

### III. The ethical veneers of liberal utopia

#### 1. Universalism, relativism and tolerance<sup>i</sup>

This is another P.K. “tour de force”, absolutely unique in theory, and apparently it will be published at:

<http://journal.telospress.com/>

later in 2018 or in 2019. If it’s not, I’ll translate it with the greatest of pleasure!

Some major points (I’ve used words and phrases P.K. would never use, so you need to read the full article, properly translated!):

Of great interest is the relationship between tolerance and universalism and relativism, that latter two being ancient, whereas tolerance is a product of the European New Times.

Initially, tolerance in favour of Reason turned against theology.

Reason, however, was still tied to what is ethical so that nihilism and libertarianism could not become accusations against the advocates of Reason.

P.K. provides us with another one of his not infrequent hilarious comments, this time regarding theology in the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

The social context of mass democracy is given.

Self-realisation, having triumphed over Christian asceticism, was accompanied by an uprising against the “totalitarianism of Reason”.

P.K. then goes into the modus operandi of combining tolerance both with universalism *and* with relativism!

There are real-world practical reasons why relativism has rarely ever wanted to take the form of consistent nihilism.

Relativism against universalism, universal principles against specific ethics.

Both sides of the “Reason”-relativism debate have accepted pluralism and tolerance; each claims it is the better means to achieve such tolerance.

Universal understanding does not mean universal values.

Communicative action talks of “rationality” and “language”, but conveniently forgets anthropology.

Panhuman characteristics does not equate with universal agreement on norms.

All that applied universalism could ever achieve, e.g. everyone living in one “global village”, is the conversion of all wars into civil wars.

Only an ideologue (and or retard) would ever believe that war-free or conflict-free utopia is achievable.

On the other hand, neither does the acknowledgement of the relativity of positionings (perspectives) and values as an empirically verifiable Is guarantee any Ought per se as the “post-modern” cretins believe.

In practice, tolerance (incl. “human dignity”) becomes a dominant ideology and is not applied because tolerance qua tolerance arises from relativism.

The “end of ideologies” is part of mass democracy’s own ideological self-understanding.

Between universalistic and relativistic positions, mass democratic and planetary-globalist ideology engages in polemics, but cannot or does not want to see its fundamental contradictions.

At the end of the day, Western mass democracy is tolerant of other cultures, but always with a hierarchisation of cultures for the benefit of the West (and once such tolerance is not of benefit,...).

There is no one fixed objective, scientific method.

One can neither draw normative results from historical-relativistic consideration, nor will universalistic perceptions ever be able to satisfactorily explain historical praxis.

---

<sup>i</sup> The original German titles (the article was published twice: in a philosophical journal (1996) and in the *FAZ* newspaper (1994)) were: „Universalismus, Relativismus und Toleranz in der westlichen Massendemokratie und in ihrem geistigen Leben“ (= “Universalism, relativism and tolerance in Western mass democracy and in its intellectual(-spiritual) life”), and, „Ohne Wahrheitsanspruch keine Toleranz“ (= “Without a truth claim (claim to truth), no tolerance”) [translator’s endnote].