

## Political Correctness as “Culture Industry” and “Revolt of the Masses”

Namely,

*The banalization of a revolutionary movement*

Lawrence C. Chin

Key words: the McDonaldization of psychiatry; political correctness as banalization of counter-culture.

### NOTICE

We have, here and before, always used the term “political correctness” in a broader, and deeper, sense. The usual sense is a certain euphemism and respectful language and opinion toward categories of people deemed “victims of oppression”. For example, Marvin J. Folkertsma, a proponent of the religious right in the United States, begins his essay “Political Correctness and Religious Freedom”<sup>1</sup> with the following description of “political correctness”:

A specter is haunting freedom of speech in America, the specter of political correctness, much like its communist counterpart haunted Europe in the nineteenth century according to Karl Marx’s fevered imagination. What is political correctness? It is the application of linguistic rules designed to banish certain words and ways of thought from the public sphere and to replace them with expressions that meet the approval of political, academic, and media elites. Indeed, it is difficult for ordinary citizens to go about their everyday lives without encountering many examples of political correctness. Thus, for instance, a morning news broadcast reveals that an illegal alien is now referred to as an “undocumented immigrant”; a new handicap apparatus at one’s workplace is designed for the “differently abled”; and suffering from mental retardation means that one is “intellectually challenged.” Perhaps worse, one reads or hears that the American flag is being banned someplace because a few observers might object; and your child returns from school teary eyed because of a policy that equates munching on a pop tart in a fashion that makes it resemble a pistol constitutes grounds for suspension.

In the other two classics on American political correctness which we have consulted during the preparation of this communication, Annette Gomis van Heteren’s *Political Correctness in Context: The PC Controversy in America* (1997) and Richard Feldstein’s *Political*

---

1 At the Center for Vision and Values at the Grove City College: <http://visionandvalues.org/docs/abused/Folkertsma.pdf?cbb716>.

*Correctness: A Response from the Cultural Left* (Foreword by Teresa Brennan), the term is also at first used to refer to the code of speech and opinion devised in order for the “dominant group” to not hurt the feelings and sensibilities of the “oppressed groups” – although, in the work of Gomis van Heteren, it eventually comes to refer to the whole “victim culture” which underlies the said code of speech and opinion, which thus comes close to our use of the term.

We mean by “political correctness” the whole world view (the total conception of how social reality works and what social justice is) behind the euphemism and code of language and opinions that are required. We call it “political correctness” when, as it has happened in our story, nobody in the criminal justice system – the public defenders, the district attorneys, and the judges – is capable of imagining that a male might be the victim of a female's stalking or aggression. We call it “political correctness” when women *must* be imagined to be the “victim” and smart and soft-hearted and morally superior and men the “aggressor” and stupid and self-centered, etc. We call it “political correctness” when you are banished from academia for publishing researches showing that women are not particularly disadvantaged in American society or thrown off stage when you deny that “women are victims” in the Western world. We call it “political correctness” when the most important thing in the world has become “compensating victims” and “protecting them” rather than “developing human talents” (“victimology”, the “sacralization of victims”). With such a “generalized” conception, we are still keeping ourselves within the classic definition such as that of Morris Dickstein: “PC, a form of groupthink fueled by paranoia and demonology and imposed by political or social intimidation” (cited by Gomis van Heteren, *ibid.*, p. 32). This “groupthink” extends to the perception of how reality is and works, such as the perception that women are good and gentle and victimized and their de-victimization would benefit not just women themselves but the world at large – which perception, as “groupthink”, is imposed through force. (We have been leaving aside the political correctness regarding the victim status of ethnic minorities for reasons which you shall soon understand.) Our framework here remains that of “Historical Materialism”: we assert that “political correctness” – the restraint which the so-designated “dominant group” in a society has, under the pressure of a whole new view on how social reality works, imposed upon themselves to prevent themselves from continuing to hurt or oppress the “victim groups” – is a phenomenon found chiefly in Western societies – in North America and Western Europe – not just because it is these countries which have attracted, and permitted, immigration, but essentially because Western societies are more economically advanced than the rest of the world, i.e. because their free-market capitalism is more advanced along the path toward consumerism and is the center of world commerce or globalization,<sup>2</sup> so that “political correctness”, as a *dispositif* of consumerism, emerges here

---

2 As we have persistently noted, although Japan is as advanced economically as North America and Western Europe, it is not considered part of the “center region” of globalization, so that “political correctness” has never taken hold there. Japan today remains “politically incorrect”, and is still arguing with China and South Korea over the issues of “Nanjing Massacre” and “Comfort Women”. Japan has recently (28 December 2015) apologized to South Korea over the

but not elsewhere in the world.

In this communication, we shall continue our two principal preoccupations. The first is the debunking of American political correctness and, with it, the debunking of American soft-power which is ultimately constructed around the attractiveness of American political correctness to peoples of the rest of the world who don't know any better. This shall have important implications for nations and parties (principally China and Russia, but also increasingly the European far right parties) which are attempting to build an alternative to the American model of liberal democracy coupled with neoliberal free-market enterprise. (The implications are derived from the fact that the “American model” is founded essentially on political correctness.) The debunking that is continued here does not say anything radically new but shall deepen our earlier communications – those in which we have pleaded Russia to expand its national agenda in the world (or its world-historical mission) and rebuild its soft-power through debunking American political correctness and halting its export to the rest of the world. Although Russia may be said to be doing this at this very moment by asserting itself as the principal embodiment of Christianity among all nations around the world, we find Russia's approach unsatisfactory because presenting another “convention” (that of the religious right) vis-à-vis the liberal and secular “convention” which the United States has presented to the world does not entail transcendence of the American way. (More on this in the end.)

Secondly, we intend to continue our twin objectives of enabling the European far right parties, especially the National Front in France and the Alternative für Deutschland in Germany, to recruit constituencies among the traditional left and encouraging them to enrich their agendas with our issues (the deterioration of the human brain under the American way of life – under American political correctness and the American way of efficiency, i.e. increasing bureaucratization and fundamentalist literalism or what is known as “McDonaldization”). The European far right parties can be said to be seeking an alternative to American-centered global capitalism or neoliberalism, and, along the way, to have found themselves battling instances of political correctness which the European (Bilderberg) elites have imported from the United States as part of the neoliberal package. Insofar as the instances they are struggling against (the United States of Europe, *immigration en masse*, Gender Mainstreaming, and globalization) are all more or less projections of the American left, our debunking of this American left (American political correctness), itself conducted from a leftist standpoint, should, when resulting in congruences with the far right, have persuaded those on the left to join the far right. Namely, a common front between the left and the right against the American Way. Our view has always been that, in Europe, the “enlightened left” – as soon as the left is enlightened like we are – should find it natural to support the far right.

“Debunking” means the exposé of the evil represented by American political correctness, principally the death of the human brain and the exhaustion of the earth's natural resources base. Again, we have

---

“Comfort Women” issue only under US pressure requiring Japan to form a strategic alliance with South Korea against China. The fact that Japan, a country among the most economically and technologically advanced nations in the world, has never developed political correctness among its population is an interesting topic for another specialized monograph.

already tried to work on such exposé in our previous communications; we shall here do no more than supplement and deepen what we have already said, especially by bringing more classical leftist thinkers into comparison. Our objective remains the destruction of American soft-power and the creation of an alternative in order to prevent the spread of this American virus, and this, in order to save humanity's future. While, when China, Russia, and the European far right try to create an alternative to the American system, their motive is geopolitical (to resist American domination and colonization which American political correctness subserves), our interest in them arises from our desire to save humanity, seeing them as forces already available to stop the spread of American virus.

### **Comparison with Theodor Adorno and Jose Ortega y Gasset**

Our political and geopolitical aims aside, we are also here pursuing our personal objective of supplementing our previous writings (both *A Thermodynamic Interpretation of History* and *The Secret History*). We were originally motivated to compose this new communication when we reread the classics of two great thinkers venerated on the left, Theodor Adorno and Jose Ortega y Gasset, and discovered the extraordinary similarity of their descriptions to what we have wanted to say about political correctness and the politically correct human beings. We feel compelled to bring their descriptions into comparison as a way to supplement and deepen ours. Before we begin, we shall say a word or two on any possible application of Adorno and Ortega y Gasset to a better understanding of American political correctness.

The classics in question are, of course, *Dialektik der Aufklärung* (especially the essay on Kulturindustrie) and *La Rebelión de las Masas*. Both Adorno and Ortega y Gasset were reacting against the rise of mass society in Western nations, the rise of the masses or the appearance of the “Mass Man” and “Mass Woman”. While neither of the two thinkers were dealing with political correctness – insofar as political correctness did not exist in the 1920s and 1940s – all three of us are essentially describing the same thing although at different times (1920s, 1940s, and 2010s), i.e., those ordinary stupid people whom you see all around you. Hence the similarity. We assert that this darling of the left, “political correctness”, is no more than the convention, “groupthink”, of ordinary stupid people in a liberal society, the essential characteristic of “Mass Woman” and “Mass Man” in the postmodern age, or the era of saturated global consumerism. Political correctness belongs, along with the McDonaldization of institutional functioning and human understanding on which it has founded itself, to the manifestations of a mass society which has evolved into the late stages of consumerism. It happens when the revolutionary ethics and moral enlightenment about social injustice – what has previously supposedly represented a magnificent intellectual progress which a given human social collective has achieved – has become mainstream and banalized, in the process coming to serve some other purpose than social justice, even, as in United States, a new form of *social injustice* which is required for the efficient functioning of a saturated consumerist economy. Political correctness then becomes the mechanism by which the “Mass Woman” and “Mass Man” impose a false notion of social reality and thereby perpetuate a new hierarchical structure of domination and submission which subserves their society's function in the global free market.

Our “deconstruction” and “exposition” consist in no more than a proper, phenomenological, description of political correctness, i.e. letting the “thing” show itself. It is then that, we hope, our leftwing audience will see what horrifying, irrational, thing s/he has always believed to be the “right thing”. What Ortega and Adorno (together with Horkheimer) were doing in their classics consists also in no more than making a phenomenological description of what they have seen and experienced, the disgusting “Mass Man” in one case and the domination which this “Mass Man” experiences under the cultural condition of his mass society in the other. It is because the contemporary political correctness offers itself as more or less the same object as that with which Ortega and Adorno were concerned – the proud, but unthinking, human being who takes herself or himself to be enlightened and always in the right and who perpetuates a system of domination and subjection – that critical theories and their precursors should look so similar to a debunking of political correctness – even though, as Folkertsma (ibid.) has attempted to show, the originators of political correctness were precisely inspired by critical theories. As the former revolutionaries against oppression have become the perpetrators of a new system oppression – as has happened in virtually every revolution in history – it is time to be critical of the system which has originated from critical theories. It is our firm conviction that those authorities venerated by those on the left – in this case, Ortega y Gasset and Adorno – would have themselves regarded, were they alive today, those values which the liberals nowadays hold dear as pure evil – which is to say that political correctness is morality and way of being appertaining to the majority who are idiots, not to the intelligent elite. We hope, again, that the intellectuals among the left, via our communications, can be awakened to the fact that it accords with the tendencies of the left – the veneration of reason and a disgust for unreasonable oppression of human beings and mindless exploitation of the earth – to answer the call to support the politically incorrect agendas of the European far right.

### **Adorno on Enlightenment as “fundamentalism”**

You have seen our previous, persistent, preoccupations with the natural death of human inventions through fundamentalist fossilization. In this first section we must continue refining our description of this phenomenon since it constitutes the background for our description of political correctness – insofar as this American invention called “political correctness” is nothing other than the fundamentalist fossilization of what is originally revolutionary (i.e. what originally exhibits great originality and creativity). In the same way, Adorno and Horkheimer begin their *Dialektik* with a description of the rationalist tendencies inherent in Enlightenment which is very similar to our description of the fundamentalist tendencies inherent in all postmodern life before they move onto “Kulturindustrie” as the fundamentalist death (in the sense of crushing all development of human potentials) of what is originally completely liberating (“culture” and “art” in the sense of enabling the complete development of human potentials). Adorno's classic is directed toward a phenomenological description of the post-modern life, showing how the pervasive domination of human beings works in a supposedly free society and how this signifies that Enlightenment is entering its self-destruction phase. While both we and Adorno are describing the same thing, we describe these things somewhat differently. We have been describing the death of Enlightenment through the reduction of discourse about reality to its literal wording – “fundamentalism” – and, concomitantly, the brain-death of the

human being under Enlightenment's technical mastery of such sort. Meanwhile, Adorno and Horkheimer have described Enlightenment thinking as containing within itself an inherent tendency toward something that is like our “fundamentalism”. It is because each thinker describes the same phenomenon from a different standpoint in time and space that their description of the same phenomenon differs and yet is very similar. We believe, again, that, were Adorno alive today, he would have described our contemporary life (fundamentalism and political correctness) in much the same way as we do.

In the “phenomenology of political correctness” which follows, we shall proceed likewise: first, we shall lay down the pitfalls of Enlightenment thinking which constitute the prelude to the first kind of “fundamentalism”, the reduction of discourse about reality to its literal wording, resulting in a simplified representation which has lost the capacity to capture reality in all its complexity. In this connection we compare Adorno and Horkheimer's prelude, “Begriffe der Aufklärung”. We then proceed to a description of a second kind of fundamentalism that constitutes the “political correctness” under discussion, where the discourse, reduced to its literal wording, continues unchanged while the reality it used to represent has disappeared altogether, resulting in a self-contained representation system, completely imaginary, in which its participants are ensnared, becoming completely divorced from the true reality. It is in this connection that we shall compare Adorno's understanding of “Kulturindustrie”. After this, we shall describe “political correctness” as the contemporary version of “Kulturindustrie” – what the conservatives refer to as the “domination of the media and universities by the liberals” – and consider the new system of domination of human beings which this “culture industry” perpetuates, i.e. white women's control of American society, at least in American coastal regions (“blue states”). After this, we shall move into a comparison with Ortega y Gasset's *La Rebelión de las Masas*. We shall then wonder whether political correctness represents the loss of that balance in the dialectic between the masses and the elites which Ortega y Gasset has taken to be the primary ingredient in the healthy functioning of any human society. Lastly, we shall comment briefly on our most important concern, the American export of political correctness to the rest of the world as a way to export American consumerism and poison the whole humanity.

In the first essay of their classic, “Begriffe der Aufklärung”, Adorno and Horkheimer describe, and lament, the process set going since Enlightenment, specifically how “technical reasoning” or “instrumental rationality” – the engineering mindset which first originates with Francis Bacon and the Enlightenment<sup>3</sup> – has overshadowed all other forms of reasoning to become the only mode of thinking

---

3 (Rev. July 2016) In the understanding of Adorno we are helped by several commentaries. The most important is J. M. Bernstein's introduction to the English edition of Adorno, *Culture Industry* (Routledge, 1991). Another is Jens Röcher, “T. W. Adorn: Resümee über die Kulturindustrie” (2009: <http://sozioblog.de/t-w-adorno-resumee-uber-die-kulturindustrie/>). Then, Adorno's own “Résumé über Kulturindustrie”, T. Adorno, GS 10.1, s. 337ff. Note that “instrumental rationality” (*instrumentelle Vernunft, instrumentelle Rationalisierung*), used also by Bernstein in his introduction, is the term originally devised by Horkheimer. See Habermas' summary in *Theorie des kommunikativen Handelns*, IV, Von Lukacs zu Adorno: Rationalisierung als Verdinglichung. Horkheimer was trying to describe the same characteristic which Max Weber has noted as essential to modernization, i.e. “rationalization” (*Rationalisierung*). “Rationalisierung” roughly corresponds to my notion of “fundamentalism” in both my Scientific Enlightenment and here. As shall be noted, I'm primarily interested in explaining this “Rationalisierung” which has characterized

in today's world. The entire process runs from modernity to post-modernity and traces out the life-cycle of Enlightenment from birth to death. We are interested in the description of Adorno and Horkheimer to the extent that “technical reasoning” or “instrumental rationality” is the root cause of all forms of McDonaldization, specifically “fundamentalism” and “bureaucratization”.

The essence of the new mindset which has originated since Enlightenment lies in the increasing drive for domination (of nature, of the object of consciousness). Adorno and Horkheimer compare the mythical and magical mindset of the primitives which Enlightenment denigrates with the new mindset of Enlightenment in order to trace out the evolution from the former to the latter: first, the gradual isolation of consciousness from its object (“Zur Ablösung der ortsgebundenen Praktiken des Medizinmanns durch die allumspannende industrielle Technik bedurfte es erst der Verselbständigung der Gedanken gegenüber den Objekten, wie sie im realitätsgerechten Ich vollzogen wird”; *Dialektik der Aufklärung*, p. 17) and then the increasing focus on the word at the expense of its meaning (“Auf dem Weg zur neuzeitlichen Wissenschaft leisten die Menschen auf Sinn Verzicht. Sie ersetzen den Begriff durch die Formel, Ursache durch Regel und Wahrscheinlichkeit”; p. 11). With this operation, the Enlightenment consciousness then proceeds with the more general operation to subsume all particulars under the universal, whereby consciousness achieves total domination of its object in the conceptual realm.<sup>4</sup> This tendency within “instrumental rationality” is the prelude to the “fundamentalism” with which we are so concerned, the degeneration to mere repeating of words without understanding their meanings. In the beginning, Enlightenment has developed in this way in order to enable the dissection of nature down to its constituents' common denominator to reveal the causal mechanisms, and this, in order to facilitate the development of the technical means (technology) to manipulate it and control it. However distasteful this may sound for a leftist revolutionary, such mindset marks the emergence of an autonomous, fully self-conscious human subject for whom freedom is at last possible (i.e. the human subject who has developed his human potential to a far greater extent than the primitive man immersed in his magics). This Enlightenment liberation however would congeal, within a few hundred years, into “culture industry” in which all possibility of liberation (all possible blossoming of the human potential) is suppressed. The concern of Adorno and Horkheimer is with Enlightenment's self-destruction after it has gone through its period of maturity: the same phenomenon of a “life cycle”.<sup>5</sup> This development of a life-cycle from maturity to decay, as we shall

---

modernity by way of the German Romantic model of growth and decay, whereas Weber, Lukacs, and Horkheimer would like to explain it in another way. In any case, while I have subsequently characterized the tendency in contemporary American psychiatry toward “rationalization” (i.e. literal interpretation of the DSM) in terms of “decay”, it is equally possible to explain this “McDonaldization” in the way of Horkheimer, Lukacs, and Weber, i.e. the literalist tendency reflects the objectification (*Verdinglichung*) of DSM diagnostic categories.

