

Panagiotis (Panajotis) Kondylis (Παναγιώτης Κονδύλης) - Carl Schmitt's 'Political Theology'

- [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 emergence 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](#)

- [Further Articles of Interest](#)

- ["Liberal Democracy"](#)
- [Important Announcements](#)

- [A Dialogue between I and S on Positions](#)

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).



[Epilogue to Carl Schmitt's 'Political Theology' by Panagiotis Kondylis.pdf](#)

Size : 769.101 Kb

Type : pdf

LIKE ALL OF P.K.'S TEXTS - AND PARTICULARLY THIS ONE, WHICH IS AN ABSOLUTE JAM-PACKED THEORETICAL TOUR-DE-FORCE, AN ABSOLUTELY UNIQUE ARTICLE IN THE HISTORY OF SCHOLARSHIP (EVEN THOUGH I LOVE THE SHORT BOOK ON MONTESQUIEU MUCH MORE, PERSONALLY!) - YOU

NEED TO READ SLOWLY, WORD BY WORD, PHRASE BY PHRASE, DEAL WITH MY ALTERNATIVE WORDS AND PHRASES IN PARENTHESES, AND FOLLOW CAREFULLY THE LINES AND CHAINS OF THOUGHT. SO, THIS IN GERMAN 33-PAGE ARTICLE SHOULD BE TREATED LIKE A P.K. ARTICLE WHICH YOU READ AGAIN AND AGAIN PROBABLY OVER SEVERAL SITTINGS, AND NOT LIKE A STANDARD PIECE OF IDEOLOGICAL RUBBISH USUALLY PRODUCED IN UNIVERSITIES BY "PROFESSORS", WHICH AT ELITE LEVEL IN THE USA AND OTHER COUNTRIES ARE GROSSLY OVER-REPRESENTED BY JEWS (US NON-JEWS WITH VERY HIGH IN-GROUP CONSCIOUSNESSES OF OUR OWN - DEATH TO SATAN!!! - ARE ABSOLUTELY SICK OF THEM (APART FROM THE ONES I'VE MENTIONED ON THIS SITE WHO ARE (VERY) GOOD UP TO GREAT, AND I'VE MENTIONED THEM MANY TIMES...) - IF YOU'RE NOT SICK OF THEM, THAT'S FINE, IT'S YOUR PREROGATIVE, BUT YOU CAN'T THOUGHT-POLICE ME AND TELL ME WHAT TO LIKE AND NOT TO LIKE, AND NOT TO LOVE MY OWN IN-GROUP ABOVE ALL OTHERS) - AND THAT'S A FACT, AND *"THEM" ARE THE FACTS* - WHETHER YOU LIKE IT OR NOT.

**THERE'S A REAL PERSON-
TO-PERSON-TO-PERSON
CONNECTION HERE.
SCHMITT WAS A TEACHER**

JURISPRUDENZ, AUSNAHMEZUSTAND UND ENTSCHEIDUNG

Grundsätzliche Bemerkungen zu Carl Schmitts „Politische Theologie“

Von Panajotis Kondylis, Heidelberg/Athen

I.

Gut 70 Jahre nach seiner ersten Publikation¹ behält *Schmitts* kleines, thematisch etwas heterogenes, doch kerniges und saftreiches Buch über politische Theologie seine volle Frische und seinen ganzen Reiz. Dies erklärt sich, wie ich meine, aus drei Gründen. Zum ersten: Obwohl sich die Beschaffenheit der westlichen Gesellschaften im Laufe des 20. Jh. wesentlich änderte, da der oligarchische bürgerliche Liberalismus durch die Massendemokratie abgelöst wurde, beharrt dennoch die herrschende Legitimationsideologie bei allen unvermeidlichen Modifizierungen auf bestimmten Gemeinplätzen, wodurch die optische Täuschung einer umfassenden Kontinuität entsteht. Zentral unter diesen Gemeinplätzen bleibt der Glaube, der „Rechtsstaat“ kanalisieren endlich – ungeachtet der zugegebenen Diskrepanzen zwischen seiner Theorie und seiner Praxis – sozialpolitisches Leben in ein glattes und geradliniges Strombett, durch seine institutionellen Regelungen mache er also dieses Leben berechenbar und vorhersehbar, er nehme den Konflikten mindestens die tödlichen Spitzen und bürge für die jeweils angepaßte Wiederholung derselben Grundverfahren; das Verfahren und die Form saugten gleichsam die Substanz auf, d. h. sie stumpften soziale und ideologische Kämpfe ab, indem sie die gegeneinander Kämpfenden zur Annahme eines gemeinsamen Verhaltenskodexes zwingen würden. In diesem Voranstellen der festen institutionellen Form vor die bewegte oder gar explosive sozial-

