

This special volume consists of the final reading and of one of
the annexes of the volume III of

“I do not agree!”
Politico-economic Readings on
the *neo_Wilhelmo*-liberalism and its Consequences
of
The *Tri*_logical Dissection of the Lobbycratic Era

Preface

Any knowledge can only be fragmentary, thus forming your own opinion can by no means be complete. Those filters that cut out things and only allow for those things to happen that deliberately have been selected by others, hence have been processed to form opinions and this way suggesting to me that I actually had a “clear view” are not helpful but they are actually harmful.

Howbeit, forming your own opinion is accomplished best if you act as a human being as a whole, that is neither overly intellectual nor overly emotional, thus without blinders, well aware that the knowledge gathered will remain incomplete. Gathering knowledge without blinders means placing this knowledge in the corresponding context, cognisant that the process of gathering knowledge extends more or less deep into the unknown. But where the consciousness is in contact with the unknown, there are those “sensors” that once, at the stage of the first forming of knowledge, had formed, now, however, serving to associate what has just become conscious and what has already been known. —

Such an opinion formation must have preceded the development of an individual, needn't it? Therefore, the following question could be raised:

This is supposed to be feasible in a mass society?
— Well, if it deserves the name democracy, it is.

QUOTATION

“The neoliberal project will not be politically compromised until a crucial demographic quantity of those people who understand that obviously nothing else can be expected from this project is reached.”

END OF QUOTATION¹

From my point of view, the situation is as follows: on the one side there is an elite that identifies itself with the lobbycratic EU and that, to a certain extent, has its effect way down into the European peoples through organisation as for example mentioned in *Reading Twenty* of the German version of The *tri_logical* Dissection of the Lobbycratic Era, volume III, part 2. But this way you cannot bind the mass of the people to the lobbycratic EU, in fact, this is only possible through force. Projects like the German *agenda 2010*², whose implementation leads to trim the mass of the people in line with the market, so that, in the end they can't help but function in the sense of this ideological guideline of the EU, thus in the sense of the EU ideology.³

¹ Source: Sebastian Müller, „Allianz des 'progressiven' Neoliberalismus“, Makroskop.eu, 18 Mai 2017 at:

<https://makroskop.eu/2017/05/die-allianz-des-progressiven-neoliberalismus/?success=1>. This link was re-checked on 26 June 2018, the quotation was translated by the author.

² Please refer to the entry: “Agenda 2010” on Wikipedia: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Agenda_2010. In the annex of the present special volume the main part of this “agenda” is mentioned on the pages 104-6.

³ The ideologic objective of the EU is the „neoliberalism“ which is dealt with in the German version of volume I of The *tri_logical* Dissection of the Lobbycratic Era. (___In the following mostly referred to as: The *tri_logical* Dissection [...], followed by “vol. I” or “vol. II” or “vol. III”.___)

Resulting from that, a ruling class as cruel as can be is evolving, for if they were not that cruel, they would not ask for such a social trimming. On the other side there is the mass of the people, gullible and hoping per se, that is being led — by the corresponding political will-o'-the-wisps by means of rhetoric that is adapted to the very audience and the collective atmosphere via a political swing to the right or to the left but always back to the neoliberal direction. That at least is the approach that has proven well for the preservation of the power of the ruling class, always accompanied by the corresponding ballyhoo. By the way, this does not only work out so easily because the neoliberal doctrine has a very sophisticated theoretical construct of ideas at its disposal.

This is a construct of thoughts that I dare to call a dadaist-surreal one, which is, by the way not at all an offense to any upright or by now lying Dadaist or Surrealist — on condition the term Dada of the Dada movement is *_never ever_* used in the context of the lobbycracy, but in this context the Dada of the lobbycratic era is to be called Dadaism — in contrast to the Dada of the „dada“ movement, for „Dada“ is *_not_* theorisable. Neither is, in fact, the Dada of the lobbycratic era, but the term “Dadaism” is appropriate in this context, for it looks as if it were theorisable — and the same applies to the human being that according to neoliberalism is also theorisable, which, of course it is not.

It should be added that the neoliberal doctrine did exactly not come without presuppositions, it did not come out of the blue, kind of like a visitation and planned by a sinister power, but because of a behaviour in line with the market that psychologically has been grounded in the mass of the people in Europe long since.

This can, amongst others, be seen in the fact that the marvellous term “time and leisure” has had a negative connotation for a *very* long time, even though, building your *own* opinion without time and leisure is in fact not possible.

After all, the industrialisation asked for forming such a corresponding collective mentality, which, may I mention, took place in a peculiar way in Germany and that led to, what needs to be called Wilhelminism. Interestingly, nowadays this mentality is coming back,

(*well* after a certain lead time that started, at a rough estimate, with the end of the Cold War *),*

and it is coming back in a form that may well be called *neo*_Wilhelminism and that is currently amalgamating with the Neoliberalism to the phenomenon of *neo*_Wilhelmo-liberalism which is the base of what is currently shaping in the EU and that goes hand in hand with a kind of *neo*_imperialism. And, objectively seen, it is this monstrosity that the EU elite and its organisations, sometimes called NGOs, with their effects way down in the societies of the EU identify with.

Mind you, it absolutely does not matter, if the members of these organisations realise that or if they indignantly want to deny it, for objectively seen you cannot deny it – on condition that you look at what has been happening ever since the end of the Cold War in an out-of-the-box manner without being ideologised.⁴

⁴ See in the German version of The *tri*_logical Dissection [...], volume III, part 2, Reading 20.