- 4 C.f. Bernstein, “Subsumptive or instrumental rationality disregards the intrinsic properties of things, those properties that give each thing its sensuous, social and historical particularity, for the sake of the goals and purposes of the subject – originally self-preservation itself. Thus, such a rationality must treat unlike (unequal) things as like (equal), and subsumes objects under (the unreflective drive of) subjects. Subsumption, then, is domination in the conceptual realm” (Introduction, p. 5).
- 5 “Es geht nicht um die Kultur als Wert, wie die Kritiker der Zivilisation, Huxley, Jaspers, Ortega y Gasset und andere, im Sinn haben, sondern die Aufklärung muß sich auf sich selbst besinnen, wenn die Menschen nicht vollends verraten werden sollen. Nicht um die Konservierung der Vergangenheit, sondern um die Einlösung der vergangenen Hoffnung ist es zu tun. Heute aber setzt die Vergangenheit sich fort als Zerstörung der Vergangenheit.” (Vorrede, p. 5.)

demonstrate presently, also characterizes the moral development of the social collective (from counter-culture and civil rights movement to political correctness).

We want to make it plain that it is this “technical reasoning” or “instrumental rationality” which leads directly to the first kind of “fundamentalism” in our description. For example – to reflect on our story, the “philosopher suspect and the One Dimensional Women” – the reduction of criminal profiling from a holistic understanding of the target person's personality (the old-fashioned way from the 1970s, such as is still seen in John H. Campbell and Don DeDevi ed., *Profilers*, 2004) to “check-listing” of a few stereotypical behavioral traits which the target person seems to display (such as is currently in vogue in America's “homeland security industrial complex”) is essentially the forgetfulness of “meaning” (*Sinn*), “concept” (*Begriff*), and “cause” (*Ursache*) in favor of mere words, “formulas” (*Formel*), and “rules” (*Regel*), which then causes widespread mis-diagnosis. The problem is caused by an attempt to reduce a complex system<sup>6</sup> to a simple, linear system for easier comprehension and management, i.e. by a desire to achieve greater domination of the object in the conceptual realm. Namely, while “formulas” and “words” work quite well in the description of simpler systems (just like the differential equations which have successfully described the trajectory of a flying object or even the forward movement of waters), they prove insufficient to describe more complex systems. (“Check-listing” to diagnose mental illness, which we shall consider shortly, is just like the application of differential equations to a nonlinear, complex systems, in which there are no coherent patterns appearing within the definable period of time.) But this means that, when a more complex mathematical model can eventually be devised to describe a complex, non-linear system, “technical reasoning” is not inherently insufficient but is insufficient *currently* only because it has not yet been fully developed. Unfortunately, however: “Was dem Mass von Berechenbarkeit und Nützlichkeit sich nicht fügen will, gilt der Aufklärung für verdächtig” (Adorno and Horkheimer, *ibid.*, p. 12). Whenever the simple “check-listing” cannot capture the complex personality in question, the diagnostician would simply pretend that it could and dismiss the possibility that the object of inquiry could be more than what has been check-listed. There is no attempt to develop the “check-listing” into a more complex form nor any desire to resort to the holistic understanding formerly in use because the diagnostician's mind has become too simplified to be able to comprehend anything more complex. Thus, because of the simplification of the human mind in our postmodern age, what is formerly a quite describable ordinary phenomenon has become “complex phenomenon” that is not even acknowledged to exist.

Here we see how the pitfalls inherent in Enlightenment thinking (the need to dominate the object of inquiry even when the mind is clearly not up for the task) lead to a fundamentalist system of understanding which essentially misunderstands, or can't understand very much. Now we want to return to one of the principal themes in our story, the disintegration of psychiatric diagnosis in the American system, to fully illustrate this first kind of fundamentalism. Here has Enlightenment's “technical thinking” or “instrumental rationality” been fully developed in psychiatry to destroy it. Just as in everywhere else, “check-listing” is now the standard procedure in American psychiatry and is the cause for so much mis-diagnosis, making psychiatry into a truly ridiculous enterprise. Consider for example the diagnosis of schizophrenia. One of the criteria for the diagnosis of schizophrenia is the

---

6 Such as those systems studied in complexity theory for which, for instance, the Santa Fe Institute is famous.



patient's display of “delusion”:

“Delusions... are erroneous beliefs that usually involve a misinterpretation of perceptions or experiences. Their content may include a variety of themes (e.g., persecutory, referential, somatic, religious, or grandiose). Persecutory delusions are most common; the person believes he or she is being tormented, followed, tricked, spied on, or ridiculed.”

The psychiatric authorities have further analyzed delusions into bizarre and non-bizarre types.

“Delusions are deemed bizarre if they are clearly implausible and not understandable and do not derive from ordinary life experiences. An example of a bizarre delusion is a person's belief that a stranger has removed his or her internal organs and has replaced them with someone else's organs without leaving any wounds or scars. An example of a nonbizarre delusion is a person's *false* belief that he or she is under surveillance by the police.” (DSM-IV, emphasis added.)

If you have any experience with somebody suffering schizophrenia, you will know that these words are meant to describe a whole thicket of experience which the patient is undergoing, i.e. the patient is a “complex system”. In our story, however, you have seen countless instances where the group of gang-stalking women sends somebody to follow their suspect so that, when the suspect notices it and writes on online forums that the women have sent people to follow and spy on him, they can take the writing to their district attorney or law enforcement officer saying, “See, he suffers from paranoia schizophrenia, he says we have sent people to follow him and spy on him, this is (nonbizarre, persecutory) 'delusion' if you check your DSM, which is a symptom of schizophrenia.” If any psychiatrist were present, s/he would agree that the suspect indeed suffers from schizophrenia because one of the principal criteria for diagnosis has been “check-listed” – even though s/he has never even seen the suspect or interacted with him in any way beyond seeing him writing, “The women have sent somebody to follow me.” Just like how the Creationists read the first few pages of the Book of Genesis, i.e. *literally*, the law enforcement authority and the psychiatrist are supposed to focus on the suspect's *literal* fulfillment of the diagnostic criteria, ignoring the circumstances under which he has produced the statement (the “symptom of delusional disorder”). When the thicket of meaning is ignored in such fundamentalist procedure, the complex system is treated like a simple system, resulting in mis-diagnosis – i.e. the fact is overlooked that the suspect has in fact *not* satisfied the diagnostic criterion because his belief about being followed is *not false*. But such fundamentalist procedure is nowadays the accepted, standard procedure in American psychiatry.<sup>7</sup>

---

7 It is fitting here to recall another instance from our story to illustrate mis-diagnosis of another kind. The suspect knows that he has come under law enforcement surveillance thanks to the false reporting of his women adversaries. These surveillance agents typically wear earphones and behave in a certain suspicious way, such as standing inside the coffeehouse carrying nothing and doing nothing in particular. There then comes into the coffeehouse a guy who wears earphones and carries nothing, etc. The suspect says this guy is a surveillance agent here to watch over him. It turns out that he is wrong. The guy is either a “decoy” that is sent in to confuse him, or somebody irrelevant. Now the suspect has fulfilled *literally* the diagnostic criterion of “delusion” again. But he is in fact not delusional; he is just wrong. He has made a mistake. The literal application of the diagnostic criteria conflates wrong judgment with delusions. Within this

Let's review our previous description, in our story, of the currently reigning “fundamentalism” in American psychiatry (in connection with a certain “Dr P” and her patient “Feefee”) before we move on to more examples that connect with the same problem in political correctness.

### **How mass participation has destroyed the mental health system in the US**

(From “Subhuman meets...” Document B)

Dr P rejected Feefee as her client today... Dr P thought him a dangerous paranoid schizophrenic [for believing having once being targeted by intelligence agencies] of whom she needed to rid herself...

Dr P’s problem is exactly what Feefee has said about most mental health workers. Recall what the problem is: why is it that when he read the earlier DSMs, like DSM-III or DSM-IV, he could see the descriptions of mental and personality disorders fit so well his case (Schizotypal and Borderline Personality Disorder) and the cases of others whom he had met or heard of, and yet that, whenever he came into the view of real mental health professionals, they consistently misdiagnosed him, typically as schizophrenia and delusional disorders, when he clearly was of sound mind and high mental functioning? If the very Western conception of mental illness is not bogus, what is going on? The truth is that Dr P was just like all the typical mental health professionals, and had never understood mental illness and human psychology but was simply practicing fundamentalism with her DSM-IV in the same way in which some evangelicals practice fundamentalism with their Bible. If a person’s surface behavior and words fit the literal description of a mental illness in DSM-IV, then the person is considered to suffer that mental illness and there is no need to explore further to see if, behind his words and behavior, the cause might be something else. Fundamentalism – the literal understanding of a text – is prevalent because it is easier than actually using your head. Just as is noted earlier, because of the decline of the higher education system (world-wide, but especially in America), most of the mental health professionals who come out of their “education” and “training” have no understanding of human psychology or mental illness; they are only capable of remembering, and repeating, the literal descriptions of mental illnesses which the earlier generation of mental health experts have laid down on papers, in the DSM – much like the ancient Hindus who, the Sanskrit language having already died as a spoken language, memorized, and repeated, every word of the sacred Vedas, but without any understanding of what the rhythmic words meant at all.

This fundamentalism is really the foundation for the more general corruptions in mental health practices which many have complained about, including insiders. The problem of fundamentalism, in every domain, has been a major preoccupation in *Scientific Enlightenment* – the problem that, after a while, the substance of a tradition (its experiential

---

more simplified procedures, there is no room for “incorrect judgment”.

content) is no longer understood by the next generations, who could only mindlessly repeat its words and formulas without understanding their meaning. It is one of the principal themes in Eric Voegelin's study of the history of philosophy (*Order of History*); and also the object of analysis in the chapters on the origin of Protestantism in *A Thermodynamic Interpretation of History* and *Scientific Enlightenment*. Every insightful scholar or intellectual has noticed this kind of degeneration in his or her respective domain. It even happens in revolutionary politics. An example is Trotsky's complaint against revolutionaries' degeneration to fundamentalism only a few years after the October Revolution, which he made explicit in his famous pamphlet, *The New Course*.

This was a somewhat cryptic attack on 'officialdom' in his own department, the army, 'and elsewhere'. The vices of officialdom, he wrote, show themselves when people 'cease to think things through; when they smugly employ conventional phrases without reflecting on what they mean; when they give the customary orders without asking if they are rational; when they take fright at every new word, every criticism, every initiative, every sign of independence...' ...Then he drew a parallel between army and the party, especially between their attitudes towards tradition. The young communists stood in the same relation to the Old Guard as that in which the military subaltern stood to his superiors. In both the party and the army the young enter a ready-made organization which their elders had to build from scratch. Here and there tradition is therefore of 'vast importance' – without it there can be no progress. 'But tradition is not a rigid canon or an official manual; it cannot be learned by heart or accepted as gospel; not everything the old generation says can be believed merely 'upon its word of honor'. On the contrary, tradition must, so to speak, be conquered by internal travail; it must be worked out by oneself in a critical manner and in that way assimilated. Otherwise the whole structure will be built on sand...'<sup>8</sup>

In this way of speaking, the problem with the newer generations of mental health professionals is simply that they have never "conquered" their forerunners' insights into human psychopathology with "internal travail". In the case of the Hindus, because the very language in which the wisdom is encoded is dead, the only way for posterity to preserve the tradition is to force them to memorize the mere sounds of the language coding that wisdom. DSM-III and DSM-IV are not bogus inventions; Feefee was not, as noted, "anti-psychiatry". He had always been impressed by the insights into human psychology (or psychopathology) contained in the manuals. Psychiatry might have had an awkward beginning in Freudians until the 1960s; but, when DSM-III unveiled itself in 1980, it was indeed a demonstrated mastery of the fundamental templates of human psychology or psychopathology (like Platonic ideas) which are replicated in each individual pathological human being. This fact is quite apparent in Hannah Decker's *The Making of DSM-III: A*

---

<sup>8</sup> Issac Deutscher, *The Prophet Unarmed*, p. 119 – 120,

*Diagnostic Manual's Conquest of American Psychiatry* (Oxford University Press, 2013), which describes the complicated history of the composition of the revolutionary DSM-III. The DSM-III achieved the mastery when its authors (Robert Spitzer and the Task Team he had assembled) reacted against the psychoanalysts and decided on a purely descriptive classification of the observed mental disorders. The dozen or so psychiatrists involved had mastered the “templates”, not by virtue of some superior theoretical orientation vis-à-vis psychoanalysis, but simply by virtue of sheer experience with dealing with a vast number of pathological individuals. In other words, when you are in a position to meet enough sick people, you cannot help but notice certain patterns emerging; without being a genius, but merely by describing the patterns, you will have mastered certain fundamental patterns or templates underlying all human (sick) behavior (just as, without much education in sociology and human psychology, a detective can understand the patterns of crimes in a society simply by being on the job for decades and seeing enough criminals committing crimes). This is the psychiatric “tradition”, or “wisdom” which the “ancestors” have accumulated through sheer experience (like the Vedas) and which it is the duty of the later generations to do more than simply memorize and repeat verbatim.

But, by 1990s, the brain of the later generations of students of psychology and psychiatry has already atrophied enough that they can no longer understand these templates... By this time consumerism has so simplified the human experience, and therefore the human brain, that the fundamental psychological templates which the earlier generations of psychologists have identified have become mere fictional entities to the current generations – just as, when the Sanskrit language in which ancestral wisdom was codified had been lost from Hindus' mind, the wisdom was mere words and could no longer evoke any experience. The current generation – like Dr P's – could do no more than remember the words and repeat them during examination, and it is thanks to the increasing laxation and bureaucratization of the American educational system that being merely able to repeat words without understanding their meaning – the experience the words are supposed to evoke in the readers – is enough to pass examination, get a degree, and obtain a license. Dr P has never figured out that she has never understood anything which lies behind the words she has repeated on her UCLA and state license examinations. There was simply no possible way for her to understand Feefee's enormously complex emotional structures – just as a dog will never understand why his master is getting up early each day and go out of the house, only to come back at night. Dr P and Feefee belonged to different species....

The decline to “fundamentalism” is linked to a second factor, “mass participation” in institutions. It is suggested that you look into those researches which show that, the more people take a standardized test, the lower the average score. The DSM-III has been a revolution; but, precisely because of this, its use has exploded beyond psychiatric specialists. It is now used by a whole army of psychologists of different grades, social workers, counselors, insurance administrators, etc. There are simply too many people participating in the mental health institutions, so that the quality of their functioning has

been completely destroyed, just as “mass education” has completely destroyed university education. It is simply a fact of life, a fact of nature, although it insults people: most people are of average intelligence, and shouldn’t have been allowed to go into expert fields. They should have just stayed home instead of going out into the world to mess up experts’ work. Fundamentalism in institutions is “bureaucratization”, and, in a way, fundamentalism/bureaucratization is designed to accommodate mass-participation in expert fields, allowing idiots to do expert works without using the brain which they don’t have. The desire for bureaucratization is natural. When human beings learn to do something, they will eventually want to make explicit their intuitive sense (the unspeakable “skills”) by thematizing them and reducing them to a series of rules, like how legislators attempt to codify morals into laws. The unspeakable “know-how” (skills) must be distilled, and represented, as a series of rules.<sup>9</sup> The reduction of “know-how” to formulas, codes, protocols, and check-lists” that are “fool-proof”, so that idiots, who don’t have the skill, and suffer brain-damage, can do (or look like they are doing) expert works simply by “following instructions” like a robot. The mis-diagnosis of Feefee occurred because the protocols which the mental health workers were trying to follow had simply prevented them from knowing Feefee at all. Dr W would never have misunderstood Feefee as delusional even though she was not a gifted psychologist because she wasn’t trying to follow any protocols. She listened to Feefee as he said whatever was on his mind, for many years, and therefore understood Feefee. But Dr P diagnosed Feefee as a paranoid schizophrenic after meeting him for six minutes because she was merely following protocols. Mass participation has brought into the mental health profession a vast number of “bureaucrats” of mediocre intelligence who were already incapable of understanding any complex personality; then the problem was made worse when the protocols they were following had further prevented them from knowing the patient at all. The problem that is exposed here – the fossilization of ancestor’s wisdoms into mere formalities, as formulas, codes, protocols, “check-lists”, without any experiential understanding, in order to allow institutions to function “fool proof” – must be intimately related to the UN Study Group’s concern for bureaucratization (Weber) and McDonaldization.... The fundamental problem of the postmodern consumerist society is precisely the fossilization of institutions which, originally, are supposed to connect human beings to the external reality and to one another, into mere formalities which have no longer any relationship with that external reality and human nature. The human social structure has degenerated into a self-contained, self-referential world geared toward an artificially created fantasy. It is not just in the mental health system, but in every institutions, whether research, business, or administrative, the worker enters it only in order to mindlessly perform fixed protocols and “check-lists”, without having to use their brain to understand anything which the language embedded in the protocols is originally trying to codify. Being a capable, responsible, functioning member of society means the ability to enter these institutions and perform these protocols like robots – required to not look into the problem of whether these protocols bear any relationships with reality. This is what lawyers do; but it’s okay in law because human laws

---

<sup>9</sup> Again, refer to Hubert Dreyfus’ commentary on Heidegger’s *Being and Time, Being-in-the-World*.

are never meant to be understood as part of the natural world anyway. And yet, today, even psychology professionals and scientific researchers are functioning like lawyers. The brain of the “responsible person” consequently atrophies, and dies, so that the “capable” person is precisely the one who is incapable of understanding anything.