¹ München/Leipzig 1922. Im folgenden wird nach dem Text der zweiten Ausgabe zitiert: *Politische Theologie. Vier Kapitel zur Lehre von der Souveränität*, München/Leipzig 1934. Die ersten drei Kapitel sind in der „Erinnerungsgabe für Max Weber“, hrsg. v. M. M. Palyi, Bd. 2, 1922, S. 3 - 35, enthalten. Das vierte Kapitel erschien zum ersten Mal im „Archiv für Rechts- und Wirtschaftsphilosophie“ 16 (1922), S. 121 - 131, und wurde außerdem in „Donoso Cortés in gesamteuropäischer Interpretation. Vier Aufsätze“, 1950, aufgenommen. Vom Text der zweiten Ausgabe fehlen eine Stelle aus dem letzten Absatz des ersten Kapitels und einige Absätze aus dem zweiten Kapitel. Diese Änderungen sind nicht so „unwesentlich“, wie *Schmitt* in der Vorbemerkung von 1934 behauptet: Die gestrichenen Stellen bezogen sich allesamt auf *Erich Kaufmann*.

ΚΑΛΥΤΕ



ΔΗΜΟΣΘΕΝΗΣ

ΑΠΑΝΤΑ - Τόμος 6

292



ΔΗΜΟΣΘΕΝΗΣ

ΑΠΑΝΤΑ - Τόμος 5

KONDYLIS: MACHT UND ENTSCHEIDUNG

CARL SCHMITT

ΠΟΛΙΤΙΚΗ ΘΕΟΛΟΓΙΑ

Τέσσερα κεφάλαια γύρω από τη
διδασκαλία περί κυριαρχίας

Μετάφραση - σημειώσεις - επιλεγόμενα
Παναγιώτης Κονδύλης

ΛΕΒΙΑΘΑΝ

ΘΕΩΡΙΑ-ΠΡΑΞΗ 1

ΠΑΝΑΓΙΩΤΗΣ ΚΟΝΔΥΛΗΣ

10

**THIS IS P.K. PARTY TIME! - AN ABSOLUTE CLASSIC! IF
CARL SCHMITT, WHO HAD A BRAIN, CAN BE
SUBJECTED TO THIS CRITIQUE, WHAT CAN POSSIBLY
BE SAID ABOUT ALL THE IDEOLOGUES-DINGBATS (ZIO
OR NOT) OF WESTERN MASS DEMOCRACIES WHO
THINK THAT REALITY ON THE GROUND JUSTIFIES
THEIR IDEOLOGICAL "TRUTHS" WITHOUT EVER
CONSIDERING THAT THE REALITY ON THE GROUND
CAN CHANGE TO NOT ONLY CONVERT THEIR
IDEOLOGICAL "TRUTHS" INTO REAL-WORLD
NIGHTMARES, BUT EVEN REMOVE THEM AS
IDEOLOGUES-DINGBATS (ZIO OR NOT) - EVENTUALLY
- FROM THE WORLD'S AND HISTORY'S STAGE**

**"... only a very naive
epistemology
would postulate that the
construction or constitution
of
scientific concepts reflects
the**

**composition and texture of
what is
real, i.e. reality, and is hence
itself
subordinated to often barely
intellectually
understandable, and to
most frequently chaotic,
fluctuations."**