This process of *neo_imperialism* based on a *neo_Wilhelmo-liberal* regimen, will be *_relatively_* completed by 2020, when an EU army will have been constituted, no need to say that it will under the rule of the German hegemon.

This is a hegemon who would completely lack his own substance, as ever, if it were not for the mis-constructed EMU.⁵

However, first of all this army will be busy preserving the neoliberal peace and quiet — well supported by the smooth propaganda of the writing staff of the media concerns. Just to make sure that everybody does understand, when, (*_for example_*) Greece needs to be occupied or that in other regions of the EU social movements need to be suppressed, movements that not only confront themselves with intentions by the EU that affect them *_directly_* and that finally even hold a referendum, but that eventually vote against lobbycracy, which then officially would be called anti-democratic, as it happened in Wallonia in October in year 5 of the lobbycratic era when so-called great German democrats — called that vote a vote against democracy — that means that German politicians and so-called *alpha* Journalist vilified a decision-making process that was in line with democracy and anti-lobbycratic as “anti-democratic”.

Once you have read the volume III of the German version of The *tri_logical* Dissection of the Lobbycratic Era you will definitely realise why the year 2016 of O.Q.C. has to be year 5 of the lobbycratic era.

⁵ You will find details on the “lack of own substance” further on in this copy.

Well, in fact, the mass of the EU inmates is best to be held at bay — that means apart from the common mawkishness such as the national anthem and so on — by spotting an opponent that is not within the EU and, at best, can be *strikingly* personalised: At present there would be Putin, Assad, Trump, Erdogan — ever changing accordingly to the own hypocritical requirements. Thus, we are talking about opponents in whose sphere of influence it *may* seem appropriate to initiate an “export of democracy” to — either covertly or, in case the opponent is still a too major one (*thus for the time being*), and/or accompanied by proxy wars, which, of course will not be called so, but (*due to the own per-se-being-good*) these wars are called “human rights wars”.

The Orwellian creation of the word “human rights wars” is especially important for the salvation of the pacifists’ souls, so that they can put their minds at rest and, nevertheless, participate — when it is about waging wars to expand the spheres of the ruling class of their so-called “own” national state.

You see that the neo-imperialism primarily differs in a semantic way from the paleo-imperialism.

It is self-speaking that even those ones will agree to all this (*if they are not the first ones to do so*) in parliament, who have never been in the army, let alone their children — and that means above all members of the so-called Green Party.⁶

⁶ See e.g. in the German version of The *Tri*_logical dissection [...], volume I, Chapter 14.

At any rate, the lobbycratic era does not allow for any *_constructive_* social ways to develop, due to the intention of its ideology that urges for homogenisation, even though there is permanent talking about “individuality” and “freedom”.

(Of course, these are terms that everybody has to like, but, because of the social trimming that has taken place for long these terms themselves are also thought in a way that is in line with the market, thus they are actually thought as a reflex which in the end means they are not thought at all, merely used as a “knee-jerk”.)

Because of all this, in fact, a revolutionary situation might actually arise. And what would that mean? Well, it would probably mean what the later door-opener of a certain Mr Hitler stated as early as in 1912:

“Either we will have a revolution in three years or we will be at war.”

Mind you that with these words Emil Kirdorf only expressed the disposition of the European power elites — for on the territories of *_their_* European playgrounds (commonly known as national states) strikes were the daily fare.

Is it worth mentioning that the power elites went for war?

However, it is less likely that such a situation, possibly developing in a revolutionary way might really result in a revolution, made by the mass of the people — for there is no revolution without the *_subjective_* factor.

* * *

Thus the intention to write these *Politico-economic readings*⁷ is twofold: Firstly to serve the enlightenment of the sympathetic reader who is interested in his own interests that basically are different to those of the power elite of each national state and their satellites in *spin*_doctorial sciences, politics and journalism. That, secondly, implies these *Politico-economic readings* are also addressed to all those intellectuals, journalists, cultural workers as well as to all those who defend the neo-liberal politics wherever, that is to say, with regard to Germany: thus, these *Politico-economic readings* are a polemic echo to all those who defend a policy animated by the mother of the Merkel-ism and by the inventor of the Schäuble-ism

(__i.e. the names of the persons currently acting may be changed, whereas the neoliberal direction is maintained__)

as the basis for the occurring homogenisation of all the societies in an "iron cage of austerity" called EU

(__instead of aligning the market to the societal claims as it were characteristic for a democracy__)

together with the yonder politicians of so-called left or so-called progressive parties, even reaching down to so-called bourgeois action groups of market conditioned younger people, who all show by their political demeanour and action that, in fact, they do not want anything else than supporting the lobbycratic policy!

⁷ ... based on the German version of volume III of The *tri*_logical Dissection [...].

It follows from the above that all those who work or behave in the manner mentioned are responsible for the present development and its consequences.

Hence, if voters have the impression there is merely the choice between the present politically wrong direction and another politically wrong direction, resulting from the present one, they vote for the “new” wrong direction with the aim to abolish the present lobbyocratic direction — and then they are betrayed again, fooled by another political ballyhoo.

Thus, if you feel the need for a real politico-economic change you cannot help but realise that first and foremost enlightenment is required — before

(*__with some prospect of success__*)

any decision followed by any action for change is to be envisaged.

Joachim Endemann
Il Piano
May 2018