Dr P has diagnosed her patient as suffering from schizophrenia within six minutes of meeting him for the first time because she has heard him describing being targeted by various intelligence agencies at one time, and because, once again, the patients' *words* fit the *literal wording* of the criterion of “delusion”: “Being followed, spied on, or under government surveillance.” All that experiences which her forerunners had accumulated in discerning the mental anguish of the patient and which they had summarized in the diagnostic criteria – all of that is non-existent with her. She merely “check-lists”, which the patient could have done it himself on a computer questionnaire without any expert being present. In the later part of our story, the suspect (the same Feefee) is in jail and undergoing mental evaluation for competency for trial. Dr T comes to jail for the task, and has 30 minutes to conduct an interview to decide whether the suspect is mentally competent to stand trial. Dr T asks the suspect about the various aspects of the trial, who's who and how it works. The suspect, being in fact of sound mind, of course answers all the questions just as any normal person can. Dr T is ready to judge the suspect mentally competent. Then he hears the suspect describing how he has the impression that persons in vehicles were driving past him to film him spraying graffiti on the streets and how he thinks that this is the investigators whom the witness in the case, one of the women with whom he is battling, has hired to find dirt on him. Dr T is alarmed; nevertheless, at the end of the interview, he has presumed the suspect mentally sound, and will only check his website as the last step in making his judgment. When Dr T sees the website, however, his ideas change. He reads the one chapter in which the suspect describes himself, and many others, being the victim of a certain brain-computer interface technology (electronic devices have been implanted inside his brain interfacing his brain activities with a computer system). Dr T thus diagnoses the suspect as suffering from schizophrenia, although he still judges him competent to stand trial since he is clearly fully aware of his environment and is thinking and deciding rationally to defend his interests.

While Dr P is clearly a phony – an unintelligent and uneducated (not well-read in other fields) American middle-class white woman who has obtained her degree and license by patiently memorizing words from textbooks and repeating them on exams: it's patience, not intelligence, which is required – this Dr T is an intelligent man of Indian descent who is well-read outside his fields as well. Nevertheless, he has mis-diagnosed his patient in the same way in which Dr P has *because he is required to follow established protocols, guidelines, and checklists rather than use his judgment*. This Dr T's psychiatric evaluation is thus the last piece of evidence to convince us that American psychiatry is completely dead – has completely severed itself from reality and truth, over which it, strangely, claims ultimate authority. Reading through Dr T's evaluation, you'll see that he would have judged the suspect “normal” except for two beliefs on his part: that people were filming him committing vandalism from vehicles and that there are electronic devices planted inside his brain and in the brains of some other people. Because the suspect has believed these two things, he must be suffering from schizophrenia (meaning that he is “not responding to reality”) – even though in every other respect he

is indistinguishable from “normal people”. Note that Dr T has made no attempt to verify whether these two beliefs are true or false. When it comes to nonbizarre delusions – since brain-computer interface technology has been in use in medicine for fifteen years, it should be classed as “nonbizarre” if it is part of some “delusion”, i.e. false belief – you certainly do not know whether the patient is being delusional about being followed or spied on *unless you check into it*. Is there indeed a referent in the external reality for the patient's words? The perversion of American psychiatry is the fact that, ultimately, it's not the reference of the mind's belief to a reality outside the mind which determines whether the mind is functional – although this is hypocritically claimed – but the literal wording or content of the belief. If the literal wording of your belief contains the words “CIA”, “implantable microchips”, or “people following me or going after me”, then you're insane. But what if you are right that your ex-friends are pulling crap behind your back, etc.? No matter, you are still insane. Modern psychiatry does not permit argumentation and empirical confirmation. To judge by the literal wording of the belief whether the mind is dysfunctional – that is “fundamentalism” – reflected in the literal interpretation of the DSM-categories to understand/ diagnose the patients – which then enables “check-listing”, which then enables the psychiatrist to process an increasing number of patients in an increasingly shorter time-interval. *This is McDonaldization in psychiatry: speed, efficiency, volume, and quantity maximized at the expense of quality and accuracy*. For it is in order to save the doctor a lot of time and clear a lot of doubt that s/he is asked to merely “check-list” rather than do more testing and checking to verify whether a nonbizarre delusion is indeed so (false belief). Again, easy domination of the object of consciousness in the conceptual realm. Insofar as the procedure seems to be especially devised for the easy dispensation of psychiatric medication, the ultimate objective with this craze to speedily process a large number of patients seems to be to increase profit for the pharmaceutical companies. The large proportion of misdiagnoses which inevitably results is deemed acceptable, in fact desirable, by the pharmaceutical companies when it means more money. What do they care about mis-diagnosis anyway?<sup>10</sup>

---

10 Very few participants in the establishment have warned about the danger (i.e. the decline in the quality of work) of the McDonaldization of psychiatry and medicine. However, Dr Ray Dorsey and the originator of the concept of McDonaldization, Professor George Ritzer, have together published “The McDonaldization of Medicine” (JAMA Neurology, 16 November 2015). “As put forth in *The McDonaldization of Society*, 'the principles of the fast-food restaurant are coming to dominate more and more sectors of American society,' including medicine... While designed to produce a rational system, the 4 basic principles of McDonaldization – efficiency, calculability, predictability, and control – often lead to adverse consequences. Without measures to counter McDonaldization, medicine's most cherished and defining values including care for the individual and meaningful patient-physician relationships will be threatened.” Here the authors especially resonate with us: “The final dimension of McDonaldization is control of humans by nonhuman technology, which is increasingly applied to both physicians and patients. In fast-food restaurants, machines, not workers, control cooking. In medicine, resident physicians now spend far more time with computers (40%) than with patients (12%). Billing codes and policies, which specify the length and content of visits, dictate the care that patients receive, influence clinicians, lead to unnecessary procedures, and can adversely affect patient health. The electronic medical record controls interactions between physicians and patients by specifying what questions must be asked and what tasks must be completed, thereby substituting the judgment of a computer for that of a physician. Consequently, physicians increasingly serve the needs of 'meaningful use' criteria and electronic medical records, which interfere with patient care, decrease professional satisfaction, and are often inefficient. These nonhuman technologies can reduce fast-food- workers and physicians to robots and customers and patients to automatons.” It's the same complaint about the replacement of holistic judgment with idiot-proof “check-listing”.

It should be remembered that the diagnostic criteria merely represent a statistical average. In the past, the psychiatry experts have come up with the criteria because patients suffering schizophrenia often develop the delusional belief that the CIA is going after them. There are of course people whom the CIA has actually gone after, just as police does from time to time conduct surveillance on suspects. As is noted in the previous communication, the appearance is the same here, but the meaning behind the appearances are completely different. But the “fake CIA targets” outnumber the “real CIA targets” by a vast margin, and it is simply statistically more likely that, when somebody says the CIA is going after him, he is suffering delusional disorders rather than describing the truth. Then comes a new generation of psychiatrists who, because they have merely learned to repeat the words of the diagnostic criteria and have never pondered the meanings behind the words, have completely forgotten that these merely describe a statistical likelihood, rather than something absolute. The “check-listing” manner of diagnosis means treating the diagnostic criteria as an absolute. Dr T has not considered the suspect “insane” because he is quite normal when talking about everything else. But then he encounters the suspect saying: “People are going after me”. There is no need to consider whether he might be telling the truth because what is merely statistically likely is now treated as an invariable, absolute truth. Put in another way, the saving of time, or “McDonaldization”, refers to the new situation where the psychiatrist no longer has to determine whether a patient is a majority case or belongs to the exceptional cases.<sup>11</sup>

---

11 This section is meant to settle the issue why the “suspect” in our story is consistently mis-diagnosed as suffering schizophrenia over such a long period of time – from 2006 to 2015 – by every psychiatrist he encounters, whereas, before 2006, he is consistently diagnosed by various psychologists as suffering personality disorders (Borderline and Schizotypal): it is because the protocol of psychiatry itself has changed rather than because he is a case of “late development”. The doctors who have diagnosed him before 2006 – Dr Caldeira, Dr Wiss, Dr Ellis, etc. – all have extensive and long-term contact with the suspect. There is no longer any prolonged interaction with any doctor in the suspect's life after 2006 – except, of course, Dr R, who thus diagnoses the suspect as “Schizotypal” rather than Schizophrenic.

The reduction of psychiatric learning and diagnosing to the simple procedure of memorizing and repeating of words and matching patient's' words with the words printed in the book, enabling a massive number of stupid people to enter into mental health professions and practice psychiatry, is similar to what we have said about the consumerization of academia in our *Thermodynamic Interpretation of History*, because here we are talking about the McDonaldization of psychiatry while over there the McDonaldization of academia: “Let's here focus on the methods of consumerization of academia in more detail. First, the problem of replication, the conversion of academic discourse (or the world of art: below) into the same structure as that of the consumerist market: a flat, decentralized field made up of disjointed and unrelated fragments (“specialized fields”). The academic process is henceforth characterized by fragmentation, mechanization, “making things ever easier,” acceleration of “production” (production for the sake of production; all these being parts of the process of “specialization”). This is also related to the second aspect, that of the contemporary intellectual trend itself, which is permeated with nihilism. Specialization means fragmentation in that each discipline is cut into smaller and smaller “specialized” fields that lose contact with one another. It means mechanization in that creativity, thinking, and reflection are replaced by “research” – whose process follows “rules” or “procedures” set down before the initiation of the “study” – following specialization, i.e. isolation, of the field. Fragmentation and mechanization together make the academic process (“research”) easier and easier to perform in that the scope of attention shrinks (it's “easier,” requires less brain-capacity, to focus on just one tree in the forest than to take account of the whole forest: more below) and that one needs from now on simply to robotically follow pre-determined rules of research rather than actually exercise one's mind creatively to come up with something original. As the academic process (research) becomes ever easier to perform, the “researchers” can “produce” monographs and articles at an ever



In addition to increasing pharmaceutical companies' profits, American psychiatry has also a mission which is *not* to enforce a correct relationship between the mind and the external reality, but to enforce a certain belief system deemed appropriate by society – it's simply inappropriate if you believe you have something to do with the intelligence agencies, etc. This – that psychiatry merely enforces cultural norms and appropriateness of beliefs under the disguises of enforcing truthfulness against falsehood – has however long been an objection against psychiatry. Hence, what is new nowadays is the “question of profit” for the pharmaceutical companies.

---

faster pace whose limited scope and non-ingenuity furthermore imply that they can be “consumed” (read) by other researchers in the field at an ever faster rate. Academia then becomes inundated with endless streams of petit, trivial and moreover boring monographs that nobody outside the “field” cares about and which furthermore clog up the channel of communication, preventing genuine studies (those that say something about reality out there) from being noticed – academic life and higher education are now just consumption and defecation of “paper stuff” and imaginary and trivial “ideas,” at best giving business to lumber and computer industries and at worst closing off all alternatives to consumption by reducing the mind from originally an organ for reflection and creativity to an intestine of the noo-spheric level, i.e. through which trivial and imaginary ideas pass, getting consumed and defecated (forgotten)...”

Meanwhile, Ortega y Gasset, in the classic on which we focus here, has also described the “specialization” in science and the “mechanization” of the scientific procedures which together, since the 19<sup>th</sup> century, have enabled an increasing number of people with mediocre intelligence to enter into scientific professions and participate in the discovery of nature. He is over there inquiring the origin of the “mass man” but what he describes is identical to what we have said, and wanted to say, about academic specialization, and hence similar to what we have said here about the “fundamentalism” dominating American psychiatry: “El caso es que, recluido en la estrechez de su campo visual, consigue, en efecto, descubrir nuevos hechos y hacer avanzar su ciencia, que él apenas conoce, y con ella la enciclopedia del pensamiento, que concienzudamente desconoce. ¿Cómo ha sido y es posible cosa semejante? Porque conviene recalcar la extravagancia de este hecho innegable: la ciencia experimental ha progresado en buena parte merced al trabajo de hombres fabulosamente mediocres, y aun menos que mediocres. Es decir, que la ciencia moderna, raíz, y símbolo de la civilización actual, da acogida dentro de sí al hombre intelectualmente medio y le permite operar con buen éxito. La razón de ello está en lo que es, a la par, ventaja mayor y peligro máximo de la ciencia nueva y de toda civilización que ésta dirige y representa: la mecanización. Una buena parte de las cosas que hay que hacer en física o en biología es faena mecánica de pensamiento que puede ser ejecutada por cualquiera, o poco menos. Para los efectos de innumerables investigaciones es posible dividir la ciencia en pequeños segmentos, encerrarse en uno y desentenderse de los demás. La firmeza y exactitud de los métodos permiten esta transitoria y práctica desarticulación del saber. Se trabaja con uno de esos métodos como con una máquina, y ni siquiera es forzoso, para obtener abundantes resultados, poseer ideas rigurosas sobre el sentido y fundamento de ellos. Así, la mayor parte de los científicos empujan el progreso general de la ciencia encerrados en la celdilla de su laboratorio, como la abeja en la de su panal o como el pachón de asador en su cajón” (p. 79). French translation (Louis Parrot): “Le fait est que, reclus dans l’étroitesse de son champ visuel, il parvient en effet à découvrir des faits nouveaux et à faire avancer la science, qu’il connaît à peine, et avec elle l’encyclopédie de la pensée, qu’il méconnaît consciencieusement. Comment une chose semblable a-t-elle été, est-elle possible ? Car il convient d’insister sur l’extravagance de ce fait indéniable : la science expérimentale a progressé en grande partie grâce au travail d’hommes fabuleusement médiocres, et même plus que médiocres. C’est-à-dire que la science moderne, racine et symbole de la civilisation actuelle, accueille en elle l’homme intellectuellement moyen et lui permet d’opérer avec succès. On en trouvera la raison dans ce qui est à la fois le plus grand avantage et le danger plus grand encore de la science nouvelle, et de toute la civilisation qu’elle dirige et représente : le mécanisme. Une grande partie de ce que l’on doit faire en physique ou en biologie est une besogne mécanique de la pensée, qui peut être exécutée par n’importe qui, ou peu s’en faut. Pour d’innombrables investigations, il est possible de partager la science en petits segments, de s’enfermer dans l’un d’eux et de se désintéresser des autres. La fermeté et l’exactitude des méthodes permettent cette désarticulation transitoire et pratique du savoir. On travaille avec l’une de ces méthodes

When we have understood this first kind of “fundamentalism” – i.e. the mere repeating of words leftover from the ancestors without understanding their meaning or experiencing the reality which they were meant to express, resulting in an over-simplified understanding or misunderstanding – we can now proceed to describe the second kind of “fundamentalism” in which lies precisely the essence of political correctness: the mere repeating of words leftover from the ancestors without understanding their meaning or experiencing the painful social reality which has in the past motivated the ancestors to utter them, resulting in a fantastic description of a non-existent reality when the original painful social reality has all but disappeared. At issue here is the life-cycle of a revolution, its “banalization”, the various stages through which a revolutionary movement passes. There is at first the revolution's founders' original experience of injustice, which motivates them to take the revolutionary step (standing up against injustice or oppression) and which they produce a brand new discourse, unheard-of before, to codify. The second wave feminism in America, for example, or Radical Feminism, originated from women participants' experience of sexism within the New Left.<sup>12</sup> In organization and rallies women were treated by male members as auxiliaries and housewives and, when they wanted to speak, were told to shut up. (“Take her down and fuck her!”) Distraught, the women participants thus stood up against the experience of injustice. “You talk about how they oppress you and everybody else, how you want to stand up against the injustice for everybody's sake, how you are the right person to bring the world to its utopian conclusion offering justice for everybody, and yet you yourself practice oppression on us, you turn out to be the same as the system of oppression you want to correct and fight against. Why the double standard? Why is it that oppression you experience from above counts and yet the oppression we experience from you doesn't count? Are you not a hypocrite?” Thus had the consciousness of the women of the New Left been raised: how women were even more an underdog than the other victims of racist, capitalist, and imperialist system, and how they were discovered to have been a underdog, and disadvantaged, in every domain – political, economic, and cultural. Thus arose also the entire feminist discourse codifying all this underdog experience previously unknown and uncoded. Thus had come about the necessity of “women's studies”, the discovery of women's peculiar experience as the underdog which had hitherto been suppressed and hidden in every domain of human functioning. Women's movement in Germany during the same period (*die neue Frauenbewegung*) originated in the same manner.<sup>13</sup> The original experience is one of suffering pain and

---

comme avec une machine, et il n'est pas même nécessaire pour obtenir d'abondants résultats de posséder des idées rigoureuses sur leur sens et leur fondement. Ainsi, la plus grande partie des scientifiques contribuent au progrès général de la science, bien qu'enfermés dans la cellule de leur laboratoire, comme l'abeille dans celle de son rayon, ou comme le basset tourne-broche dans sa cage.”

