

3. The universalisation of technique (technology) and world cultureⁱ

The technicisation of the economy and of the lifeworld (*or*: of life), which has been carried out and executed since approximately a century ago in an increasingly quicker tempo at the planetary level, was and will often be interpreted as the concomitant, or at least as the harbinger and herald, of a universal imposition and predominance of Western culture shaped and formed (moulded) by the Renaissance and the Enlightenment. This interpretation rests on two interrelated assumptions, which at least more often than not are unreflectedly taken as a basis (*or*: which usually become accepted without examination). On the one hand, a not merely temporal, but a content-related and qualitative continuity of Western culture is postulated (*or*: the continuity of Western civilisation, and indeed not only from a temporal point of view, but also from the point of view of quality and content, is axiomatically accepted)ⁱⁱ. Western culture, it is said, is supposed to have by and large preserved the unity of its constitutive components, and these are supposed to, for their part, belong together because they spring from one and the same rational intellect(-spirit) (*or*: and these again owe their coherence to [[the asserted/claimed fact]] that they are the aftereffects of the same rational intellect(-spirit)). This intellect(-spirit) acts indeed at times technically and economically, i.e. in terms of the economy, at other times, politically and ethically, but always ultimately wants and effects the same thing, as for instance the parallel development of technique (technology), of the free economy and of political freedom, and of humanity under the rule of law (*or*: the humanitarian state under the rule of law), respectively, are supposed to prove.

The second assumption arises from this conceptual and historical connection between material civilisation and ethical-political culture, that namely already the predominance and imposition of technical civilisation – which requires a certain division of labour, that is to say, social mobility (*or*: a certain division of labour and social mobility), and hence corrodes, undermines and abolishes patriarchalisms, i.e. authoritarian patriarchies – necessarily entails the advent of the corresponding ethical-political culture. This correlation holds true (applies, is correct) in the general sociological sense that in actual fact between technical development, form of economising (i.e. form of economic activity), and form of social organisation, an interaction (or mutual influence/influencing, interplay, alternating/changing effect) exists and can be observed, which certainly can look very different and appear in multifarious versions and manifestations, and in particular does not make any kind of binding statement, or signify absolutely anything binding, as regards the polity (constitution). Here, it is not, however, a matter of whether the sociological correlation in general is right and holds true, but whether the correlated magnitudes regarding their content, their specific weight and their mode of combination, i.e. their manner or their way of being combined with one another, have remained more or less stable over recent centuries of Western history. According to my perception (view), that is not the case. Since the final decades of the 19th century a radical break or rupture took place, changing and modifying the form, content and composition of Western culture shaped and moulded until then in terms of the bourgeoisie (*or*: of Western – until then bourgeois as to its basic character – culture) – and only (*or*: precisely) this break and rupture enabled the universalisation of some aspects of this culture, which now of course were torn and pulled out of (severed (cut away) from) their original context or framework, developed their own dynamic(s), and frequently turned against other aspects with which previously they stood, or were found to be, in a relationship of ideal harmonyⁱⁱⁱ. In this way, the universalisation of the Western – or righter: from or out of the Western –

accompanied a dissolution of that which from the Renaissance until approximately the First World War was Western-European (*or*: Thus, the universalisation of Western culture/civilisation –more correctly: certain aspects of it– went with the disintegration of that which from the Renaissance until roughly the First World War constituted the Western-European element in the distinguishing sense, i.e. in the sense of a *differentia specifica*)^{iv}.

The polytheism of consumption

The complicated process of universalisation of the Western [[element as *differentia specifica*]] (*or*: of (aspects) of Western culture/civilisation), during the parallel disintegration and dissolution of the Western cultural synthesis shaped and moulded in terms of the bourgeoisie (*or*: of the Western, basically bourgeois cultural/civilisational synthesis), can be followed very well or very nicely in regard to the key question (central problem) of technique (technology). Inside that [[formerly distinctly Western cultural]] synthesis, technique (technology) appeared as the act (deed, feat) and achievement (acquisition or action) of the Promethean dimension of a *homo universalis* (*or*: of a Promethean *homo universalis*), who could only maintain his multi-dimensional unity by connecting his technical activity with endeavours of another kind, and knew how to subordinate his whole doing (all his doings and deeds), i.e. his entire activity, in turn, to higher aims (*or*: maintain his multi-dimensional unity thanks to his ability at connecting his technical activity with occupations of another texture, and at subordinating, moreover, his whole action to superior goals). There cannot, of course, be any talk of an alleged “fact” (*or*: It cannot, of course, be asserted) that *homo universalis* was ever a social reality worth mentioning, i.e. a socially weighty reality, or that the determinative synthetic-harmonising approach of the bourgeois thought figure in itself demonstrates the