Facts are Facts, and Fair is Fair - it's quite clear that the bout between Tribal Warrior Kelsen and "Supreme" Tribal Warrior Schmitt, who probably engaged in some untoward, conniving, and very shifty "sleight of hand", was won FAIRLY and SQUARELY by the JEW, and I would have no hesitation ever saying that, even if I think that Jews generally are even *more* REPULSIVE than Krauts generally, and I really - generally, not always, as there are always

exceptions - feel an Instinctual ***DISGUST*** when I see a "High IQ" Kraut... [[*HahahahahaHA!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!*]] [[On the other hand, Kelsen's epistemological advantages also lead to a reality of law ultimately not attached to ethics (e.g. he makes a strict Is and Ought distinction), which of course leaves room in all societies for a whole lot of realpolitik "behind the scenes" wielding of power, whilst the edifice of the "rule of law" remains intact (which applies, anyway and as well, even when ethics ostensibly and officially ***are not*** detached from the law, as in Christian-Roman Law(s), Sharia Law, The Laws of Manu, etc.). And although such social phenomena, mutatis mutandis, apply generally or universally, in certain Western countries since the 19th century, what e.g. "judicial review" might mean on one view is **GROSSLY DISPROPORTIONATE** "jewdicial review" or "judicial review with a Behind the Scenes "other reality" (of blackmailing, extortion, setting people up, buying others off, etc.)". I personally remember an elderly - "kind and nice" - man of a particular ethnic-religious group, as it "just

happened", who lived in the most affluent suburb of the city, as it "just happened", teaching "ethics" to post-graduate law students, as it "just happened", when his fellow Tribal Members were... as it "just happened",... and that's exactly why I'm now naming Levinas for the third time, the Tribal Warrior *par excellence*... the "nicer" they look and sound and "read", the more certain something really "stinky" is going on... of course, all of this has absolutely nothing to do with P.K.'s article... - at least on the surface... And yet there is another "on the other hand"... on the other hand, if Kelsen's position of Law not being subject to any inherent or "natural" Ought holds (even though there must be some kind of man-made Ought), there is no inherent reason why e.g. abortion or "homosexual marriage" ***should or should not*** have constitutional and or other legal force. And we all know that, "the Courts" have not been hampered by the State, or have not stopped the State, in regard to various

kinds of "non-Traditional" Ought("s") in recent decades. In other words, we return to questions of Power notwithstanding who "wins" the legal argument-epistemological points.]]

[[READ AND MARVEL...!!! DO YOU UNDERSTAND WHAT THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS ARE? ARE YOU A SOCIAL SCIENTIST OR AN IDEOLOGICAL TALKING HEAD-MORON?]]

"But from Kelsen's perspective, jurisprudence, i.e. legal science, can achieve such systematic cohesion only because it – like every other science too – represents and constitutes a fiction, i.e. it moves at the level of ideational magnitudes, at that (level) of discontinuities, and the incessant, unremitting, unforeseen fluctuations of living human reality must be shoved aside in order to make room for the regularities and the generalisations, which alone allow the building of systematic science – and there cannot be another *science*. That is why the putting first of the general and of the regular constitutes an epistemological necessity, and it

says nothing about the way and manner one assesses the specific weight of the exception and of the state of emergency inside of the empirical reality of social-political life."

[[Kelsen continues to "score points" against Schmitt on matters of epistemology and scientific understanding.]]

"... and only when the boundaries towards the outside are clear, is the systematic building and constitution of the internal space in respect of knowledge (cognitive space) possible."

[[After indicating how the Law can never stop the existence of "Behind the Scenes" forms of Power, P.K. then tells us straight out (if we know the rest of his oeuvre well) that whether you want x clique or y clique or z clique in command - because there will always be a clique or

cliques in command (!) - is ultimately an aesthetic choice, and nothing else.]]

"It should be added here that the pointing out of the distance between rule and decision by no means constitutes an argument that could strike a blow against exclusively the liberal "state under the rule of law (constitutional state)". This distance or chasm is just as old as the norms of right-justice-equity-law themselves, and it cannot be overcome even by a "philosophy of concrete life": Even this ("philosophy of concrete life") is necessarily restricted in registering or ascertaining the said distance or chasm; because this distance/chasm can be overcome only by the abolition of *every* norm (rule), *every* right-etc.-law, *every* jurisprudence."

**[[Having dealt with
Schmitt and his political**

leanings clouding his scientific judgement, it's Kelsen's turn, and what follows is an absolutely stunning discussion of value freedom etc. incl. further critique of Kelsen's fellow (much overrated) Tribal Warrior, Popper. **AND POP GOES THE WEASEL!]]**

[[P.K. refers to Kelsen and "parliamentary democracy", which I say means P.K. was not averse to using expressions/terms incl. "liberal democracy" only very occasionally in referring to other thinkers - incl. for the sake of convenience, because the point of such references is not to examine if there actually is such a thing as "parliamentary and or liberal democracy", but to illustrate something else. Obviously, if we define "democracy" more strictly in another context, then there can be no such thing as a

"parliamentary/liberal democracy", etc.. Cf. my discussion on "Translator's Page - Prelude".]