12 Josephine Donovan, *Feminist Theory*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Ch. 6, “Radical Feminism”.

13 See, for example, Rosemarie Nave Herz, *Die Geschichte der Frauenbewegung in Deutschland* (Fünfte, überarbeitete und ergänzte Auflage, 1997), p. 39: “1968 kam es im Sozialistischen Deutschen Studentenbund (SDS), der sowohl Studentinnen als auch Studenten umfaßte und als einer der Wortführer der Studentenbewegung galt, zu ersten Spannungen zwischen den beiden Geschlechtern. Denn die Studentinnen begannen plötzlich zu merken, daß ihre männlichen Kommilitonen zwar nach außen antiautoritäre Verhaltensmuster forderten, sich selbst aber im Innenbereich – und somit den Studentinnen und Ehefrauen bzw. Partnerinnen gegenüber – recht autoritär verhielten. Die studentischen Gruppierungen erschienen ihnen als Abbild der gesamtgesellschaftlichen Strukturen. So gingen ihre männlichen Kommilitonen zu Demonstrationen, Vorträgen und diskutierten untereinander, entwarfen Flugblätter usw. und diktierten den Frauen ausführende Arbeiten zu: Frauen durften die Flugblätter abtippen, Kaffee kochen und die Kinder während der öffentlichen Aktionen betreuen. Auf den Versammlungen kamen sie kaum zu Wort oder ihre

resistance against pain, and a new discourse has arisen to codify this original experience. To use a simple example to illustrate, “After our consciousness is raised, we look around and we begin to discover the same double standard everywhere, previously unspoken of, that women are getting paid less than men for the same work done. Double standard!” Hence also Simone de Beauvoir's famous line in her classic (“Woman as the Other”: *Autrui*). Then, as women activists' efforts in resistance and rectification gradually bore fruits and double standards disappeared from one domain after another, the discourse which has codified the original experience is stocked onto the bookshelves and in the general media. It has solidified into meaningless slogans in the sense that the social reality (the injustice) to which it originally refers has faded away and as the originating experience has consequently disappeared. The original founders of the second wave feminism were already mediocre thinkers, they were not a “Hannah Arendt” or even a “Simone de Beauvoir”, nor were they professional economists or sociologists casting a wide view on the empirical reality (“numbers”, “longitudinal studies”, “cross-section studies”) but were only speaking from their own personal (anecdotal) experiences, so that it was never necessarily the case that the discourse which had codified the original experiences was an accurate index of the overall situation – as the feminists would have liked to claim – rather than of the limited cases of the founders. The next generation, with even less intelligence, and eventually the mass of women without brains, then find the discourse that is stocked on the shelves and in mass media. They learn to repeat the discourse on their mouth because it makes them feel good about themselves – since it portrays them as good and innocent victims to whom their unjust society (the “system”) owes compensation. (“Victimology” is already presupposed as gaining wide currency.) Namely, they repeat the discourse like political slogans without understanding of its meaning, or without having actually experienced the same obstacles which have originally motivated the founders to form the discourse. This is because the “revolution” has succeeded, social reality has changed, much of the injustice has been eradicated, and the discourse itself is no longer a dissenter's view that is laughed at and sneered at, but is accepted as legitimate or even forced upon people as the “obviously correct” point of view. However, the new generation, because they are too simple-minded to know that time has changed, somehow believes that the conditions complained about in the discourse *are* current conditions. The mere repeating of the slogans has caused the new generation to believe that they have run into the same obstacles even though they have not<sup>14</sup> – and nobody can point this out to them because the slogan has,

---

Äußerungen wurden milde belächelt, zumindest blieben sie ohne Wirkungen. Sie hatten nur einen abgeleiteten Status als Frau oder Freundin eines SDS-Mannes. Als den Studentinnen dies bewußt wurde, fingen sie an, sich dagegen zu wehren und bildeten eigene Gruppen. So entstand als erster Zusammenschluß im Januar 1968 in West-Berlin der „Aktionsrat zur Befreiung der Frau“, gegründet von sieben Frauen des SDS. Sie legten auf der nächsten SDS-Konferenz, die in Hannover stattfand, zum ersten Mal eine Resolution vor, in der den männlichen Mitgliedern repressives Verhalten vorgeworfen wurde und die eigenständigen Gruppierungen begründet wurden...”

- 14 For example, when, February 2016, a former female staffer for Donald Trump's campaign sued him for gender discrimination (less pay for women for the same title and non-invitation of women staffers to speak at rallies) it is really not clear whether she has actually suffered the conditions noted or has simply interpreted ordinary vicissitudes as “discriminations” because she has learned to interpret thusly from the discourse that is “stocked on the shelves and in the media”, i.e., whether she has simply “grabbed off the shelf”, and implemented actions on its basis, the line “Across the economy, women who work full-time, year round still make 79 percent of what men make, on average, a gap that shows up in every industry and virtually every job. And while there are many causes of that gap, economists can't rule out discrimination as a likely factor” which the journalist covering the incident is required or wont to repeat. Bryce Covert, “Trump campaign sued for gender discrimination”

through endless repetition, been mistaken by everyone for “truth”, i.e. applicable to the current situation as well. The loss of considerations for the meanings of words is reinforced when more people, who do not benefit from the politically correct understanding of things, are forced by those who do to repeat these same words. Now you have “political correctness” (e.g. the world-view that women are continually disadvantaged by their society, which underlies all the “right speech” that is enforced). Insofar as the New Left and the Radical Feminist counter-action against it were part of the “counterculture”,<sup>15</sup> the problem is that “counterculture” has become “mainstream” without anybody really becoming cognizant of it. The root cause is thus that ordinary human beings – the “Mass Women” and “Mass Men” – are simply too dumb, without sufficient intelligence to enable them to reflect on the dominant opinions of the day and critically compare them with the external reality to see whether correspondences actually hold between the two sides (*adequaetio intellectus et rei*). Most people's mind does not have the ability to interact with the world outside it which it might not yet understand completely but is only capable of interacting with its own ideas which it has already perfectly understood. Most human beings on the planet are not capable of using words to refer to reality but are only smart enough to repeat them on their mouth. Thus results “political correctness”, which is moral reasoning banalized into meaningless formulas, without reference to any concrete situations. Thus results also “fundamentalism” in every sphere of postmodern life, such as in psychiatry as we have seen earlier. While the *raison d'être* of fundamentalism in psychiatry is McDonaldization to increase profits for the pharmaceutical companies, that of the fundamentalism of a counterculture which has become mainstream – a banalized revolution or political correctness – is, we shall emphasize, to perpetuate a new system of oppression, “reverse sexism”, which has replaced the older system of oppression, “sexism”, in order to increase the profits of the multinationals. Thus, it's more or less the same objective everywhere: to increase consumption and profit at the expense of mind's relationship to truth.

Depuis la chute de ces régimes, ils ont paraphrasé la vision de Tocqueville des périls insidieux d'une société de consommation qui invite chaque citoyen à se retirer dans le confort d'une vie privée dépourvue de toute solidarité; et ils ont aussi mis en valeur les pages où Tocqueville montre le danger corrélatif de la substitution aux décisions librement discutées, d'une bureaucratisme tout-puissant et stérile.

Tocqueville, observant l'enfance des démocraties modernes, y avait diagnostiqué les germes de maux qui se sont développés avec leur croissance. (Préface, de Tocqueville, *La démocratie en l'Amérique*, André Jardin: warning about the coming of McDonaldization.)

---

(<http://thinkprogress.org/economy/2016/02/01/3744784/trump-gender-discrimination-complaint/>). A woman who has heard the same line repeatedly and learned to repeat it on her mouth, thus coming to believe that it is “true”, i.e. refers to an objective reality outside her, would believe that she is underpaid even when she is not, and would be constantly looking for evidences confirming that it is true while overlooking everything else, so that, when others step on her toes, she will shout “sexism”, but when she steps on others' toes, or when others step on someone else's toes, she will not even notice it.

15 Diane Hart, *History Alive: Pursuing American Ideals*, Ch. 49.

We have been so preoccupied with “fundamentalism” because it signifies the death of a civilization (through fossilization). Many thinkers since the Frankfurt School have raised alarm about the same phenomenon (this “instrumental rationality”, or “Rationalisierung” as “Verdinglichung”), although they describe it differently than we do. In line with Adorno and Horkheimer, Habermas, Lukacs, and late Heidegger have warned about the exportation of “Technik” from engineering to every sphere of human life,<sup>16</sup> Ritzer has warned about “McDonaldization”, while we have kept ourselves along the line of de Tocqueville, Wellhausen, Spengler, and Voegelin in describing the “rationalization of revolutionary ethics” as “fossilization” or “sterilization”. Political correctness as part of the general phenomenon of “fundamentalism” manifested in the particular domain of social justice is, within our Spenglerian framework, the sign of a dying civilization – just as the fundamentalism that is the standard procedure in American psychiatry is a sign of the decaying and dying of American society and culture. The death in question is the death of meaning while the word remains intact, the death of the relationship between the “signified” and the reality while the chain of “signifier-signified” persists, which therefore becomes worthless from then on. It is the death of the human mind while its body lives on and continues to run the human institutions, robotically and without self-awareness. It is the death of culture while the machineries and institutions that constitute the physical existence of a civilization continue to function – for culture is to the physical components of a civilization what the mind is to the body in the case of an individual human being. It is the death of “national identity” of a nation-state while the nation-state continues to exist and exert power and influence on other nation-states. The death of the meanings of words, of the mind in the body, of the culture of a society, and of the national-identity of a nation-state – all these are different facets of the death of a civilization, the reduction of a civilization to a machinery that is not conscious of itself or anything else – that exists solely to consume resources and defecate waste, as we shall argue. You can see how we are again moving into the agendas of the European far right parties.

The “fundamentalism” that is now the rule everywhere in American society – i.e. that, everywhere in American society, people are only repeating words without comprehending the meaning of their words, which includes comparing what is repeated on the mouth with the reality outside oneself – while a sign that United States is dying out, does not mean that this dead nation-state cannot continue to be the most powerful nation on earth. (On this point we differ fundamentally from Ortega y Gasset, as you shall see.) The death of mind and culture does not necessarily have any effect on the power which the nation-state exerts on the rest of the world because power, nowadays, is produced entirely by machines, which are usually produced by other machines. It would not matter very much if everybody is brain-dead. Besides, in the case of the United States, the nation-state imports brains. The United States is brain-dead also in order to enable faster processing and disposing of products and resources that are coming into it.

All this should be related to what we have noted earlier, the “death gene” in Western civilization, that, within the Western tradition itself, there exists a “program”, an inborn tendency, a potential to suppress all its other potentials and to kill itself. It is precisely to this that Adorno and Horkheimer refer when they warn about the continual development of “technical reasoning” or “instrumental rationality” as the

---

16 C. f. Alessandro Pinzani, *Jürgen Habermas*, II Die ersten Jahre: von Heidegger zur Frankfurter Schule.

essence of Enlightenment to result in Enlightenment's self-destruction. That this supra-development of human reason which has in the beginning yielded such power to discover the nature of our universe and to dominate, control, and shape our external reality – to further develop our human potential – shall in the end “disappear us” within the system of discovery and domination is more or less the same theme as Spengler's decline of the West, of which we have just described one facet, the fundamentalist fossilization of intellectual traditions.

### **Political correctness as the latest Kulturindustrie**

In “Kulturindustrie: Aufklärung als Massenbetrug” Adorno and Horkheimer offer a phenomenological description of the degradation and vulgarization of culture in mass society, or how culture has deteriorated under the structure of mass society, becoming an instrument for the degradation of human beings and their domination whereas, we recall, it used to be a means to ennoble human beings and liberate them from immanence (that is, to liberate them from the oppressive forces which suppress the development of their human potentials and to develop their human potentials).

Contrary to most of the theorists who have deplored “pop culture” (culture in mass society), Adorno and Horkheimer do not see this sort of mass culture as evolving spontaneously from the common people, but regards it as being systematically imposed upon them by the elites (at least the elites of the economic cosmos, those who are in control of the means of production) in order to standardize and regulate mass consumption on the scale of the whole society (a better way to ensure corporate profits, of course). This is why they have thought it fit to replace the term “mass culture” with the new designation “culture industry”.<sup>17</sup> The novelty in their phenomenological description of mass culture is that they have noticed that, at the threshold of modernity, i.e. since the inception of mass society, a change has occurred in the way in which culture is produced. In modern, and postmodern, societies, “culture” is no longer produced by individual artists and writers, but by an industry, like the “automobile industry” with its “assembly line” (“Standardisierung von Produktionsweise der Kulturindustrie”). The result is that the production of culture is now intimately linked to the progress of technology and therefore becomes increasingly intertwined with, and absorbed into, the means of production, of which the control has also become increasingly concentrated in the hands of the few – in the hands of the few corporate executives who control the means of production in a modern and postmodern society. Just think of the diffusion of culture through radios, films, and television (in his days) – and through the Internet (in our days). However, Adorno would emphasize that the “culture industry” is primarily characterized by standardization of the “product” and the rational manner of its diffusion (i.e. a systematic distribution of a film or a book that is planned by a committee to maximize

---

17 Adorno, “Résumé über Kulturindustrie”: “Das Wort Kulturindustrie dürfte zum ersten Mal in dem Buch 'Dialektik der Aufklärung' verwendet worden sein, das Horkheimer und ich 1947 in Amsterdam veröffentlichten. In unseren Entwürfen war von Massenkultur die Rede. Wir ersetzten den Ausdruck durch »Kulturindustrie«, um von vornherein die Deutung auszuschalten, die den Anwälten der Sache genehm ist: daß es sich um etwas wie spontan aus den Massen selbst aufsteigende Kultur handele, um die gegenwärtige Gestalt von Volkskunst. Von einer solchen unterscheidet Kulturindustrie sich aufs äußerste. Sie fügt Altgewohntes zu einer neuen Qualität zusammen. In all ihren Sparten werden Produkte mehr oder minder planvoll hergestellt, die auf den Konsum durch Massen zugeschnitten sind und in weitem Maß diesen Konsum von sich aus bestimmen.”

profits), and not by the production process itself.<sup>18</sup> All the major themes in Adorno and Horkheimer's phenomenological description of the degradation of culture would result from this main trait about the modern, and then postmodern, mass culture: the industrialization in the production of culture as well as in the production of any other daily necessities.

The first theme is the “standardization” of culture. While the production of culture through industry and technology has enabled culture to be produced and consumed on a mass scale, produced for and consumed by everyone, such mass consumption of culture has at the same time decreased the diversity in the culture that is produced, to the point that the entire “culture” is the same from one end to the other, in any form whatsoever. Adorno and Horkheimer take great pain to emphasize this fact – i.e., their emphasis on the repetition of the same general “template” from radio shows to TV shows to magazines and short stories – since this is really the whole point in any industrial production of culture.

The second theme relates to the complete absorption of the consumer into the (standardized and perpetually repeated same) products of the culture industry. The consumer himself/ herself becomes standardized and a perpetually repeated, always the same, moment. One moment is like all moments – like what we have said about the “consumerization” or “intestinalization” of the human mind – and every person becomes like every other person. The result is the dumbing down of the consumer (*Verdummung*) and his or her increasingly depersonalization – or loss of individuality to the point that s/he becomes a “pseudo-individual”. Adorno and Horkheimer are, in essence, describing the “McDonaldization of human beings”, his or her simplification and standardization to render consumption ever more efficient and ever faster.

It would not seem that this “dumbing-down” and “depersonalization” must result from the very structure of the culture industry. While the technology of mass communication has ever enlarged the mental horizon of the consumers – images from ever larger parts of the world are now accessible to the eyes of modern, and postmodern, common people – it has at the same time ever decreased their thinking capacity. As their intelligence seemingly grows, they become ever dumber in reality. “Der Fortschritt der Verdummung darf hinter dem gleichzeitigen Fortschritt der Intelligenz nicht zurückbleiben” (p. 153). The reason is that culture has become increasingly no more than the technology which produces and transmits it at the expense of any plot whatsoever. (Think of a movie which is full of special effects but which is devoid of any coherent story line.) The consumers are also brainwashed through admiration of the same stereotypical heroes or heroines in the same stereotypical story lines, which then causes them to conform themselves to the same stereotypical personalities which they see repeated in media and short stories and all other representations: “Pseudoindividualität.” (“Die Besonderheit des Selbst ist ein gesellschaftlich bedingtes Monopolgut, das als natürliches vorgespiegelt wird”; p. 163). *Verdummung* and “de-personalization” then entail a decrease in spontaneity and creativity. The so-called “talent” which the culture industry constantly looks for to perform at the next show is a simple stereotype which has already been determined and which is never

---

18 “Der Ausdruck Industrie ist dabei nicht wörtlich zu nehmen. Er bezieht sich auf die Standardisierung der Sache selbst – etwa die jedem Kinobesucher geläufige der Western – und auf die Rationalisierung der Verbreitungstechniken, nicht aber streng auf den Produktionsvorgang” (ibid.).

more than manifestation of the “standard”.<sup>19</sup> Because of the lack of any complex plot in the culture products that are produced beyond the coincidence with the means of production and transmission, the consumer can increasingly absorb them without exercising mental concentration.<sup>20</sup>

An essential feature in the industrialization of culture production which Adorno and Horkheimer have not explicitly emphasized in their phenomenological description is the fact that culture in industrialized and post-industrialized societies has become entirely a function of technology and institutions. (Think about how, while, on the side of technology, films are one and the same with first the cameras and then with computer graphics, and while even more and more art is produced on Adobe Illustrator and the like, movie scripts and television shows are, on the side of institutions, almost exclusively written in committees according to objective surveys determining who would like to watch what.) Culture is no longer dependent on the hands and mouths of individual human beings (the artist and writer) for production and diffusion.<sup>21</sup>

The ultimate concern of Adorno and Horkheimer is with the domination of human beings under the capitalist system. With the loss of “plot” and creativity (something which the individualistic producers of culture, artists and writers, used to offer) under the industrial production of culture and culture products' absorption into the means of production and diffusion, “culture” becomes increasingly just “entertainment”. While, before the advent of mass communication technology and infrastructure, the workers were dominated while at work but were left a semblance of independence when they returned home from work, the workers of the mass culture era, by putting in their home a radio and then a TV, have invited the capitalist system to come indoctrinate them (dumb them down), and so dominate them, especially their mind, even during their free time and in the privacy of their home, even in their mind. There is now not any corner left in the universe in which the worker/ consumer is free, or free to develop his or her human potential. The same with the Internet today. The full-time worker has now transited to being a full-time consumer in order to bear the burden of the growth of the capitalist

---

19 “Jede Spur von Spontaneität des Publikums im Rahmen des offiziellen Rundfunks aber wird von Talentjägern, Wettbewerben vorm Mikrophon, protegierten Veranstaltungen aller Art in fachmännischer Auswahl gesteuert und absorbiert. Die Talente gehören dem Betrieb, längst ehe er sie präsentiert: sonst würden sie nicht so eifrig sich einfügen” (p. 130).