actual superiority of bourgeois culture over other cultures^v. But such ideals or ideologem(e)s stand for, and symbolically represent, the fact that – as long as, in accordance with today’s yardsticks and benchmarks (measures), the technique (technology) of the New Times was and remained elementary, and above all, as long as the life of broad masses had not still been covered and encompassed by such technique (technology) – the technically usable mechanistic perception of Nature remained interwoven with a mythical representation, notion and conception of this same Nature. The latter (i.e. mythical representation etc. of Nature) functioned as the ethical and aesthetic norm, which directly or indirectly supported the hierarchisations of oligarchic bourgeois liberalism, although it could be interpreted against such liberalism too.

In view of this constellation (*or*: On account of this conjuncture), which in the eighteenth and nineteenth century had been socially decisive and determinative, despite all important opposed tendencies, the substitution of oligarchic liberalism by modern mass democracy effected the decline (downfall) and eclipse of the mythical representation, perception and notion of Nature. And this occurred to the extent that technique (technology) was detached or cut away from the Promethean endeavours and efforts of *homo universalis*, in order for it to be put at and in the prosaic service of the satisfaction of mass needs, that is, to be connected with the process of mass production and of mass consumption^{vi}. The autonomisation (= making autonomous) of technique (technology) from or vis-à-vis the old ideological context, and its interweaving with the vital functions of mass democracy, had as a consequence a considerable shift in the cultural main emphasis (*or*: the displacement of the centre of gravity of civilisation/culture), which, amongst other things (*inter alia*), manifested itself in a double-sided (dual, twin) crisis of the concept of rationality. The contrast and opposition between technical and ethical-normative rationality, which conceptually (i.e. in terms of concepts and conceptual meaning), was known

long ago, did not however particularly trouble or perturb either the eighteenth or the nineteenth century; only in the course of the twentieth century did such a contrast and opposition become a pressing, urgent theme, matter or topic. On the other hand and at the same time, it became apparent (or proved) that both processes of mass production and of mass consumption are indeed equally indispensable for the continued existence of the mass-democratic social formation, but are coupled with attitudes and modes of behaviour which neither ethically nor psychologically, necessarily belong together (*or*: however, are connected with stances and behaviours which are different from an ethical and from a psychological point of view) – and this [[is the case]], even though such attitudes, stances and modes of behaviour/ behaviours exist and necessarily have an effect – side by side – in the same society and most often in the same person. Mass production demands an activation of pure technical rationality, which for its part does not exhaust itself in the narrower productive process (process of production), but extends and expands into economic calculus/calculation in general: it commands accumulation and the foregoing and renunciation of immediate pleasure. On the contrary, in relation to that, mass consumption in the West has promoted and favoured a hedonistic ethic(s), which in very different variations – from vulgar-materialistic to high(ly)(-)spiritualistic (*or*: extremely spiritualistic) – threw overboard, i.e. set (put) aside and jettisoned, the more or less ascetic, that is, oriented towards abnegation (self-denial), Christian or bourgeois ethic(s), and at the same time elevated and made a world-theoretical and ethical polytheism and pluralism an almost normal and natural, in any case, decisive and determinative thought form and life form (form and way of thinking and of living). Now, all kinds of “rationalisms” and “irrationalisms” co-exist and compete against or interweave with one another. Only [[that]] technical rationality is not permitted to stand for any nonsense and does not take any jokes; rather, technical rationality must keep its distance and cut itself off from the carryings-on and freedom to do whatever one feels like in

respect of the sphere and field of consumption, although technical rationality absolutely needs the sphere of consumption as an unfolding space, i.e. in order for technical rationality itself to unfold.