[[I'm ~~not~~ going to copy-paste them here, ~~but~~ there are about 3 pages which are ABSOLUTELY UNBELIEVABLE. ANOTHER P.K. HIGH AMONGST HIS SO, SO, SO MANY. CLEARLY THE GREATEST THINKER IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES/ "PHILOSOPHY" TO EVER LIVE - BAR NONE (WHETHER, "POUND-FOR-POUND" OR "GREATEST HEAVYWEIGHT" OR

**BOTH,... IS THE ONLY
MATTER FOR DEBATE).]]**

**[[INSANE SATIRICAL
LITERARY PERSONA
CHANGES MIND... AND...
"*EXPLOSION*"!!!...]]**

"And indeed: in the attempt to support parliamentary democracy by means of scientific (that is not merely ethical or political) arguments, Kelsen made the same logical mistakes which he himself uncovered so astutely when he combated the teaching of natural law. At its core, his argumentation regarding this coincides with the theses which *Popper* popularised after the Second World War: value-free (axiologically free) science shows the relativity of values, and the ascertainment of this relativity calls, for its part, for a willingness or inspires a preparedness to

renounce, forego and to abstain from struggles over ultimate world-theoretical questions, and through that consolidates mutual respect and tolerance; relativism and scepticism would hence constitute the ideological foundations of modern parliamentary democracy. The way I think, this syllogistic reasoning is not as perspicuous and self-evident as it appears. The value-free way of looking at things (*or*: Axiological freedom) itself ceases to be value-free (axiologically free), when it holds value freedom (axiological freedom) to be a value with morally (ethically) beneficial effects. If value freedom (axiological freedom) could be characterised at all as a value, then this would be possible only in the methodical, i.e. methodological (not ethical) sense, and only with regard to the activity of science – of course, if and in so far it can be empirically demonstrated that value-free (axiologically free) science is cognitively the most fertile science. Leaving aside that value-free (axiologically free) scientific activity makes up neither

quantitatively nor qualitatively an influential area (or weighty sector) of social life, the transference of a methodic (methodological) principle from the level of the observation of society to the level of society or social life itself remains logically highly precarious. Because whilst this principle at the first-named level [[of science]] can successfully be actuated or act only in its method(olog)ical purity, i.e. irrespective of its chance (contingent) mixing with psychological factors, at the level of society, it is no longer reckoned or anticipated to act with such a purely method(olog)ical usage or in the same way (since one cannot expect that humans en masse will heed a principle from which absolutely no instruction as regards behaviour can be deduced or derived), but it is hoped that value (axiological) freedom will have an effect and act through its probable psychological consequences. Present here is a logically inadmissible or impermissible transition from the methodical, i.e. methodological, to

the psychological, that is to say, from the genus of (methodo)logical to the genus of psychological magnitudes. Nonetheless, a correlation of methodical/methodological or logical, and, psychological magnitudes with each other could be effected and or managed only if the former were originally and always charged or loaded with certain contents, which for their part would correspond with certain psychological attitudes. But whereas the psychological and moral (ethical) stances, of necessity, are connected with certain content(s), which are turned against other content(s) (e.g. tolerance against intolerance), value freedom represents a method, which must be free of a certain psychological content exactly because it raises or makes the claim of being able to – in terms of understanding and alternately – make its own or appropriate all psychological and all moral contents (*or*: axiological freedom constitutes a method empty of certain content, precisely because it has the ambition to approach in terms of comprehension *all* the

psychological and *all* the ethical contents). On the basis of the principle of value (axiological) freedom it cannot be decided whether scepticism and tolerance are to be preferred in regard to blind, unshakeable and intolerant belief or faith. Still more: at the level of the value-free (axiologically free) observer, scepticism and relativism crop up even then – or even more so then –, when opposing or inimical social groups, which make up the object of the value-free way of looking at things (*or*: axiologically free consideration), very firmly, absolutely believe in their own truth on each and every respective occasion (*or*: each and every side on its own behalf), and display the corresponding intolerance; but at the level of socially active subjects, whose psychological stances are supposed – as it is said – to support the functioning of parliamentary democracy, *these same subjects themselves*, and not merely their value-free (axiologically free) observer, would have to regard their own views and world-theoretical stances as relative or just