20 “Die Produkte der Kulturindustrie können darauf rechnen, selbst im Zustand der Zerstreung alert konsumiert zu werden” (ibid., p. 135). (“The products of the culture industry are such that they can be alertly consumed even in a state of distraction.”)

21 It is indeed strange that, even while Adorno and Horkheimer offer a phenomenological description of the culture around them, they seem to be more than describing the mass culture of the 1940s. Their description seems to apply even more accurately to the present digital and information era such that it is as if they were predicting the future, not just describing the present: “Die rücksichtslose Einheit der Kulturindustrie bezeugt die heraufziehende der Politik. Emphatische Differenzierungen wie die von A- und B-Filmen oder von Geschichten in Magazinen verschiedener Preislagen gehen nicht sowohl aus der Sache hervor, als daß sie der Klassifikation, Organisation und Erfassung der Konsumenten dienen. Für alle ist etwas vorgesehen, damit keiner ausweichen kann, die Unterschiede werden eingeschliffen und propagiert. Die Belieferung des Publikums mit einer Hierarchie von Serien qualitäten dient nur der um so lückenloseren Quantifizierung. Jeder soll sich gleichsam spontan seinem vorweg durch Indizien bestimmten »level« gemäß verhalten und nach der Kategorie des Massenprodukts greifen, die für seinen Typ fabriziert ist. Die Konsumenten werden als statistisches Material auf der Landkarte der Forschungsstellen, die von denen der Propaganda nicht mehr zu unterscheiden sind, in Einkommensgruppen, in rote, grüne und blaue Felder, aufgeteilt” (p. 130 - 1).



system. S/he is not only exploited to produce for the growth of the system, but also consume. A consumer, that is, produced under the pressure of standardization, *Verdummung*, and de-personalization. We have here come around to the same prominent theme in the world-view of the European far right figures: the consumer must be without national identity (without a “plot”, a drifter from one moment of consumption and defecation to another) and without a thinking mind (not understanding what has been done to him or her): these traditional characteristics of a human individual – an identity, and a destiny (“plot”), which distinguishes him or her from other human individuals – slow down the consumption process. If these are demolished, consumption can proceed much faster. That is, McDonaldisation: it is the same process which is at work in the consumerization of human beings (standardization, *Verdummung*, and depersonalization), the retention of mere forms while the meanings are discarded.

Adorno and Horkheimer, like what we have done (in our Thermodynamic Interpretation of History), were identifying what is good as in fact its opposite, to see “free society” as in fact “totalitarian”. They have quite concurred with our view that the difference between a traditional totalitarian society and a “free society” lies not in one's being unfree while the other is free, but in one's being structured as domination over the body while the other is structured around the domination over the mind instead of over the body. Like us, he has cited de Tocqueville on this.<sup>22</sup> Democratic free societies have their own ways of achieving totalitarianism, through domination from within the subjects. They differ from traditional totalitarian societies not in terms of the aim for absolute domination over the individuals, but only in terms of the method for achieving the aim. The method being different, the result is the same, and in fact even worse.<sup>23</sup> The illusory “individualism” in free societies is in fact no more than simple repetition of what is a general template, and quite simplistic at that, a mere intestine without a functional brain, who repeats words without comprehension of their meaning, and here domination has produced not any less conformity, and not any less standardized human beings. Here is the same hierarchical structure of human beings achieved through domination in order to accomplish the society's goals. Again, the same distinction we have made: whereas traditional “totalitarian states” accomplish conformity by force, free societies do so by means of socialization. “Socialization” is the process which Adorno and Horkheimer have described in “Kulturindustrie”.<sup>24</sup>

---

22 “Die Analyse, die Tocqueville vor hundert Jahren gab, hat sich mittlerweile ganz bewahrheitet. Unterm privaten Kulturmonopol läßt in der Tat »die Tyrannei den Körper frei und geht geradewegs auf die Seele los. Der Herrscher sagt dort nicht mehr: du sollst denken wie ich oder sterben. Er sagt: es steht dir frei, nicht zu denken wie ich, dein Leben, deine Güter, alles soll dir bleiben, aber von diesem Tage an bist du ein Fremdling unter uns.« Was nicht konformiert, wird mit einer ökonomischen Ohnmacht geschlagen, die sich in der geistigen des Eigenbrötlers fortsetzt. Vom Betrieb ausgeschaltet, wird er leicht der Unzulänglichkeit überführt. Während heute in der materiellen Produktion der Mechanismus von Angebot und Nachfrage sich zersetzt, wirkt er im Überbau als Kontrolle zugunsten der Herrschenden. Die Konsumenten sind die Arbeiter und Angestellten, die Farmer und Kleinbürger. Die kapitalistische Produktion hält sie mit Leib und Seele so eingeschlossen, daß sie dem, was ihnen geboten wird, widerstandslos verfallen” (p. 141 – 2).

23 “Die Naturverfallenheit der Menschen heute ist vom gesellschaftlichen Fortschritt nicht abzulösen. Die Steigerung der wirtschaftlichen Produktivität, die einerseits die Bedingungen für eine gerechtere Welt herstellt, verleiht andererseits dem technischen Apparat und den sozialen Gruppen, die über ihn verfüen, eine unmäßige Überlegenheit über den Rest der Bevölkerung. Der Einzelne wird gegenüber den ökonomischen Mächten vollends annulliert” (Vorrede, p. 4.)

24 “In der Kulturindustrie ist das Individuum illusionär nicht bloß wegen der Standardisierung ihrer Produktionsweise. Es

We have briefly summarized Adorno and Horkheimer's description of the basic socialization process through the culture industry (the creation of a simple, and thoughtless, consuming automaton) because this is also how political correctness works to socialize everybody: the seamless “groupthink”. This is so because “Politische Korrektheit” has become identical to the contemporary “Kulturindustrie” whereas it wasn't in Adorno's days. In Adorno's days, the novelty about culture was its industrialization, and hence its becoming increasingly enmeshed with the emergent technology of mass communication – principally radios, films, and TVs – at the expense of the traditional manner of cultural production through the personal efforts of the individual artists and actors (books, paintings, and plays). Today, that culture *is* mass communication (and hence “entertainment”) is taken for granted. What is so novel today is however the fact that culture, in Western societies, is essentially “politically correct”. In Western societies, the (in fact quite shallow) theme in virtually every TV and cable TV show, in every film, and in every mainstream Internet emission is the politically correct line on social justice. In the United States, this theme is about how (white) women are unfairly disadvantaged and endangered, how society is sexist, how they would do the world a lot of good if only given a chance, how racial minorities are often similarly disadvantaged, with white males being privileged for success. (You see that at the core of this politically correct culture is the liberal white women's culture.)<sup>25</sup> A reflection of this condition is the complaint by a minority of conservatives and right wing broadcasters that the media and universities are dominated by liberals and biased toward liberals' agendas. (Even though what they mean by this is that the majority of broadcasting is pro-Democrats and anti-Republicans, the complaint is really about the increasing identity between the

---

wird nur so weit geduldet, wie seine rückhaltlose Identität mit dem Allgemeinen außer Frage steht...

Pseudoindividualität wird für die Erfassung und Entgiftung der Tragik vorausgesetzt: nur dadurch, daß die Individuen gar keine sind, sondern bloße Verkehrsknotenpunkte der Tendenzen des Allgemeinen, ist es möglich, sie bruchlos in die Allgemeinheit zurückzunehmen. Massenkultur entschleiern damit den fiktiven Charakter, den die Form des Individuums im bürgerlichen Zeitalter seit je aufwies, und tut unrecht nur daran, daß sie mit solcher trüben Harmonie von Allgemeinem und Besonderem sich brüsten. Das Prinzip der Individualität war widerspruchsvoll von Anbeginn. Einmal ist es zur Individuation gar nicht wirklich gekommen. Die klassenmäßige Gestalt der Selbsterhaltung hat alle auf der Stufe bloßer Gattungswesen festgehalten. Jeder bürgerliche Charakter drückte trotz seiner Abweichung und gerade in ihr dasselbe aus: die Härte der Konkurrenzgesellschaft. Der Einzelne, auf den die Gesellschaft sich stützte, trug ihren Makel an sich; in seiner scheinbaren Freiheit war er das Produkt ihrer ökonomischen und sozialen Apparatur” (p. 163 – 4).

- 25 When you browse through the latest movies, you see movies about white women happy being single and financially successful. When you walk into a bookstore, you see Sheryl Sandberg's *Lean In* encouraging young women not to be hampered by their lack of self-confidence which their sexist society has taught them. When you walk into Skylight bookstore in Los Angeles, you see: *Slut: A play and guidebook for combating sexism and sexual violence*, ed. Katie Cappiello and Meg McInterney, Introduction by Jennifer Baumgardner. 2015; or Jean Shinoda Bolen MD, *Goddess in Everywoman*; or Jennifer Doyle, *Campus Sex, Campus Sexuality*, 2015; namely books which teach white women to develop the impression that they are disadvantaged by society so that they can be mobilized to ask society and the world and their fellow human beings to pay them back what is owed to them; and which also teach them to feel themselves to be very special and important, as if they were doing the world a big favor by living and breathing. When you turn on your cable TV you see Samanthe Bee making comedies to the same effect, how women, despite their potentials to contribute a great deal to society and the world at large, are being neglected by their society in every possible way. All this is “liberal white women's culture”, a generalization and simplification of American feminism since the second wave, which has now become the politically correct “culture industry”.

culture industry and political correctness since it is mostly the Democrats who are charged with advancing social justice.) This is what happens when the “counterculture” of the past has become “mainstream” (become identical with the culture industry).<sup>26</sup> In Europe the theme is similar but slightly different. (We shall presently come to the case of Germany, the most politically correct nation in Europe.) The only other theme which is dominant as politically correct and so unchallengeable (what must not be questioned: “groupthink”) is the patriotic one – that the soldiers are fighting terrorists oversea to protect the citizens' freedom. (One sees that, in France, after the Paris attacks, the culture industry has evolved on a similar path as it has in the United States, there emerging the theme, unchallengeable, of French soldiers fighting ISIS oversea to protect French citizens from monstrous devils.) Often, the two themes, although coming from completely different subcultures and seemingly having nothing to do with each other, intermingle. Recall Meg Ryan's film “Courage Under Fire” (1996). The film may be seen as one dominant theme of political correctness attempting to boost itself on the support of the other dominant theme.<sup>27</sup> This film, and countless films like it, are illustrative of our point that at the core of political correctness is liberal white women culture's “exaltation of the female sex” (the “race question” must be left aside for now to not complicate the problem): that this creature the “white woman”, only if not disadvantaged and endangered by violent males, could do the world so much good because they are so morally good and so competent. It is the feminine reversal of the dominant theme from the 1950s, when the dominant image in all films (in the culture industry) is the exaltation of the white male – the confident and competent white male with a counterpart in the frivolous and childish white female. Today the standard, dominant, image is a confident and competent white female who is however unfairly disadvantaged and not properly valued by her society and who has a counterpart in the violent and selfish male of any race. It is forbidden (“politically incorrect”) to wonder whether evidences actually support the image of the “competent female” who would do the world a lot of good only if given a chance. The dissenters to these two themes (e.g. the religious right to the feminist theme and the conspiracy theorists to the patriotism theme) have their own private communication channels and community gathering, but they cannot expect to have a place in the “mainstream”, i.e. in the culture industry itself.

Our emphasis on the “exaltation of the white female” as the core of American political correctness to the exclusion of the “race question” is motivated by the possibility that, while one part of the theme of the contemporary culture industry might be false reality (i.e. that white women are disadvantaged by their society and could do the world a lot of good only if let out of their cage), the other part might be true reality (i.e. that certain racial minorities, such as African Americans, are indeed disadvantaged by their society) – especially in view of what we are going to say next, i.e. that political correctness is the “enactment” of a fantasy reality. (*Politische Korrektheit als Massenbetrug.*) We will defer the discussion of this problem of a mixture of truth with falsehood in American political correctness to the

---

26 This is how one should understand, e.g. the Berlin festival, like the 2016 Berlin Festival, “Das politischste aller A-Filmfestivals” ([http://www.deutschlandradiokultur.de/die-berlinale-baeren-sind-verliehen-das-politischste-aller.2165.de.html?dram:article\\_id=346278](http://www.deutschlandradiokultur.de/die-berlinale-baeren-sind-verliehen-das-politischste-aller.2165.de.html?dram:article_id=346278)) or the Academy Awards, like the 2016 Academy Awards, “Der Rassismus in der US-Filmbranche” ([http://www.deutschlandradiokultur.de/oscarssowhite-der-rassismus-in-der-us-filmbranche.979.de.html?dram:article\\_id=346511](http://www.deutschlandradiokultur.de/oscarssowhite-der-rassismus-in-der-us-filmbranche.979.de.html?dram:article_id=346511)).

27 Meg Ryan in fact constituted a more effective patriot contrary to people's prejudice that women don't make good soldiers.

end of this section.

If we combine the description of political correctness as “fundamentalism” (the literal repetition of words without consideration of their meaning) with the description of political correctness as “culture industry”, we shall see that it is precisely the mechanism of the cultural industry (the standardized, industrial production of culture) which has caused this “fundamentalism” in the conception of social justice. Namely, it is the mechanism of the culture industry which has trained everybody to repeat, and believe, the politically correct lines without any notions of their meaning. That is to say, when counter-culture has become mainstream and thoroughly permeated the culture industry, the mechanism of culture industry would cause the morality, ethics, and notions of justice encoded in the counter-culture to degenerate from its origin as an expression of a genuine experience with pain to the retrieval of ready-made slogans without correspondence to, and consideration of, reality. As culture industry, the ethics encoded in political correctness has lost its meaning as “resistance against an oppressive system”. As a mere repeating of slogans, it is but the reading of some “script”, and the “moral resistance against injustice” that is encoded in the “script” or “slogan” is but the “enactment” of a staged, “scripted”, show without any connection to reality – it is as much a self-contained fantasy world as “Star Wars” is: it is absurd, and mental illness, to believe, when you walk out of the theater, that all the heroines and heroes you have seen in the movie actually exist. But this “enactment” – to act out your life on the basis of a fantasy, just as when you live your life as if Star Wars are going on in the real world you live in – is however required, because the capitalist or consumerist system need you to accomplish the other, covert, objective of society, i.e., to increase its dissipative capacity by favoring the values of women who consume more and degrading the values of men who are more focused on production.

Now if political correctness as the “enactment of a script” independent of the external reality is the result of the operation of the contemporary culture industry in socializing human beings, both themes of the culture industry – standardization on both the side of the culture product and the side of the consumers and the dumbing-down and depersonalization of the consumers – must characterize the operation of political correctness as well, i.e. as the operational procedures to produce an unthinking automaton immersed in the “groupthink” called “political correctness” completely unawares.

First, let's see how “standardization” is operative in political correctness. This is essentially what has happened when counter-culture has become mainstream culture. The condition of injustice and the corrective stance against it which are encoded in political correctness have become a “standardized script” which is reproduced, without variation, in all forms of cultural expressions of a given society (in films, TV, printed stories, and the majority of discursive ensemble online) and which is then absorbed by the majority of the consumers who have therefore “bought into it” and who apply it to all instances of social reality – in order to categorize them and make them comprehensible – also uniformly and without variations, whether or not actual instances really fit the “script”. In just the way in which Adorno and Horkheimer have described the standardized culture produced by the culture industry supplanting the categories of pure reason in the consumers' mind, the standardized “script” about social injustice (e.g. “women are disadvantaged”) has become the categories of pure reason by which the

majority of the population filter out and understand all instances of social reality. We have amply complained that most actual instances don't really fit the “script” or the standardized categories. You might think of the example which has already been used, “domestic violence”. (Refer again to Murray A. Straus' 2007 article, “Process Explaining the Concealment and Distortion of Evidence on Gender Symmetry in Partner Violence”.) While the reality is “gender symmetry in partner violence”, the “script” in the United States by which people can understand “domestic violence” and which is codified in the laws is “complete gender asymmetry” (i.e. it is always the male partner who has inflicted the violence) and, because the “script” constitutes the categories of pure reason by which the mind understands the external reality, people are simply not capable of acknowledging that reality might be telling a story completely divergent from the “script”. And yet the “script” is a both outdated and/ or too simplistic to even capture half of all instances. In fact, most likely only a tiny minority of them.<sup>28</sup> (The first kind of fundamentalism.) Sometimes the “script” doesn't capture any part of reality at all, a pure fantasy. (The second kind of fundamentalism.)

In our ordinary parlance we usually call this “script” “prejudice” or “preconception”. Our own story – the “philosopher suspect” and the “One Dimensional Women” – is basically a story about the complete dominance of the “script” in the human mind and human institutions: where the women are so entrenched in their preconception of themselves as the righteous victims (the “script”) that they simply cannot see the obvious fact that it is they who are the aggressors and would retaliate against their victim, the male “suspect”, if the authority does not share their perception of themselves; and where everyone in California's criminal justice system is so entrenched in the widespread preconception (“script”) that males are the aggressor and females the passive victims that the women “protagonists” can actually use district attorneys and law enforcement detectives as their personal “hit-men” to assassinate the guy whom they want to silence. We can therefore see that what we have described earlier, “fundamentalism” – the banalization of a revolution or ordinary people's complete inability to use words to refer to reality – is precisely the result of the culture industry's operation to standardize the “script” (or narrative) of reality and thus the consumers' mind. The “script” being standardized by the contemporary culture industry is precisely the past feminist revolutionaries' descriptions which have today degenerated to empty slogans and “categories of thoughts” unconnected to a social reality which has already changed.<sup>29</sup> The process is thus: the original devising of a feminist description of social reality; its subsequent fossilization when social reality has changed; its penetration into the culture industry; its standardization across the culture produced by the culture industry; and the standardization of consumers in its image, where the consumers repeat the fossilized feminist descriptions on their

---

28 The reality is simply far more complex. Refer to our discussion “Is it 'better' to be male or female in 'patriarchy'” in “The Origin of Women's Oppression”, A Thermodynamic Interpretation of History (<http://enlightenment1998.com/1/classicalpatriarchy.htm>).