This ascertainment is significant and meaningful (telling and crucial) in order to be able to correctly evaluate the cultural aspect of the universalisation of Western technique (technology). If the autonomisation (= making autonomous) of technical rationality accompanies a programmatic, not merely occasional bursting or breaking (blowing) up of the unity and the bindedness of the cultural sphere, which now as mass culture is absorbed by the sphere of consumption (*or*: becomes mass culture and is absorbed by mass consumption), then we cannot expect any longer from the achievement of technical rationality any uniform and unambiguous cultural content(s) (*or*: that the achievement of technical rationality will be connected with monsemantic, i.e. unmistakable, unequivocal and clear cultural/civilisational contents)^{vii}. The spreading of that (*or*: those elements) which formerly was (were) connected culturally with the technical-industrial intellect(-spirit) does not, therefore, necessarily follow the planetary spreading of Western technique (technology). Cultural development can in fact go in the reverse(d) (opposite) direction, as (or to which) the growing amounts in respect of esotericism, meditation, magic or, at intellectually-spiritually more sophisticated and more demanding levels, in artistic primitivism^{viii}, attest (bear witness), which the West since decades ago imports to the extent it exports technique (technology)^{ix}. Formulated more generally: whereas technique (technology) as type of rationality and as type of praxis (practice), presents itself and is seen unitedly on a planetary scale or at a planetary level, the cultural content of acts and actions, which constitute the broad sphere of consumption, varies very greatly and intensely. Or put otherwise (said differently): the more the cultural content(s) varies/vary, to which material and intellectual-spiritual consumption relates, the more

colourless and unbinding does technique (technology) become in a cultural respect. That is why the expectation is premature and rash that through its planetary imposition and predominance, technical reality will bring about a world culture oriented towards such technical reality's specific needs and commands. The chasm or gulf between technically-rationally directed and dominated production, and, hedonistically (that is, through the aim and goal of "self-realisation") shaped and moulded consumption, could be even or perhaps deepened and extended through the progress of technique (technology)^x. Because increased productivity will free more and more humans from direct dealing, engagement and occupation with production to (*or*: to make the transition to) the possibility of an anti-technical/technological way of thinking and anti-technical/technological way of living (*or*: an anti-technocratic way of thought and of life). Accordingly, the pantheism or the pandaemonium of consumed culture would become still more broken, unclear, confusing and chaotic. Thus seen, present-day technical rationality, in or by itself, and without the coaction or collaboration of other social factors, can unify under its aegis the cultural sphere in regard to its signs and symbolism, just as little as the common (joint) use of the wheel and of the plough could bring ancient Egyptian and ancient Chinese culture down to a common denominator (and unify the aforesaid ancient cultures[[, i.e. make them the same or very similar]]); nor the use of the same alphabet in a society could ever engender agreement over the "true" meaning of controversial and disputed concepts^{xi}.

The experience(s) with the spreading of Western cultural property (cultural possessions or assets, culture or civilisation) in the twentieth century shows clearly (or makes obvious) that the more successful this was, the more the "West" distanced itself from the canon of (*or*: the more the "Western" elements were cast out from) the culture shaped and moulded by the Renaissance and the Enlightenment^{xii}. A comparison of the relative achievements of both main

representatives of the “West” in the modern world, namely, Europe and the United States, is illuminating and instructive. Europe culturally dominated the world in its liberal and imperialistic age, when present-day mass culture existed only in its beginnings; that is why European culture outside of Europe influenced for the most part only members of the higher, upper strata, who, incidentally, very often were plagued and tortured by an identity crisis (crisis of identity)^{xiii}. Things were different as to the United States, which, as Tocqueville^{xiv} already perceived, fairly or very early on, entered into the mass-democratic phase: the United States confronted the dangers which, because of its multi-national mix(ture), threatened its cohesion, amongst other things (inter alia) through the assimilating force of a mass culture^{xv}. The flooding and inundation of the globe by American culture, above all after 1945, is due not merely to the worldwide political-military presence of the United States. The reasons for that flooding etc. must also be sought in the texture and composition of this culture itself, which despite all of its great variety and multiformity, represents and constitutes a medley, mixture (miscellany and jumble) out of nonchalant technicism and kitsch usable for all kinds of consumer purposes and goals of consumption, whereupon and over which the bad conscience of betrayal of time-honored traditions casts no shadow (*or*: without a shadow being cast all over that, by a conscience burdened with the betrayal of respected traditions)^{xvi}. The fact that the “Westernisation” of today’s world, in so far as it is real, was conducted, carried on and achieved as Americanisation rather than as Europeanisation, has, therefore, a deeper meaning for the history of society and of culture. Certain elements of the European New Times likewise, of course, made their world journey, i.e. such elements travelled and spread across the world, and in fact planted roots here and there. However, this fact is not decisive in the present-day context, but rather, the broad framework of the cultural pantheism, in which these elements are put in order, classified and incorporated in part next to other elements, entirely heterogenous [[is decisive]].

