAYS might, more or less, GROSSO MODO, get to the heart of the matter - whether you like it or NOT! Anyone who has the time and brains to study all of P.K.'s core texts very carefully will see exactly where I, the fictional Literary Persona of this Site, am Silly and Over-the-Top, but also speaking - at least up to a not insignificant point - TRUTHS "no-one" wants to know

about because they break their own ideological self-delusions, including in regard to extant real-world Relations of Power and such Power's Distribution amongst Elites vis-à-vis the People... **all of this is not to say that there is any viable and or "better" alternative**, but it does say that whoever claims to be a social scientist is invariably going to be an observer of Relations of Power betwixt Humans as Individuals in and or with reference to Groups - and there is absolutely no way whatsoever of getting around these **SOCIAL-ONTOLOGICAL REALITIES** (e.g. through ethicising "beautification" and **FULL-SPECTRUM ZIO-LOBOTOMISED OBFUSCATION** of reality in trying to conceal what "The **SATANISTS**", i.e. the Holders and Possessors of relative Power including in **GROSSLY DISPROPORTIONATE** doses/concentrations/crystal(lisation)s/accumulations, are really doing, in Ultimate Tribal Warrior Par Excellence (e.g. "nice and kind" Levinas-like) fashion) - **LIKE IT OR NOT!**) (What is the Reason Israel has **FULLY SHUT**

BORDERS, AGAIN, WITH AN ALMOST ETHNIC-RACIAL LEGISLATIVE AND OVERALL NATIONAL, QUASI-FAR-RIGHT DISPOSITION? I DIDN'T QUITE CATCH THAT - WHAT EXACTLY IS THE REASON?):

" ... Thus, posed again – via other paths and with other coordinates – is the classic problem of national survival, which many believed they would solve comfortably and jovially with “European unification”. Others again advocate that every formulation of such problems and generally any kind of concentrating whatsoever of political thought on the nation, signifies an atavism to be rejected. Whoever does not want to confuse his wishes with reality ought to ascertain that – as much as this seems to be sad as regards the prospects of world society – the nation, as a basic unit of political grouping (group formation), and consequently its survival, as the guarantee for the natural and political-social survival of specific people, have not in the least, in practice, been surpassed either at a European, or at a world level. In this book we explained why the perception is erroneous that economic mergers and international standardisations (formalisations, unifications) of law (right) or of ethics can by themselves create supra-national unities. As the behaviour of great European and extra-European [[i.e. non-European]] Powers after the Cold War – to whomever follows and observes such behaviour carefully – shows, these great Powers do not at all consider that the merging of economies will abolish national economic and other

interests, or that the relocation (moving) of the centre of gravity towards matters of the economy, will efface (wipe (blot) out, eliminate) national antagonisms. The smaller nations, including the Greek nation, ought to deduce their conclusions from these observations. The fusion (merging) of politics with the economy does not mean the abolition of politics, and indeed of national politics (policy), but begets (provokes, brings on) an all-the-more close connection between economic and national success or failure. This is crystal-clear in the narrower military sector; equally obvious will it, however, become as to the whole national-economic spectrum, to the extent that energy, population, ecological and related factors obtain in the phase of planetary politics now underway, privileged significance for the survival of individual nations. In such a case, only he who does timely and persistent preparation will be saved in the long run – and a small nation perhaps needs greater foresight than large nations.

As someone perceives and understands (fathoms), the mass-democratic removal or obliteration (elimination, eradication) of the programmatic bourgeois-liberal separations (divisions, segregations, dissociations, demarcations) between the government(al), economic, political, cultural or ethical sphere etc. made the problem of the economy, and at the same time that of national survival, much more synthetic, composite and complex than what it was in the epoch of 19th century nationalism. The sphericity of the contemporary economic problem demands sphericity and collectivity of effort for its resolution, that is to say, it demands its conception and comprehension as a problem of national survival. Given mass-democratic pluralism and the weakening of traditional ideological cohesive-cohering bonds, the

efficient social division of labour, and the harmonising of individual efforts so that social parasitism from above and from below is limited as much as possible, constitute a condition of social cohesion of greater essence than in previous societies. Today's Greek nation would have to view its economic rationalisation precisely as a fight against parasitism, as the replacement of a social co-existence where one "branch" lives by sponging off and sucking dry directly or indirectly (i.e. through the government(al) handling and management of public resources) some other "branch", whilst everyone lives all together by mortgaging the national future, [[with such a replacement being carried out]] by a social cohesion in the aforementioned functional sense [[of mass-democratic removal and obliteration of bourgeois-liberal separations between the various social spheres]]. This entails so many things, so many and radical changes to so many different levels that it is more than doubtful whether it can today be realised, i.e. put into practice, to a determinative (crucial, great) extent. But here we are talking only about what are the necessary preconditions of a national policy (politics), i.e. a policy (politics) with the purpose and goal of national survival, without also arguing that such a national policy is feasible anymore. The correct therapy does not always start in time."

Designed by [Arcsin](#)

Make a [free website](#) with

iii[iii] Das Kapital, I, loc. cit., ((foot)note 23), p. 249.