29 For example, the politically correct conception of the woman as invariably the victim and of the man as invariably the victimizer is simply the adoption by, and generalization among, the general population of the original radical feminists' conceptions about gender relations, e.g. the thinking of Catherine MacKinnon who consistently portrays women as the victims of male aggression in every instance of interaction between the sexes; even normal sex is just “rape” happening too frequently as to appear as “nothing wrong”. It was already an exaggerating notion during the time when she wrote her works, let alone today when men have become so respectful of women in North America, and yet MacKinnon's stereotypes are still being applied.

mouth believing that these actually coincide with the external reality: how the fossilized, outdated descriptions have become “categories of pure reason”. There has occurred a McDonaldization in the conception of social reality.

This is the manner in which the politically correct culture produced by the contemporary Western culture industry produces out of its consumers a standardized politically correct mind, just as Adorno and Horkheimer have described how the culture industry socializes individual human beings into standardized consumers with a deadened mind who have lost all capacity to think beyond the standardized culture. Through the exposure to the politically correct media – and “white women's culture” which has thoroughly penetrated it – the feminist mind is reproduced in every person within its domain (i.e. in the “blue states”) who is now without the capacity to think beyond the “oppression of women” (the “script”): like those “One Dimensional Women” in our story. This will be a serious problem when the “oppression of women” has ended, for the mind will not have the capacity to comprehend the new, “post-oppression” reality.

Let's then look at *Verdummung* that is operative in political correctness. If the culture that is decided in marketing committees and produced and consumed via mass communication technology, unlike traditional cultural products which stimulate thinking, deadens brain's functioning, so does the moral indignation and resistance against injustice which is not indigenously grown or naturally acquired (the first-hand experience of the first generation revolutionaries) but which is merely ready-made slogans manufactured by marketing committees and then picked up by consumers from the same mass media (films, TV, the discursive ensemble of online postings) and popular books. When it becomes the perpetual repetition of the same words, themes, and images – same both across space and through time – without correlation to a reality outside the discursive domain, the mind can be said to be dead. This of course tells us that a mind is living when it can relate to the external reality, especially by using language to describe it. Political correctness, as in essence the *past* moral indignation reproduced among these words, themes, and images that constitute the mindless, and yet standardized, culture produced in Kulturindustrie, is fake ethics and morality, and, insofar as the whole purpose of Kulturindustrie lies in the reinforcement of a hierarchy of human beings (i.e. women's domination of society) best suited to the enforcement of global consumerism and maximization of corporate profits, is immorality (or social injustice) disguised as morality (or social justice). The mind which practices injustice while believing it is practicing justice is the quintessential “dead mind”. You can see that we see the politically correct mind as the McDonaldized mind: it's fast and “efficient” to speak pre-packaged words about “women being victims” without relating the words to an external reality (like verifying a “hypothesis” against reality).

Let's finally look at “depersonalization” that is operative in political correctness. It is quite easy to see how expressions of political correctness create a semblance, or illusion, of a blossoming individuality while suppressing the growth of any true individuality – in just the way in which Adorno and Horkheimer have analyzed the socialization process through admiration of the heroes and heroines seen in films, etc. When a politically correct soul stands up against a supposedly sexist statement, for example, there is an illusion that s/he has more fully developed his or her human potential (and so

individuality) by making a courageous stand against a dominant unjust convention or deplorable human instinct. In reality, that era of sexist convention is long gone. (We shall again defer the more complicated question about the current status of the “racist convention”.) When social reality has changed and yet the expressions against its supposedly unjust nature remain unchanged, the result is that “standing up against an (in fact non-existent) convention or (in fact outdated) instinct” has itself solidified into the latest convention and latest instinct. Rather than “revolutionary”, standing up against sexist expressions is now merely “conventional”. This is political correctness. The politically correct person who goes around condemning sexist expressions from others is a “pseudo-individual”, somebody who can only follow the “crowd” and repeat what is already there rather than inventing something original.

We cannot overemphasize this point, that social reality has changed, that we no longer live in a “patriarchy” – and yet the feminist rhetoric, among both professional (including academic) feminists and ordinary women, remains essentially the same, the same words, the same themes, and the same images. The rhetoric itself is today the “oppressive convention” which sexism used to be. Of course both the feminists and ordinary liberal women will vehemently dispute this – but that's only because they do not want any challenges to the newly constituted hierarchy of human beings in which they are on top and because they have been “dumbed down”, “depersonalized”, and “standardized” into unthinking automatons who can only repeat words left over from 40 years ago without the capability to correlate the words with the external reality. Even without going into the murky domain of numbers – that is, without attempting to correlate these words with the external reality – one could still debunk them working solely within the rhetoric itself – by pointing out that it is indeed “convention”. Make a comparison. When president Kennedy was at one of his press conferences asked by a woman journalist what progress he had made with his women's agendas, he replied, smiling and obviously thinking it not a serious matter, “We have not done enough” – laughter from everybody in the audience – “are doing more” – laughter from everybody – “and will have to do more” – laughter from everybody. Everybody was, in essence, making fun of the journalist, and every feminist-minded woman, for taking seriously such an obviously unimportant issue. Imagine today if any politician makes fun of women's agendas in this way – nobody will be laughing, and it would be the end of his political career. In the former case, the weight of convention (i.e. male chauvinism) was against the woman journalist and any woman who spoke against it; today, the situation is reversed, and the convention is weighed against any male chauvinist who used to be the “convention”. This simple Gedankenexperiment, with which everybody is familiar, should convince everyone – who however seems unable to draw this obvious conclusion from what is only too familiar – that political correctness and, with it, all the revolutionary ethics from the counterculture of 40 years ago, is the convention of contemporary time just as sexism or male chauvinism was the convention during the time of the emergence of the counterculture. The mystery is then that the feminists and the feminist-minded liberal women in America somehow seem unable to pose to themselves the question of where the oppression is of which they complain when nobody dares disagree with them, when, furthermore, their protection has been irrevocably written into the legal system.

In the case of the United States, the feminists and the liberal women can, of course, probably still

object that they only represent the “convention” in certain regions of the society (i.e. the “blue states”) and refer to the existence of the other “convention” which is still dominant in the other regions (i.e. the “red states”) and which should justify for them their perception that the “revolution” has hardly finished. Most of the latest controversies (Planned Parenthood, abortion rights, LGBT rights) in fact center around this battle between two coexisting and yet conflicting conventions. Just as earlier, we are of course not blind to the complexity of the situation, i.e., that there is a coexistence of different conventions just as there are coexisting themes within the same convention, each unchallengeable (i.e. precisely as “convention”) in its own “fiefdom”, so to speak. We will return to this issue shortly.

In any case, it is undeniable that, in both North America and Western Europe, social reality has changed – vastly. It is because the same feminist rhetoric from 40 years ago is still being constantly repeated, and believed to refer to reality, when it clearly does not refer to any reality existing outside the feminist mind, that we say that this feminist mind is the product of a feminized, and feminist-saturated, Kulturindustrie. There is an *industrialized propaganda machine* to propagate (at least the simplified versions of) the conceptions of women and men found in radical feminism, Betty Friedan, and the eco-feminism which has come after them: that's part of the meaning of conservatives' saying, “The media is biased toward the liberals”. The feminist rhetoric and activism today is a mere enactment of a show, a make-believe, rather than any real resistance against pain – since there really is not much left which still causes pain. (In the “blue states”, at least.)<sup>30</sup> This “banalization of the revolution” is signified by the complete lack of creativity in this sense: the mind is so uncreative that it is unable to update its old ideology to keep up with a changing social reality, or unable to recombine words inherited from ancestors to describe a new reality, i.e., precisely what has been noted in “politically correct fundamentalism”, that the mind has lost the capacity to use words – originally invented to refer to reality – to refer to reality. We see this make-believe all the time. All the hype over terrorism and human trafficking are likely, on a closer look, to be hype over nothing. In the end, in America, the terrorists that have appeared each year can be counted on one hand and police raid on prostitutes never quite find any victims of human trafficking.

Our position has always been that, in such advanced countries as the United States and other Anglophone nations which are the consumption centers of world economy, consumerism has developed political correctness to enforce (especially white) women's domination over society's resources and their special protection while hiding their privileged position in order to leave it unchallengeable or because “becoming victims” rather than doing it through merits is (white) women's way of obtaining the consent of everybody else necessary to maintaining themselves in their privileged positions;<sup>31</sup> and that consumerism has favored this development in view of women's greater affinity to consumption and wasting resources. We thus maintain that political correctness functions to enforce a

---

30 This statement of course has to be digested in connection with our earlier observation that the technique which the feminists and the liberally minded women most often employ to make themselves look like they are suffering disadvantages is (1) talking only about their own problems and never talking about the problems which other groups suffer, and (2) talking only about what others have done to them and never about what they have done to others, etc.

31 Ortega's notion about the exercise of power or command is assumed here: that the commander assumes command only by representing the public opinion and he can never go against it as long as he is commanding.



certain hierarchy of human beings (i.e. white female domination in the United States or other Anglophone nations, or at least in the urban centers in these nations) through imposing an uniformity of thinking, dumbing down all participants of society, and leveling them to standardized stereotypes while producing the illusion that they are blossoming in individuality more than ever before – and that the ultimate purpose of this new hierarchy is to enable the society to accomplish its latest objective, i.e., the maximization of its dissipative function according to an even higher standard, or the wasting of as much resources, both materials and human, as possible. This should be the result when we allow political correctness to show itself in the same way in which the culture industry has been enabled to show itself with Adorno and Horkheimer.

### **Liberal white women as the enforcers of American political correctness**

Recall that we have left open two issues: first, the “race question” in political correctness; and, second, the question about the other “convention” in the interior of the United States. Let us clarify our position here by first describing the race factor in American political correctness. When we debunk the whole notion that American white women are “victims” and assert that they have in fact been using their fake victim status as a cover under which to advance their hidden agenda of domination, we are not asserting at the same time that the other “victim groups” so considered in the same feminism-saturated Kulturindustrie (i.e. in the postmodern tradition) – from the well-established ethnic-gender groups “African Americans”, “African American women”, “Asians”, “native Americans”, and “Hispanics” to the controversial “LGBT” grouping – are not really “victims” either. One index, although not the only one to be considered when making a judgment as to “who really is a victim and who a fake victim”, is the proportion of the various categories of people in the prison system.<sup>32</sup> While it is thus debatable whether Asians and Hispanics are “victims” and “oppressed”, it is clear that black people, as a group, are “victims”, in the sense that they are enormously disadvantaged in comparison with whites, especially those liberal white females who take themselves to be the quintessential “victims of oppression”. (Although the conservatives have been in the habit of pointing out that black Americans' disadvantaged position is largely due to their own fault and there might be some truth in this,<sup>33</sup> there is no possible denying that they are, on the whole, disadvantaged, even if it is partly their own fault, and that, even when it is their own fault, it is not their fault that it is their fault, i.e., they have been unable to recover from past oppression.) Our position is therefore that the slogans codified and the words

---

32 See, for example, US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics, “Prisoners in 2013”, by E. Ann Carson, Ph.D. (<http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/p13.pdf>): “Similar to 2012, non-Hispanic blacks (37%) comprised the largest portion of male inmates under state or federal jurisdiction in 2013, compared to non-Hispanic whites (32%) and Hispanics (22%). White females comprised 49% of the prison population compared to 22% black females. However, the imprisonment rate for black females (113 per 100,000) was twice the rate of white females (51 per 100,000).” At least among the male inmate population, whites are significantly underrepresented while Asians and Hispanics are slightly overrepresented.

33 See, for example, Dinesh D'Souza, *The End of Racism* (1996), in which he argues that the widespread social failures among African Americans are due to their dysfunctional culture, which was originally evolved to adapt to the oppressive social conditions under racism but which has become an impediment when discriminations against blacks are gradually lifted. Again, the need to update an already fossilized culture to keep up with a changing sociality. There seems to be some truth in D'Souza's analysis.

repeated in the contemporary politically correct Kulturindustrie – including the postmodern leftists' world-view – are not entirely unrepresentative of the external reality, but only half wrong, and purposely so: the fundamentalist feminist mind produced by Kulturindustrie has been asserting, correctly, that black Americans are oppressed only in order to convince people that the falsehood that white women are still oppressed is also the truth. A falsehood has an easier time of being accepted as truth if it is mixed up with another truth: if you understand this classic technique of lying. However African Americans might feel about liberal white women, the truth is that the latter are using the former as a cover which under which to falsely assert their “victim status” and thus as an instrument with which to gain domination over everyone else in American society. This is the reason why, in our previous descriptions of political correctness, we have confined ourselves to the gender paradigm and refrained from commenting on the political correctness in the requirement for everyone to agree that black people are oppressed. It is true that political correctness is pure fantasy, a false reality, but this is more complicated than you think. We dare assert that it is the white females who have been enforcing the requirement that we see black Americans as “victims”.

What we have meant by “postmodernity” is the current politically correct culture, i.e., the current Kulturindustrie, and we have been using the term “postmodernism” rather vaguely, as that new trend in the conception of reality which denounces all Grand Narratives, all coherentness, and all objectivity in the external reality. We have also been following Shadia Drury in conceiving the reaction against this trend, i.e. neoconservatism, as merely the other wing (right wing) of postmodernism. We have been saying that this postmodern mind is essentially the mind of a beast, the set of raw animal instincts when capacities for reflection and thinking about others are supposedly removed entirely. The descriptions of this mind as “fundamentalist” (unable to relate words to the external reality), “dumbed down”, “standardized”, and “depersonalized” are supposed to further qualify this animal mind. This of course reveals that the postmodern animal mind is not identical to the real animal mind, since it can still repeat words, by which capacity it can live and float in an imaginary reality that might even be the opposite of the true reality – something which a real animal simply can't do. (While an animal cannot understand reality very much, it is doomed to live in a real reality because *it doesn't have the capacity* to live in an imaginary, or false, reality which it has invented to fool itself.) Now, for a finer definition of “postmodernism”, see Stephen Hicks's *Explaining Postmodernism* (2004). Note how he has emphasized postmodern theorists' desire to dismiss all discourses' claim to represent an objective reality and to find, instead, in any discourse, a reflection of the power status assigned to the category to which the speaker belongs. Postmodern thinkers in America, dominated by feminist thinking, would like to see all Western traditions as merely reflecting the white male bias as a way to reinforce white male dominance over white women, all minorities, and finally nature itself. We only hope that the postmodern feminist thinkers can apply this way of thinking to themselves, for we, as non-white “minority”, certainly see white women feminists' discourse and its vulgar reflection in the mind and mouth of liberal white women – how white women are “disadvantaged” in this sexist society, how they would do the world a lot of good if only let out of their cage, how they have this intrinsic connection to nature which would make them the most effective protectors of the earth, and how they are therefore “sacred” in comparison to the profane “mankind” – as merely reflecting the white female bias as a way to reinforce white women's dominance in American society (at least in the “blue states”). In this

politically correct discursive world of postmodern thinking – in the more sophisticated stratum of the contemporary Kulturindustrie – the white male is the “master devil”, the one to whom white women and all other minority groups owe their misery and disadvantages. We would like to “deconstruct” this manner of attribution of all evils to the white male and arrive at the conclusion that it simply points to the obvious fact that white women's political correctness – to which white males are increasingly subjected – is nothing other than the product of a *power struggle* which white women have launched against white men in an attempt to wrestle from them the control over society. That's all women's movement in America has amounted to – far from being a movement for universal justice for all the oppressed people, even for the natural environment, as the women activists would like to claim, but a replacement of one group of oppressors by another group who are even more cruel, more covert (in the sense of continuing to pretend to be “victims” as a way to hide their domination), and more power-hungry than the previous rulers – and, in the process, white women have found it necessary to frame all other minority groups as also “victims of the devilish white male” because, first of all, they need more allies to demonize their “Enemy”, and because, secondly, once they have acquired power and control over society, they need to continue to pretend to be “victims” – the never-ending process of inequality – and this is because they have less interest in acquiring, and maintaining, power through merits and sacrifice such as white males have done before them. They are also more attached to their new found power than white men used to be attached to *their* power so that they have a far stronger desire to pretend to be powerless as a way to hide their power.<sup>34</sup> For this end, they continue to feel the need to frame other minority groups as “victims of white male domination” and, as noted, would fight for their “rights” from time to time, in order to cover up their status as the new masters of society. The liberal white women in America, that is, must continue to feign victimhood because this is how they have gained power and prestige and they do not yet know of another way to do it.<sup>35</sup>

To sum up, the contemporary American culture industry has been training everybody (at least in the “blue states) to repeat the politically correct words which have been extracted from the feminist discourse which has existed unchanged since late 1960s and early 1970s, thus enabling the whole society in its region to dwell in the half-imaginary reality where white women, along with other minorities, are the victims of white male domination; the result of the enforcement of this half-imaginary reality is, on the subjective side, the brain-dead automaton who is no longer capable of using words to refer to reality; and, on the objective side, the maintenance of white women in control over the whole society (at least in “blue states”) whether or not this would have raised the power and social status of other minority groups in anyway whatsoever; and this – the maintenance of white women's control over society – has only come into being – the “revolution” has only succeeded – because it is desired by global commerce and consumerism. In other words, feminist fundamentalism – words-repeating without reference to the external reality – creates “fake victimhood”, which maintains white

---

34 This is borne out by the following Gedankenexperiment: while you can see many liberal white males sneering, out of the need to be politically correct, at the idea that white males should rule society, you can never imagine white women refraining, out of a new political correctness, from praising the idea that women should rule society.