as good and right as those of every other person. Such a state of affairs is, however, psychologically and sociologically highly unlikely (*or*: It is not probable that something like that will happen). And it is two entirely different things whether every individual holds his own views to be relative, or whether people all together believe in the socially sanctioned ideology of tolerance and of (moderate, it goes without saying) scepticism. This means: to the extent tolerance and scepticism prevail and predominate socially, they do that (*or*: they are imposed) not because certain scientific positions are gradually internalised by (*or*: permeate, saturate and soak degree-by-degree/gradually) the members of society, but because they constitute new ideologies which were spread and disseminated on the basis of the same mass-psychological laws, and determine action, like the earlier or opposing ideologies too. Nonetheless, when the corroding, undermining and subverting inner logic of scepticism surpasses and outstrips its socially acceptable functions,

and the calling into question of the objective (continued) existence of values goes beyond and exceeds the socially bearable (tolerable and endurable) boundaries, new values are summoned, in reference and as to which every doubt is made a taboo and prohibited, and which, as we said at the outset interrelate and mesh/engage with ultimate anthropological assertions and justifications (“human rights”, “human dignity”). The sociological analysis of the network “scepticism – tolerance”, as well as the values which have an effect by supplementing or by compensating, can show that it is a matter here of complementary aspects of a many-sided ideology, which is interwoven with the overall internal organisation of the mass-democratic social formation. If this organisation in regard to its foundations were to be convulsed and shaken, then one would in vain reckon in relation to that, or expect that, scepticism and relativism could in themselves continue to guarantee the social application of the principle of

tolerance (*or*: reckon on or expect the perpetuation of socially accepted scepticism as the ideational foundation of tolerance)."

[[Re: "Readers' Page" and Schmitt being aware in *The Concept of the Political* of Friend-Foe existing beyond the political being confined to the operations of the state and government. It's referred to in this article explicitly! One of Schmitt's problems though is that he does use this awareness to adequately and convincingly deal with the exception, including by equating politics with the state and thus ignoring the fact that the political and power are active beyond the state and government, and are explainable by sociology (e.g. as in the case of GROSSLY DISPROPORTIONATE ZIO(-LOBOTOMISED) input into the running of ZIO-USA and its satellite states such as the UK, France and Australia - I ADD).]]

[[The error of reducing the political to the state - which was made by at least one of the speakers(-Retards) I refer to on my "Readers' Page" re: the YouTube videos -, is something P.K. deals with re: the decision and Schmitt in this article.]]

[[READ THIS RETARDED "REVIEWERS, INTERPRETERS, COMMENTATORS AND GOD ONLY KNOWS WHAT ELSE"! IF YOU DON'T KNOW WHAT THE FUCK YOU ARE TALKING ABOUT, THEN DON'T FUCKING TALK ABOUT IT AT FUCKING ALL - UNLESS YOU WANT TO ENGAGE IN THE DELIBERATE SPREADING OF

MISINFORMATION, IN PARTICULAR IF YOU BELONG TO A PARTICULAR GROUP OF PEOPLE WHO HAS HISTORICALLY PROVEN VERY, VERY, VERY ADROIT AT DOING THAT KIND OF THING, EVEN THOUGH ALL PEOPLES DO IT. SO LEARN TO SHUT THE FUCK UP IF YOU DON'T KNOW WHAT YOU ARE TALKING ABOUT AND WANT TO BE KNOWN AS A "SERIOUS" SCHOLAR!!!]

"– On this point, it can of course be questioned whether the structural correspondence of theological and profane (secular) concepts in themselves can be derived from the systematic superiority of the former, or whether such structural correspondence is due to the common origin of both from underlying thought structures grown together and knitted

with

anthropological *and* cultural

constants;

were this the case, the truth, and were e.g. the distinction between a From Here (i.e. This World or Life) and a From There (i.e. That World or Life),

looked at as, and given, a conceptual structure, already with belief (faith) in the meaning of human life (regardless of the theological or non-theological justifications or rationalisations), then the priority of theological thought vis-à-vis the secularised thought of the New Times could be characterised as merely a chronological priority. Yet the discussion and investigation of such a question, whose mere formulation, incidentally, surpasses Schmitt's thought horizon, would take us far."