They are appropriated and assimilated, in other words, not as samples or specimens of a higher and separate culture (exactly this, however, was the self-understanding of European culture until approximately 1900), but as constituent parts of equal value, and should the situation arise, interchangeable constituent parts (*or*: as equivalent and possibly interchangeable parts) of a fluctuating, flowing whole^{xvii}.

Endlessly combinable and colourless

All in all, the West through its technique (technology) exported something which indeed was culturally relevant (*or*: had significance for culture), but at the same time, by virtue of its combinability with very different cultural content(s), it is culturally colourless. A coherent and independent, self-contained cultural ensemble was not exported, whose planetary imposition would have secured the superiority of the West over the long run, but an isolatable and freely usable instrument, which can soon, as a weapon, turn against the West itself (just as, by the way, “free trade” or “human rights”, in as much as these imply an unrestrained (unlimited) freedom of movement and freedom of settlement (relocation)). The exporter finds itself, of course, in the beginning, with the advantage. It, i.e. the USA leading the West as the exporter, through short-term gains and profits, easily loses sight and loses touch with the internal logic of (the) development[[s]] ((the) trend[[s]], evolution). It, however, necessarily quickly notices that imitations can have a more resounding success than its own original creations. Even if we assume that conflict-laden(/pregnant/riddled) and or explosive backlogs[[, i.e. in relation to the macro-historically determined gap between the “developed” First World and the Third “developing” World]] and imbalances could be avoided for all sides, and on a world scale, a uniform and even development of technique (technology), and a

homogenous world society, could be achieved and secured, then this again would culturally bring about, over a longer period, an expansion and consolidation of syncretism and of pantheism, not the gaining of the upper hand of its Western components, whatever this expansion of syncretism and pantheism may look like after some (a few, several) decades.

Nonetheless, high obstacles and hurdles stand in the way of the realisation of this possibility, with (upon) which the optimistic cosmopolitans today reckon (count) (*or*: Nevertheless, the realisation of this possibility, about which optimistic cosmopolitans dream, runs into serious obstacles). The inescapable question and problem of distribution forces every actor or subject on the international stage, in relation to that, to remember and reflect upon his own self-assertion and self-preservation – and self-assertion and self-preservation include cultural identity as a symbolic connective tissue. Even if we take into consideration the significant ideological free spaces, i.e. margins of ideological freedom, which befit every more or less atomised consumer (consumption) society (society of consumption) (*or*: which every consumer society splintered, broken up and fragmented into individuals, leaves), again, it can be well imagined that cultural osmosis at the planetary level will be kept within certain elastic boundaries. This would correspond with the formation of a number of basic types of mass democracy. This differentiation of such basic types of mass democracy would possibly not even stop at the coupling and conjunction (package deal) between the free economy and parliamentarism of the Western type, i.e. the said differentiation would possibly dissolve, break up or take apart the said coupling and conjunction. It should be noted that the question and matter of distribution – even in the case of general growth and affluence – is posed, and indeed (then) when the absolute gains and profits in the eyes of those concerned count less than the relative gains and profits, that is to say, those which someone achieves in comparison to others. However, should the question

and matter of distribution be posed under conditions of acute shortage as a result of dramatic ecological and demographic developments, then the perceptible diminution of mass consumption would lead to corresponding restrictions (limitations) of and on cultural pantheism. The cultural demarcations and delimitations between different types of mass democracy would therefore be exacerbated, aggravated and intensified. And then of course, merely or simply a political legitimation (*or*: a legitimation of the political regime), which ultimately is founded and based on reality or, at any rate, on, or from the perspective of, growing affluence and prosperity, would not [[just]] collapse. A world-theoretical reorientation would also be needed, because nothing less than the pride and motor (driving force) of mass-producing and mass-consuming society: technique (technology), would have failed, broken down or gone bankrupt. Already today, technique (technology) in part lives on or off the fact that it combats its own side-effects. Accordingly, its advances and progress become all the more fictive. And the great aporias and dilemmas of the Western world-plan(/design/project) or Western social model/blueprint in the age of mass democracy, and of culturally colourless technique (technology), more and more come to the fore (into the foreground) (*or*: come into sight (come up) all the more clearly).