35 We are confident that we are describing an objective reality, but if the white women feminists dare accuse us of being reactionary – misogynist – we can always appeal to postmodern thinking itself, according to which we, because we are not white, cannot speak in such a way as to reinforce our power over white women.

female domination over society while masking it at the same time, and all this development is favored by the changing global economic context. Here you see us supplementing the conclusion of our chapter “Cultural Feminism's Transition to Victim Feminism” in our *Thermodynamic Interpretation of History*, that “victim feminism” is “white female supremacism”.

An acquaintance (a liberal white male) once objected to our thinking that white women are the new masters of American society by referring to the continual sexual objectification of women in society. Women, he said, when they are walking home at night, might be followed by men, whereas men don't quite suffer such problem. Indeed, we can imagine American liberal women vehemently objecting in this way insofar as they will do everything they could to hold onto their “victim status” because it is the source of their power and insofar as, while numbers from longitudinal and cross-section studies might prove that white women are in fact materially privileged rather than disadvantaged in this society, the impression caused by their physical attraction – that she who is being pursued cannot possibly be considered the master, just as sheep cannot possibly be considered the master over wolf – is indeed a natural one. Once again, this betrays an inability to conceive of complex situations. We have covered objections of such kind in Footnote 9, “The Origin of Feminism in Eschatological Consciousness”, in our *Thermodynamic Interpretation of History*. There we have pointed out that this sort of objections depends on a black-and-white conception of the world and an inability to imagine the “gray zones”. It is quite possible that, within a different system, the sheep shall establish dominion over the wolf and chain them up, even though the nature of the wolf is to chase after the sheep. Similarly, when a rich man walks on the street he is much more likely to be targeted than a homeless man by a pick-pocket or a thief, but this does not mean that the rich man is the disadvantaged member of society while the homeless man is the privileged one. This sort of objection is worth mentioning again because it might refer to another reason why white women have preferred to establish domination over others by pretending to be victims rather than through merits and achievements: should the sheep ever decide to achieve domination over the wolf, they might prefer the same pernicious trick.

We can never over-emphasize our objection to the way of thinking of the Radical Feminists. Male sexual pursuit of females, even in the form of rape, is not, by itself, an indicator of who has power and who is powerless. It is the system's response to the male behavior which is such an indicator. When a black man pursues a white woman, when he rapes a white woman, or when Bill Cosby rapes a few white women, these acts do not tell us in any way about the hierarchy in which white women and black men find their places. If the system responds by harshly punishing the black man, or by punishing him harsher than if he were white, if the system is determined to punish him with all its might, or if it decides to punish him less than whole-heartedly and only in response to protests, only then do we get an indication about the power structure, i.e. whether the black man is the proletariat vis-a-vis the white woman who is then the bourgeois, and vice versa. While it is in the nature of things for the wolf to chase after the sheep, the sheep is proletariat to the wolf only if the system favors the wolf at the expense of the sheep, and so on.

Political correctness, at least in the United States, is fundamentally about maintaining the power and privileges of one group of people – the white females – above all other groups because of economic

necessities. White women's revolution has succeeded because the condition of global commerce favors it, and this condition of global commerce suppresses all counter-revolutionary forces through political correctness. In non-Western countries, where social justice features far less as an issue in the mind of the general public, the unchallengeable convention is usually political in nature, rather than social. In China, it is still impossible, *politically incorrect*, to criticize Chairman Mao in any fair way whatsoever. This is because the legitimacy of the Chinese Communist Party – the masses' consent to its rule – is at stake. That is, the purpose of the “convention” is to maintain the communist party in power. Meanwhile, in Russia, it has become increasingly “incorrect” to criticize Putin – for the same reason as in China. Political correctness in the United States is simply the same convention as in China and Russia except that it exists on the social plane, rather than on the political plane. This should convince you that the purpose of political correctness, as “convention”, is to maintain somebody in power, specifically the protagonist in the convention, the so-called “oppressed” and “socially disadvantaged”. And we argue that this is the white female only, while the other protagonists are merely serving as her cover.

While the principal aim of political correctness in the United States is to maintain the white female in power, in Germany political correctness might be something different and might not, on first sight, seem to serve the same function of the maintenance of a certain social group in power. The principal political correctness in Germany – the “convention” over there, which is certainly identical to the Kulturindustrie over there – is the avoidance of asserting German national and racial pride, i.e. the maintenance of the “German guilt”. The most popular and forceful theme in American political correctness – how white females have been disadvantaged through society's injustice and how they are sacred and would do the world a lot of good if only let out of their cage – has only a small audience over there.<sup>36</sup> While everybody knows that this German political correctness is born from the reaction against a Nazi past – from Germans' guilty feeling and remorse over the crimes they have committed against others during World War II – when we proceed to phenomenologically describe this guilty

---

36 While we can find one-to-one correspondence, e.g. Caroline Kebekus as the German version of Samantha Bee, or Alice Schwarzer as the German version of any of the American radical feminists, Caroline and Alice would find far less popularity among German liberal women. This is certainly because cultural (gender, difference) feminism – asserting female superiority – has never taken hold in Germany. For instance, where cultural feminism derives its force in the form of eco-feminism: “Eine besonders extreme Ausformung dieser Entwicklung stellte der in den USA entstandene und auch in England existierende 'Feministische Spiritualismus' dar. Ihre Vertreterinnen betonten nicht nur eine natürliche Überlegenheit der Frauen, sondern wollten sogar die Astrologie neu interpretieren, legten den Tarot, zelebrierten feministische Rituale zu Geburt, Tod und Menstruation, praktizierten Meditation und Yoga, ernährten sich nur von natürlichen Substanzen, da sie sich abhängig von den übrigen Teilen der Biosphäre begriffen usw., usw. Sie schrieben: 'Durch die Frauenbewegung haben wir gelernt, daß wir unsere Befreiung nicht erreichen, indem wir männlichen Normen nacheifern, sondern eher, indem wir unsere innere Stärke und unsere göttlichen Qualitäten erkennen. ...' In der Bundesrepublik Deutschland hatte diese Richtung zu keiner Zeit eine sehr große Anhängerschaft, und Alice Schwarzer schrieb bereits 1983 über diese Entwicklung: 'Die schlimmsten Phasen der biologistischen Argumentation – vom Natur-Mythos bis zur neuen Mütterlichkeit – sind überwunden. Frauen werden wieder kämpferischer, viele haben erkannt, daß wir unsere Rechte, die wir uns mühsam erkämpft haben, nicht mit Hilfe der Mondgöttin verteidigen können. Dennoch bleibt die Sorge ... vor einem Rückfall in den neuen/alten Weiblichkeitswahn gerade in Zeiten der Millionen-Arbeitslosigkeit und lautstarker Propagierung einer “heilen Familie” und der 'weiblichen Rolle' leider hochaktuell.’” (Rosemarie Nave-Herz, *ibid.*)

complex known as “German political correctness” we see that it is also dimly reflected in American political correctness, i.e. in the (although far less pronounced) guilty complex of the American white males, which may be considered as the underside of “white female supremacism”. (That is, in the United States, while “white female supremacism” has replaced “white male supremacism”, the latter has morphed into a mild form of “white male guilty complex”.) It is not quite the case that both guilty complexes are the direct results of a “reeducation process” – the reeducation and denazification imposed by the Allies in one case and white women's bullying of their partners to submission in the other. Allies' denazification and reeducation of the German people immediately after World War II did not quite succeed in instilling a guilty conscience in them; but traces of this guilty conscience first appeared with the leftist counter-culture of late 1960s and only solidified in the 1990s, after reunification.<sup>37</sup> On the other hand, it is quite correct to speak of American liberal women's “reeducation” of American liberal men – a process that you can see going on everyday in American blue states. The result is that, in one case, Nazism, or national pride, and, in the other, white male superiority and white male rule, have both come to connote something brutishly disgusting and even pure evil. This is not to deny that the “guilty complex” represents a certain advance, a certain degree of liberation (i.e. a certain further development of the human potential in comparison to the previous stages) – that there is a certain truth in it: the Germans and American white males have come to accept the “Golden Rule” and thus expanded their mental horizon as they have become more capable of imagining the situation from the perspective of the Other.<sup>38</sup> The danger remains that the guilty complex might soon fossilize into the mere repetition of words signifying a guilty feeling in an empty space – i.e. without real understanding of that of which one is guilty because it has receded too far into history and society has never done anything more than teach you to repeat words of shame. The liberal Germans must ask themselves whether the German toleration of the “Flüchtlinge” might have become something just like this, a mere retrieval of pre-written “scripts” under the operation of a Kulturindustrie rather than a response to real guilt, and whether the AfD and PEGIDA might be doing something other than re-immense themselves in traditional German racial pride – i.e. whether they might be re-igniting the mind's yearning for meaning when the mouth has been, per the operation of a culture industry, repeating certain words like a standardized dummy.

The usual warning about the downside of political correctness is a very real one. For example:

Sprachverbote und Zensur vergiften die geistige Atmosphäre und lähmen die lösungsorientierte Debatte. Statt zu Offenheit und Toleranz führt Politische Korrektheit zu Feigheit und Anpassertum.<sup>39</sup>

You see that we are essentially providing a deeper understanding which, however, does not, in essence,

---

37 For a short account of the rise of the “guilty conscience” in the German people, see Christine Anton, “Repositioning German Identity” in *Beyond Political Correctness*, ed. Christine Anton and Frank Philip (2010).

38 As we have analyzed in our Thermodynamic Interpretation of History, “The Origin of Feminism in the Differentiation of Subjectivity”, the German and American white male “guilty complex” may be considered the result of a further “differentiation of consciousness”.

39 The Antithesis to political correctness in Thomas Wolf, “Was darf man in Deutschland sagen – und was nicht?”, FOCUS-MONEY ([http://www.focus.de/finanzen/news/tid-29319/political-correctness-klappe-zu\\_aid\\_911015.html](http://www.focus.de/finanzen/news/tid-29319/political-correctness-klappe-zu_aid_911015.html)).

differ from this most usual objection to political correctness. What is overlooked in political correctness is an opportunity to phenomenologically describe the guilty complex and then investigate the empirical reality to see whether it is a proper act by consciousness to correlate with its object (in this case, social injustice). As can be seen from what we have already communicated, an attempt to phenomenologically describe the German and American white male guilty complex will reveal that it is at bottom consciousness of a debt owed to others and the world – just as the dominant American political correctness which elevates the white women is at bottom consciousness of a debt others and the world owe to oneself. It is this guilty complex about the debt owed to other and to the world – again, quite legitimate – which has entailed the rest of the social democratic and “green” correlates of the German political correctness.<sup>40</sup> Without denying that their ancestors have owed the world and many ethnic groups like the Jews, the Gypsies, the Poles, and the Russians by having once unleashed tremendous destruction upon them, the contemporary Germans who are in the AfD and the NPD can be seen as asking the question, in face of today's immigration and refugee crisis, of whether they still owe the same debt to the world, or the same debt to peoples of Muslim background, who do not seem to be relevant to the picture. Again, fairness and objectivity would have you believe that recalculation of the “debt” – whether it can ever be paid off and when or whether it is being paid to the right creditors – is completely legitimate, as long as it is affirmed without equivocation that a debt has indeed once been incurred (e.g. as long as there is no holocaust denial, etc.). The attempt to recalculate the “debt” is thus an attempt to correlate words with meanings once again for fear that the meanings might be lost – just as Jesus can be seen as attempting to bring meanings back into the Judaism of the Pharisees. The constant recalculation of the debt still owed is thus the constant attempt to keep the human mind in relationship with the external reality – and for this it should be applauded, if your objectives include the development of the human potential and the prevention of the human brain from atrophying. Currently, political correctness in Germany forbids anyone from recalculating the debt which the Germans still owe to the world *because, as Kulturindustrie, it wants the German people to be standardized dummies*

---

40 For example, Thomas Wolf (ibid.) again: “Es gibt in Deutschland Tabus. Wer gegen den ist und dies öffentlich kundtut, hat in aller Regel einen schweren Stand. Gutmenschen jeglicher Couleur denunzieren Menschen mit europafeindlichen Meinungen in Talkshows als europafeindlich und als Revanchisten. Auch wer den menschengemachten Klimawandel in Frage stellt, findet kaum Fürsprecher. „Solche Menschen haben kein Verantwortungsgefühl für die Zukunft unserer Kinder“, heißt das Totschlagargument. Und wer gar die Schuld an Armut und sozialen Problemen bei den Betroffenen selbst sucht, ist hartherzig und bar jeder Solidarität. Nur das Christentum darf man ablehnen. Weil der Papst die Pille verbietet und Priester im Zölibat leben. Am Islam ist dagegen jede Kritik verboten. Das wäre fremdenfeindlich.” Also, Hans-Dieter Radecke and Lorenz Teufe, “Die Diktatur der politischen Korrektheit”, Cicero, 21 Feb. 2014, “Zwischen diesen beiden Extremen gibt es wie so oft im Leben sehr viele Grautöne. Der deutsche Mainstream erstrahlt in einem davon. Nun sind mehrheitsfähige Ideologien in allen Gesellschaften zuhause, in Deutschland allerdings werden sehr viele der herrschenden Mainstreamthesen nicht nur von einer großen Mehrheit geteilt, sondern auch als letztgültige Wahrheiten aufgefasst. Wer dem „Konsens“ dann nicht zustimmt, kann somit nur verrückt, böswillig oder korrupt sein: Statt Argumenten setzt es dann Hiebe mit der Moralkeule. Verkürzt lässt sich der deutsche Mainstream-Konsens so zusammenfassen: mehr soziale Gerechtigkeit, mehr Nachhaltigkeit, mehr Pazifismus, weniger Markt, weniger individuelle Freiheit, mehr Staat. Stille Voraussetzung: Wir Deutsche stehen immer auf Seiten des Reinen und Guten. „Gegen Lüge und Ausbeuterei. Wer das Leben beleidigt, Ist dumm oder schlecht. Wer die Menschheit verteidigt, Hat immer recht“, heißt es treffend im Loblied auf die Erste deutsche Einheitspartei.” The guilty complex can be summed up in this way: *the powerful white male imperialists who have in the past taken advantage of their women, non-white peoples, and nature, must now learn to refrain from raising their hand against all these physically weaker parties and entities*. Political incorrectness is “relapse” into the former imperialist ways of “might makes right”.

*without brain, individuality, and identity.* Once you have described the phenomenon correctly in this way, you should see that it should be those enforcing political correctness who should be regarded as brutishly disgusting and pure evil – for wanting people to have no functional brain, for requiring everyone to repeat words without thoughts of, and comprehension for, their meaning.

In the same way American liberal white males should be invited to recalculate the debt they have owed, and might still owe, to the world and others – and then to recalculate extenuating circumstances such as the respective merits which they possess and which their creditors possess. (If the white guys owe an apology to every other group in their society and should pay something back, do the fact that they are still the main figures doing the things most important for society, and the fact that their creditors, white women and black people and anybody else, aren't doing things as important, permit “discount” in the debt-paying?) As long as, again, there is no denial that they have once owed somebody – the African Americans, the Native Americans, their own female partners, the Chinese and Japanese Americans that were here in America early on, etc. – and might still owe somebody – principally the African Americans, for example. This is in fact the most reasonable stance as long as, when one performs the calculation, one continues to bear in mind the “Golden Rule”, the requirement to imagine the situation from the “creditors” perspective. And genuine social justice can only be arrived at in this way, rather than through the mechanism of political correctness which requires you to blindly assume that you are the debtors or the creditors and be blind to the injustice which then results. It is truly the political correctness which their white female partners are enforcing upon the liberal white males and which demonizes anybody who attempts to recalculate which should be demonized. Make no mistakes about it, when it becomes politically incorrect to wonder whether white women are really always the victims and never the aggressors (such as Straus has recounted, *ibid.*, and such as has happened in our story) this is political correctness' prohibition for anyone to calculate debts and credits. This is what we have meant in the beginning, that “political correctness” is the “restraint which the so-designated 'dominant group' in a society, e.g. the white males in American society, has, under the pressure of a whole new view on how reality works, imposed upon themselves to prevent themselves from continuing to hurt or oppress the 'victim groups’”. Under political correctness, the very act of calculating debts and credits – wondering whether anybody really is the victim of white males' imperialist ways – is forbidden. In other words, political correctness is some sort of “accounting trick”: the white female, once she has convinced her white male partner that he owes her and started the debt-paying process, immediately shuts down the whole accounting process so that it can never be known whether he has ever finished paying her back. (Apparently, the white female wants this because she is quite uninterested in any other manner of money-making.) Political correctness, whether in the United States or in Germany, is fundamentally “unreasonable”, and, insofar as the most distinguishing characteristic of the human species is their capability for reason, “inhuman” (*unmensch*).

Not forgetting our ultimate objective (anti-globalization) we shall of course ask why “unreasonableness” (political correctness) has been perpetuated at all. In the United States it is because the liberal white women are power-hungry and are not interested in gaining power and control over society through possessing merits but are addicted to doing so through a “creditor status”. They have an inherent interest in making sure that the fact forever eludes their white male partners, and everyone



else, that these devilish white males have long ago finished paying off the debt owed to them and that nobody else really owes white women anything at all – just as the Japanese militarists during World War II would prevent anybody in their society from coming to awareness that nobody actually owed the emperor anything. It's an ideology to perpetuate slavery. Without the behind-the-scene support of multinationals American liberal white women cannot have so effectively commanded the allegiance of their white male partners and everybody else. “Unreason” must reign because the make-believe about white women's “creditor” status and the behavior of everybody which results from it is most conducive to the maximization of consumption of foreign-made products.