[[= See *Power and Decision* (incl. in the light of *The Political and Man*).]]

[[The main reason why there is no such thing as a simple, general or even "universal" identification of causality and causation in the development of the West as a capitalistic-parliamentary West, is that the

centuries long development of this West (which on one view is now already dead even though it may not seem that way yet), - apart from taking a very long time -, has many different causal chains operating simultaneously and in all manner of interactions and interrelations. One of these causal chains includes the "evolution" of sovereignty and the operation of the law and of the state. But such a social phenomenon, like all social phenomena, is theoretically-conceptually abstracted from the vast complexity and multiformity of reality, to give us an image/idea of that one historically developing causal phenomenon. One, however, should always avoid REDUCTIONISM where or rather from the point where the many causal chains cannot be separated, unless one intends to

engage in a particular normative programme such as in Militant Atomising Feminism-Homosexuality, or the Extermination of a particular ethnic group as e.g. Turks did to Armenians, Greeks et al.. The social phenomena during the development of the West starting from about the 13th to 15th centuries are many: from Mercantilism and Usury-Banking-Finance (GROSSLY DISPROPORTIONATE JEWISH INVOLVEMENT), to the Renaissance and Colonialism and Imperialism, to Protestantism, to Bourgeois-Liberalism and the Industrial Revolution to Mass Democracy and Corporations (GROSSLY DISPROPORTIONATE ELITE-LEVEL JEWISH INVOLVEMENT) along with all the attendant Secularisation, Urbanisation, Massification,

**Atomisation,
Hedonisation, FeminoFaggotisation, FULL-
SPECTRUM**

**ZIO-USA-LOBOTOMISATION,... all of
which and much much
much more occurred at different points to
varying degrees during the
long historical multi-layered and multi-level
course of arriving at today's
ZIO-GLOBALISING AUTO-
GENOCIDING of historically white
nations,whilst apparently Israel is "special"
with FULLY SHUT ZIO-
BORDERS refusing to be "enriched" and
"dieversified" by say six (6)
million beautiful and intelligent Black
Africans and or Mohammedans,
etc., etc., etc..]]**

**"The concept of sovereignty acquires a diametrically
opposed
sense in the New Times. The centre of gravity, i.e. main
focus, shifts from the protection and safeguarding
(preservation) of right-
etc.-law, to the creation of right-etc.-law, i.e. from
executive and judicial**

to legislative activity, which increasingly appears to be the lever for the changing of society (or: and indeed to the changing of society through legislation). Right-etc.-law ceases to be god-given and unchanging, and is comprehended as an exclusive product of a sovereign will, which not once makes a halt (stops) even before the fundamental norm of the constitution (polity). The state can, accordingly, be manufactured **just like a machine: in Hobbes, this conviction is found next to a clear confession of faith in the new-times concept of sovereignty, and the interrelation is obvious."**

[[More P.K. historical-sociological succinct, to-the-point, explanatory magic. As mentioned above, the process or "evolution" leading to where we are today with the absolutely *GROSS OVER-REPRESENTATION* of

Jews at elite-level (it is really DISGUSTING (almost vomit-inducing) as a subjective matter of Taste - that *thing* with the Satan-Book actually looks like SATAN's rectum, and that "Face of Globalisation", looks worse than one of SATAN's turds put through a ZIO-BLENDER),... took place over centuries and at many different levels and in many different ways... this paragraph highlights the aspect of importance in the current article.]]

"We now comprehend without difficulty why conservatives and counter-revolutionaries before and after 1789 saw in the new-times teaching of sovereignty, a genuinely revolutionary ideology, irrespective of whether its bearer was an enlightened despot, who through state centralisation, smashed and broke up the feudal centres of power, or whether a liberal-democratic parliament continued and completed the work of absolutism. Against the modern voluntaristic concept of sovereignty, the counter-revolutionaries

summon the traditional concept of sovereignty, and when they demand the dynamic intervention of the monarch against the revolutionary forces, they then connect with this demand entirely different representations and expectations than those which for instance Hobbes connected with his sovereign. They do not want, therefore, to allow the sovereign a free hand in the legislature, which could turn even against the privileges of the nobility, but – according to the medieval perception – want to equip him (the sovereign) with sufficient executive and judicial powers in order to exorcise the revolutionary danger, if need be with dictatorial means. Their high rhetorical tones and their emotional, dramatic (emphatic) explanations in favour of the sovereignty of the (counter-revolutionary) monarch and against the sovereignty of the liberally or democratically minded legislature, ought not to mislead or blind us as to the concrete content, which they ascribe to the “good” concept of sovereignty, in contrast to the