ENDNOTES

All endnotes are by the translator, and **have nothing whatsoever to do with P.K.. Readers can and in fact probably must simply ignore them and draw their own conclusions from P.K.'s texts only, though some of the endnotes might be useful to some readers, and other endnotes are really only for the very few people who can look at themselves in the mirror and say "Oh my God, I'm really ugly, and retarded". I do**

4) and finally – say since c. 1900 or WW1 and esp. WW2 – mass democracy (with (Zio-)USA now dominating), which by the end of the Cold War had effectively totally killed off the West as we entered into the mass-democratic (with different kinds of regimes) Planetary World, otherwise known as “globalisation”, with different versions of mass democracy taking root and taking place across the whole world (many, if not the (vast) majority, based on Cold War era developments).

Don't forget, all these Periodisations and Classifications (in ideal-typical form), are somewhat fluid and GROSSO MODO, because in reality the different periods have different elements which carry over into – and overlap with – other periods depending on time and place and or are transformed and or die out in all sorts of different ways and in all sorts of different time-frames and in all sorts of different loci – which then become the object of specialist historical and or sociological investigation. What P.K. is giving you is the “GRAND VIEW” or “macro-” view of history in terms of Weberian ideal-typical analysis and his own Conze-Koselleck-influenced and absolutely incomparable history-of-ideas/concepts-in-the-context-of-social-history analyses.

^v Don't forget, in the Kondylian typology, “bourgeois” culture since the Renaissance is (increasingly) “liberal” culture – oligarchic, urban-based/urbanising/massifying-(proto-)capitalistic, imperialistic, patriarchal, white-European (though he never expressly mentions that, for understandable reasons) and generally – not always – racist against non-whites, with individualistic tendencies which do not though break totally from strong collective consciousness, extended families, etc., to end up in the mainstream at “degenerate” individualistic hedonism, etc.. And that is why “liberal democracy” is totally wrong scientifically (cf. “mass democracy”), even though we understand why people use “liberal democracy” in polemics and or because it is too much trouble to explain things otherwise, etc.. Of course, “liberalism” as ideology, i.e. free-market trade for the whole globe, even though “we-know-who” GROSSLY DISPROPORTIONATELY benefit from such “free-market global trade” until of course it becomes really apparent that others have benefitted (a lot more than was expected!), and, a state under rule of law (even though we know exactly who “behind the scenes” GROSSLY DISPROPORTIONATELY wields forms of Power), continues to this day – though it is extensively confused or co-exists with “liberalism” as the Western mass-democratic programme (– erroneously also called “cultural or Western Marxism” when Marxism died with the last vestiges of bourgeois Liberalism c. WW2 or at the end of the Cold War at the very latest –) of Femino-Faggotisation, Otherisation, potential White genocide, Negrification, Multi-Culturalism, Multi-Racialism, DieVersity, full-spectrum Zio-Lobotomisation, etc..

^{vi} So, what P.K. is describing is that in the broad transition from the 18th and 19th bourgeois-liberal-oligarchic centuries to the 20th century of mass democracy, there is a comparatively great levelling and flattening out both of “spiritual” matters, as well as material matters – notwithstanding all the very great differences that still existed. Macro-historically seen, the overall tendency was a loosening and (gradual) collapsing of hierarchies.

^{vii} As we can see today in relation to the the GROSSLY DISPROPORTIONATELY Zio-led anti-white hysteria of Zio-USA-centred mass culture, some “forces” are using technology to push other messages. Whether they will have any kind of success, or whether the Zio-USA-centred part of the world will descend into increasing authoritarianism and or Ape-Anomie Chaos, remains to be seen.

^{viii} Is P.K. OK here? Or are we just being very, very, very FUNNY!!!

^{ix} To me this quite clearly indicates that in terms of macro-historical causation, the West itself brought itself to this point, inter alia, through (first in part but significantly Protestantisation), massification, atomisation, urbanisation, industrialisation, feminisation, secularisation, commodification, monetisation, faggotisation, Otherisation, negrification, Zio-lobotomisation, etc., etc., etc., and that the fact in recent decades there is undoubted factual GROSSLY DISPROPORTIONATE involvement of a particular – subjectively seen as a matter of Taste – HIDEOUS GROUP at elite level, has little to do with macro-historical causation qua multiple long-term chains of causation based on innumerable interrelations, interactions and the macro-historical operation of the Heterogony of Ends and the continual waves of unintended consequences ensuing therefrom.

^x This is one of the reasons I keep on saying that for as long as “I shop, I consume garbage, therefore I am” continues, and there is no major breakthrough in what is an accepted part of public discourse, things are looking very, very, very GRIM – to say the least – for the Remainder of Westernish “culture or civilisation”.

^{xi} This means that relations of power are ultimately behind all forms of meaning.

^{xii} Which of course is a perfect opportunity for Satan and Satan's representatives to do what they “have to do” in order to destroy everything valued by an increasingly smaller “majority”, or rather by now minority, given that

at least half of the remaining whites have gone over to the APE, i.e. they are blind to APE-ANOMIE (even when they experience it personally!), and think in line with SATAN.

^{xiii} This can happen to migrants and their children too, though in my case it was never an identity crisis but a reality of having to “live fake” in the sense of engaging in theatre and role play over and above the role play people ordinarily engage in when they live in their “natural” cultural environment.

^{xiv} The first volume of *De la démocratie en Amérique* (= *Democracy in America*) was published in 1835, and Tocqueville had spent 9 months in America in 1831 (about 80 years before it became apparent that things in the USA had started to get out of control with *them*), when the “multi-national” mix was – as far as whites were concerned – British Anglophone-based, with some Irish and other Northern Europeans. Let’s not forget that the great Frenchman viewed “democracy” – as was common from ancient times up to about the end of the 19th century or up to about WW2 at the latest (grosso modo) – as a whole social/sociological phenomenon, and not just as a “system” or form of government.

^{xv} If one is able to study P.K.’s *Decline...* then it becomes very clear how the mobilising, interchanging force of the mass culture from the early 20th century contains within it the germ and sperm of racial replacement, since it is not at all concerned as a matter of guiding, fixed principle, with history, continuity and biology-ancestry, in the course of “mixing everything up” in society. Hence, you arrive at present-day circumstances (under the aegis of ZIO-USA geopolitical, military and cultural imperialism or hegemony, if you prefer) where the Satanic Circus Monkey People do their Primitive Secret Society networking amongst the elite incl. re the Mass Media of SATAN, and nearly everyone else has been fairly easily Bamboozled into thinking that the average newly arrived African Black and or Mohammedan is the same as the average native White, whose ancestors have been White for up to thousands of years in a particular region of Europe, whilst the Satanic Circus Monkey Compound/Bunker keeps its Borders Fully SHUT. This will almost certainly “end” in a Disaster for everyone, and if I were Chinese I’d keep on reminding myself not to get too complacent, but I still would not be able to stop LAUGHING!!!

^{xvi} That in itself means the end of the European-based West. So, if you want to survive as a white-based ethnicity in Europe, you’re going to have to get a hell of a lot of things done, and I personally don’t see how you’re going to ever make it. Things have already gone way too far, people in general are way too Zombified or Zio-Lobotomised, for enough people to wake up. The elite – which obviously is the most crucial group you need to get on-board – seems to be either fully ZIO-compliant or simply not interested in anything other than continuing the current regime of profits year-in, year-out. So, inevitably, the jolts to the “system” are going to have to come from without – but when? And will it be way too late by then, anyway?

^{xvii} Think about it. If whole peoples can “chuck out” centuries of traditions, beliefs, customs, etc., based on certain social-economic fundamental changes pertaining to mass production and mass consumption (“I shop crap, therefore I am ZIO-LOBOTOMISED RETARD”), why wouldn’t they completely Zio-Lobotomise themselves and “chuck out” their attachment to racial-identity continuity?