“bad” concept of sovereignty. Incidentally, de *Maistre*(’s) and *Donoso*’s statements on this critical point are more than lucid, and simply summarise the traditional perception of sovereignty, as it had been formed already in the Middle Ages[1]. Recourse to the distant past was no mere Donquichotterie (knight errantry, quixotism), rather it suggested that the enmity of the counter-revolutionaries against liberalism and democracy implied an across-the-board rejection of the New Times.”

[1] Die Belege, *ibid.*, pp. 228/230.

[[Of great historical and comparative interest is the absolutist(-proto-) bourgeois-liberal Hobbesian social-contract Fiction of pactum societatis and pactum subiectionis coinciding, in contrast to the Fiction of the Middle Ages with its divine/natural law and "vested" privileges, and the Fiction of Western mass democracy with its "civil rights, everyone is

equal and the same" Fiction or Bullshit, through which
e.g. elite-level
Jews, who "took the lead in fighting for civil rights", can
divide and rule,
divide and conquer society - as
least **GROSSLY OR HIGHLY**
DISPROPORTIONATELY - and even if not
by possessing and wielding
even a majority of the dominance -, along of
course with their non-Jew
allies, who tend to make up the majority of
the elites when looking at
aggregate numbers,... in obtaining and
wielding
GROSSLY DISPROPORTIONATE forms of Power, as it
"just happens",
but as it actually happens through *Primitive Secret*
Society Networking,
which of course other groups can and do do throughout all
of history,
whilst maintaining and propagating the absolute "ZIO"-
LIE that
"everyone is equal and the same and interchangeable
etc.", but Israel
"must" have **FULLY SEALED BORDERS** through which
not even half
of one quarter of a mosquito can pass - and you're telling
me there is no

such thing as *FULL-SPECTRUM ZIO-LOBOTOMISATION*? Well done, 10 points to you, and have a Prize. You'll feel really good receiving it.]]

[[There is another brilliant comparison by P.K. between de Maistre and Donoso vis-à-vis the revolutionary communists of the 20th century.]]

[[There is no such thing as a human being without some kind of reference to collective social relations (a group or groups) and without some kind of identity, unless that individual exists without orientating himself in the social world. There is absolutely nothing to debate here, facts are facts and these facts are absolutely universal you **ABSOLUTELY DUMB FUCKING ZIO-LOBOTOMISED RETARD**, pushing the "only individuals exist" ideology because you are essentially a ZIO-F???ot

**sucking ZIO-???? WHY THE FUCK
DOES NOT ISRAEL OPEN ITS
BORDERS FULLY TO SIX (6) MILLION
BLACK AFRICANS AND
OR MOHAMMEDANS BECAUSE
THOSE SIX (6) MILLION
COULD PERFECTLY REPLACE -
SINCE ALL PEOPLE ARE EQUAL
AND THE SAME AND
INTERCHANGEABLE - THOSE LOST
IN THE
20TH CENTURY "HOLOCAUST" - AS IF
MORE THAN 200
MILLION OTHERS WERE NOT
"HOLOCAUSTED" OUT OF
EXISTENCE IN THE 20TH
CENTURY, YOU ABSOLUTELY, FILTHY
AND TOTALLY DISGUSTING
ANIMALS?]]**

[[You now need to listen to this and understand your place in the world, *DUMB FUCKING RETARD!!!* (Don't worry, I'm a Dumb Fucking **RETARD too - the difference between you and me is that I know it!) And don't ever forget, if you don't know what the fuck you are talking about - don't fucking talk, **SHUT THE FUCK UP** - especially if you are one of *them!!!*]]**

[[FORGET ABOUT IT. THERE IS THE GERMAN SIDE OF P.K. AND THERE IS BACH. THE REST OF US CAN FORGET ABOUT IT. THERE'S NO POINT. WE'RE NEVER GOING TO DO BETTER OR REACH HIGHER. IN FACT, WE'RE NEVER EVEN GOING TO COME CLOSE.]]

Designed by Arcsin

Make a [free website](#) with