In Germany, however, the intermediate of a power-hungry “creditors” is not involved in the perpetuation of unreason. The Muslim immigrants are not currently enforcing political correctness on Germans; it is the Germans themselves who are enforcing unreason upon themselves. Ultimately, of course, it is the multinationals which are desiring the *Grande Remplacement* because they desire, over there as well as in North America, the maximization of consumption of foreign-made products at the expense of domestic productive capacity and any brain activity which eschews consumption as the sole meaning of life. We therefore see that political correctness is different in Europe than in the United States because the multinationals have to operate differently on the two sides of the Atlantic given the different social conditions.

The “utopia” which we desire is a society which can most enable its members to develop their human potentials, and we hate the current McDonaldized and politically correct society because this consumerist wasteland is most hostile to the full development of our human potentials. In order to be conducive to the development of human potentials, however, a society must value merits and achievements more than harms suffered: a society where you assess the value of human beings according to the merits they possess and the positive things they have achieved rather than according to the harm they have suffered. This much we have said many times before. But here we add that our “utopia” is also a society where words must have meanings again, where words are used to refer to a reality outside the mind rather than to constitute a self-contained universe that refers only to itself. Words having meaning indicates also the development of the human potential, for a human being who is able to use words to describe a reality outside himself or herself is a more intelligent, and more developed, human being than one who is only able to repeat words, completely closed in upon himself or herself. This is one reason why we want words to have meaning again, why we want a public recalculation of debts and credits in the consideration for social justice. But we also want the public recalculation of debts and credits for the sake of something else, for the sake of our original concern, i.e. restoring our society to one where merits count more than harms suffered. This is because, in order to restore society to such a pristine state, you will have to rid the public consciousness of this “guilty complex” of the superior people. Yes, we dare assert the politically incorrect view that, before the revolution, white males dominated American society not simply through discrimination against other groups but also through their own merits, and, with Geert Wilders, that Western civilization is superior to cultures of the Third World. Consumerism has, through their white women agents, enforced a “guilty complex” on the superior people in order to keep them down while elevating their supposed “victims” who don't have as much merits. Make no mistake about it, the function of the “guilty complex” (i.e.

political correctness) is to elevate the useless people above the useful people: the “Opposite World” (*terra inverta*) of which we have spoken many times before. The reason why a society would want to do that is, as we have repeatedly noted, that it wants more waste at the expense of productivity in order to enlarge the profit margins of multinationals. To correct such situation, we want a recalculation of debts and credits in order to factor in these extenuating circumstances such as the relative merits of the creditors and debtors. In order to restore useful or superior people to their proper place, we must recalculate publicly debts and credits, and this is because, when injustice happens, we cannot just forget about it; we must settle the debt since it is everybody's desire to live in a just world. We must recalculate debts and credits because, while desiring to live in a just world, we cannot at the same time allow injustice to consume us entirely, to become our only concern, our only focus, for, otherwise, nobody can do anything productive and everybody would be arguing to the end of time about who owes whom, rather like the “perpetual class struggle” championed during China's Cultural Revolution, where full-time preoccupation with creating social justice has completely debilitated the nation's productive capacity. We must settle the debt once and for all in order to move on, to move into a society where merits become our principal concern. Only then will we have arrived at our utopia. Finally, we want the recalculation of debts and credits and be rid of white males' “guilty complex”, also for the sake of white women themselves. As we have noted before, we are feminists, and we want white women to fully develop their human potentials. With all this automatic consideration of women as “creditors” and as having merits without any actual calculation done, you end up with a woman that is but a spoiled child (*enfant gâté*), born into the world believing that everybody owes her something and constantly demanding compensation; believing that she is doing the world a big favor simply by being alive: this is a disgrace to womankind! American liberal white males' “guilty complex” has not only done many groups a disservice, but it has principally done the liberal white women themselves a disservice. American liberal white women are, as a result of it, essentially grown up children. They are only capable of taking, not of giving. They are only capable of thinking about the debt others have supposedly owed them, never about the debt they might actually owe to others. When talking about the disadvantages of African Americans, they are thinking essentially of the debt which white males have owed the minorities, not of the debt which they might themselves have owed the minorities. We want a woman who is fully developed, capable of objectively calculating what debts others might have owed her and equally what debts she might have owed anybody else, and who is willing to face up the fact that she is inferior if she is indeed found to be inferior, and do something to improve herself. (Again, this is against the Gilligan approach.) We want a woman who is “reasonable”, and capable of being reasonable.

We are here supplementing our previous lamentation about “victimology”. The self-critical apparatus which is found in white women feminist literature (e.g. the extreme care taken to include the experiences of non-white women and LGBT persons) is hardly genuine. This is because their notion of themselves as the quintessential “creditors” is so solidified that no gray zones (that they might be the debtors at all) are even imaginable. Human beings so unable to critically reflect on themselves are not fully grown adults, fully developed human beings. In Germany, the defense of immigration and the Flüchtlinge is also one-way – oriented entirely toward Germans' guilt – and thus lacks a reflective capacity. While one side demonizes the Flüchtlinge, the other side never asks whether the Flüchtlinge

can inherit your toleration when they have replaced you.

We advocate reflection in both directions. Only in this way can the real, i.e. the world historical, function of “political correctness” – and all this tolerance, all this guilty complex, all this impressions of debts owed – be discovered once and for all, i.e. as the support for globalization, for global commerce, for the global division of labor. And only then can the harmful effects of political correctness be recognized as well. Among the harmful effects we have noted: the destruction of human merits, the severance of the human mind's connection to reality through the fossilization of the meanings of words, and the consequent killing of the human mind. What we have not thoroughly described is political correctness' erasure of human identity, that is, any meaning which the human being might attribute to his or her life. The European far right's scruples over national identity is not a superfluous attachment to something old fashion, but to a conscious mind. To speak like Marine Le Pen: the physical components of a society – the pathways through which products come in and get distributed and consumed and disposed of – are entirelyly mechanical, while culture, or national identity, may be considered to add “meaning” to the whole process. Similarly, the indigenous preference for “made in Germany” or “made in the USA” to “made in China” or “made in Malaysia” is a preference for meaning to indifference. These meanings differentiate one group of human beings from another. The multinationals would like you to be indifferent, i.e. forget the meaning of it all: be indifferent to your identity, where you come from, where you are, and where you are going. But it is these meanings which keep your brain functional, i.e. thinking about more than consumption and defecation. The loss of culture or national identity while consumption of products and services continues as the only thing left is the same as a mouth repeating words without the mind recognizing their meaning and correlating the words with a reality outside.

You have seen that, in this essay, our principal concern in dealing with political correctness is with the continual, and natural, degradation of language, whose results is the increasing stupidity of the human being and the increasing simplification of the human mind. Above all, the mere repeating of words without consideration for their correlation with the external reality – the loss of the meaning of words and the meaning of life through the operation of political correctness – has resulted in the solidification of a self-contained, even if self-consistent, discursive world which no longer serves to represent any reality outside the human mind – the original function of language. The human mind thus becomes closed in upon itself, capable of only interacting with its own content rather than with the rich content of the reality outside itself. This (responding only to internal stimuli and not to external ones) is, by the way, just the psychiatric definition of “delusional”, and is the most important characteristic of the “Mass Man” who is in revolt (Ortega y Gasset). This is the “stupid postmodern human being” who is constantly misdiagnosing the social reality and other human beings – who has been bred to be “delusional”. To sum up the post-modern, politically correct, human being: s/he is stupid, simple-minded, “delusional”, and governed only by instincts.

Adorno and Horkheimer have described a similar degradation of language under the operation of the culture industry, something like “fundamentalism”. Again, while we are both describing the same thing, their description is somewhat different because the difference in our standpoint in terms of space

and time:

Durch die Sprache, die er spricht, trägt er selber zum Reklamecharakter der Kultur das Seine bei. *Je vollkommener nämlich die Sprache in der Mitteilung aufgeht, je mehr die Worte aus substantiellen Bedeutungsträgern zu qualitätslosen Zeichen werden, je reiner und durchsichtiger sie das Gemeinte vermitteln, desto undurchdringlicher werden sie zugleich.* Die Entmythologisierung der Sprache schlägt, als Element des gesamten Aufklärungsprozesses, jü Magie zurück. Unterschieden voneinander und unablösbar waren Wort und Gehalt einander gesellt. Begriffe wie Wehmut, Geschichte, ja: das Leben, wurden im Wort erkannt, das sie heraushob und bewahrte. Seine Gestalt konstituierte und spiegelte sie zugleich. Die entschlossene Trennung, die den Wortlauf als zufällig und die Zuordnung zum Gegenstand als willkürlich erklärt, räumt mit der abergläubischen Vermischung von Wort und Sache auf. Was an einer festgelegten Buchstabenfolge über die Korrelation zum Ereignis hinausgeht, wird als unklar und als Wortinertaphysik verbannt. *Damit aber wird das Wort, das nur noch bezeichnen und nichts mehr bedeuten darf, so auf die Sache fixiert, daß es zur Formel erstarrt. Das betrifft gleichermaßen Sprache und Gegenstand.* Anstatt den Gegenstand zur Erfahrung zu bringen, exponiert ihn das gereinigte Wort als Fall eines abstrakten Moments, und alles andere, durch den Zwang zu unbarmherziger Deutlichkeit vom Ausdruck abgeschnitten, den es nicht mehr gibt, verkümmert damit auch in der Realität. Der Linksaußen beim Fußball, das Schwarzhemd, der Hitlerjunge und ihresgleichen sind nichts mehr als das, was sie heißen. Hatte das Wort vor seiner Rationalisierung mit der Sehnsucht auch die Lüge entfesselt, so ist das rationalisierte zur Zwangsjacke geworden für die Sehnsucht mehr noch als für die Lüge. *Die Blindheit und Stummheit der Daten, auf welche der Positivismus die Welt reduziert, geht auf die Sprache selber über, die sich auf die Registrierung jener Daten beschränkt.* So werden die Bezeichnungen selbst undurchdringlich, sie erhalten eine Schlagkraft, eine Gewalt der Adhäsion und Abstoßung, die sie ihrem extremen Gegensatz, den Zaubersprüchen, ähnlich macht (ibid., p. 173 - 4).<sup>41</sup>

Much of our insights are born from our own experience with being gang-stalked and persecuted under the American liberal system. Our story, “the philosopher suspect and the One Dimensional Women”, is in essence a story about language's loss of meaning (its loss of correlation with reality) that is widespread in American society. What we have had to deal with over there is precisely the gang-stalking women's fundamentalist mindset, a mind which cannot relate itself to the external reality. These liberal white women are going after the suspect because: (1) they have already decided in advance that they are the victims of stalking and the suspect the victimizer or the stalker. Meanwhile the reality is that they have hundreds of volunteers following the suspect wherever he goes and have

---

41 In “free society”, advertising corresponds to the political propaganda: performing the same brain-washing (brain-deadening) function. “Die allgemeine Wiederholung der Bezeichnungen für die Massnahmen macht diese gleichsam vertraut... Das blinde und rapid sich ausbreitende Wiederholen designerter Worte verbindet die Reklame mit der totalitären Parole.” Thus fundamentalism, brain-deadening: “Die Schicht der Erfahrung, welche die Worte zu denen der Menschen machte, die sie sprachen, ist abgegraben...” (p. 175).

often complete control over the law enforcement surveillance on him, thus knowing every little thing the suspect does at every little moment while the suspect is completely unable to know where they are and what they are doing; and that they are constantly forging and staging evidences to frame the suspect in order to use law enforcement as their personal assassin to assassinate the suspect –and yet it has ever occurred to them that their actions seem to contradict their wording “He is stalking us”, “He is dangerous to us”, or “We are terrified of him”. (2) The women have got the sympathy and backing of ten thousand people around the world simply by lying that the suspect is obsessed with them, stalking them, and imagining them to be stalking him and that the police wouldn't care; and are framing the suspect without his being able to respond in any way because he is excluded from all due-process and law enforcement system given his status as the “suspect” – and yet it has never occurred to the women that the system's and the people's bias against the suspect and his powerlessness seem to contradict their wording “The society is sexist”, “Guys are privileged”, “Women are ignored”, or “Women are powerless”. Here we see that words, for these women, do not acquire validity by referring to something in reality, but are magically valid in themselves. (3) The women's mind is so inflexible that they can never adjust themselves to a changing reality, i.e. that, when the stalking suspect turns out to be a stalking suspect only by mistake, when law enforcement, after much investigation, reveals to the women that the suspect is not dangerous as is formerly assumed, the women will get angry and protest and complain that law enforcement is “sexist”. Once the women have decided that reality is like this, they will never accept, given new evidences, that reality might not be like this but might be like that. Namely, once they have heard and uttered the words, “He is a dangerous stalker”, the words must acquire a reality independent of any external reality. In fact, they will try to frame the suspect and falsely incriminate him, just so that he might appear to fit the wording which has portrayed him as a monster. For these women, words are not invented to describe reality, but reality is invented to fit the words. (4) The women all comport themselves like Empress Dowager: the wrong they have done to the suspect is invisible to them and should never be taken into account, while they expect law enforcement to punish the suspect with death penalty or life-long confinement without explaining why if the suspect offends them in the slightest way, or even if he merely knows about their criminal conducts against him, which causes them discomfort. As we have claimed, this inability to place oneself in the shoes of others is intimately connected with the loss of ability to correlate words with their referents. As has been noted in our story, what the women are really seeking after is the enactment of the longed after “script”, a scenario where women are pure, innocent, good, and superior and, because of this, are constantly threatened by an ugly, stupid, and violent male monster, i.e. a exemplary story of “victimology” (being victimized is proof of one's intellectual and moral superiority). The women in essence live in an inverse universe where reality is supposed to conform to words rather than the other way round. It is through a loss of language's ability to refer to reality, or rather through a reversal of the relationship between words and the reality they describe, that the women's sheer bullying and gang-stalking of the poor suspect is reinterpreted, and justified, as mere attempts to correct injustice!

In the story we then see the suspect struggling against political correctness – the fundamental assumption that white women are the embodiment of innocence and goodness and, because of this, are constantly endangered by monstrous men in this sexist society – throughout the criminal justice system: how nobody in the criminal justice system – judges, district attorneys, public defenders, and law

enforcement officers – is able to even imagine the possibility that the women might be lying, that the suspect might have been misrepresented by them, and that reality might be the opposite of the “fundamental assumption”.<sup>42</sup> We see how, when the suspect writes down in clear description the women's modus operandi to defraud the law enforcement and criminal justice system and shows it to a lawyer, the lawyer couldn't even understand what he is describing. We see how the suspect finds it impossible to make anybody understand the women's modus operandi in gang-stalking him, falsely reporting him, and framing him. We see how everybody is only capable of understanding the imageries encoded in the oft-repeated words of political correctness, and will not understand a new set of words which the suspect has had to invent to describe something new and different, his peculiar circumstances. We see how even supposedly educated people like judges and lawyers and psychiatrists don't have enough of a functional brain as to be able to interact with a reality outside themselves: even “educated people” are only capable of interacting with the contents of their own mind. We see how the suspect's friends are recruited by law enforcement and/or Homeland Security as informants against him, and how, when the suspect finds out and accuses them of informing on him, they truly believe he suffers schizophrenia because “he believes everybody is working as informant against him.” (Namely, there is a *literal* fulfillment of one of the diagnostic criteria.) We see how, in short, the suspect just can't find anybody to communicate with who is able to escape the literal wording of language and ponder on the meanings of words – who is able to interact with the reality outside his or her mind. We see how, as American society becomes ever shallower each year and people are ever less able to understand anything complex and which is not already being repeatedly represented in the media, the suspect wants to die because nobody can possibly understand the expressions of the potentials inside him.

We have seen the suspect himself writing about the widespread “literal interpretation” in the functioning of American society:

What is going on with the male sex in America? I have heard many horror stories about guys getting convicted as sex-offenders because, while they were urinating by the side of the street, some child happened to come upon the scene and see it. Yesterday I heard another horror story from somebody. The guy, 22, was living with his girlfriend for two years. He saw her ID, which indicated that she was almost 21. It then turned out that her ID was fake, that she had lied, and that she was only 15. The guy was now charged with statutory rape and could get 15 years and would have to be a registered child-molester for the rest of his pathetic life.

---

42 Our story invites comparison with Jeffrey Masson's *Assault on Truth* (1984) documenting Freud's suppression of the “seduction theory”. Freud at first discovered that his hysterical female patients had frequently suffered incest rape by their male acquaintances, from which the trauma caused the psychological problems in question. But nobody in his society can even imagine that females can be victims of their male relatives' sexual aggression, so that Freud, with his career at stake, suppressed this “seduction theory” and invented a new theory which claimed that the female patients had *imagined up* their sexual victimization because they were secretly in love with their male relatives (infantile sexuality). It was politically incorrect to speak of females as victims of incest rape back then, just as it is politically incorrect now to speak of males as victims of female aggression.

What is wrong with this picture? It's the literal application of the wording of the law without regard for their "original intent" (the meaning behind the words). Certainly, the law to protect minor from sexual exploitation is originally devised to prevent minor predators hanging around school yards from preying on teenage school girls. Now just because the 22 year-old guy's cohabitation with his girlfriend fits the literal description of the law, he is treated the same way as the minor sex predator. Another instance of "fundamentalism". The "spirit of the law" is completely ignored, only the "letter of the law" matters.

We dare assert that Americans' lawlessness with words is intimately connected with the pathological lying and fondness for slandering opponents which is widespread both among the American people and the American government. We have already mentioned a plenty of times the most annoying habit of the US government, i.e. making up bad stories about people to slander them, when it comes to our own case, the case of Viktor Bout,<sup>43</sup> that of Jose Padilla, and many so-called "terrorists".<sup>44</sup> It is the same with the American people. We can recall one incident from our own experience to illustrate a general tendency with which everyone is familiar. Once driving in rental car, we scratched another car. The woman inside was nervous that we might drive away, but we didn't, and she was grateful. We came to a corner to exchange information, and we, unaccustomed to the American way, admitted fault. She later sued the rental car company for "injuries" and "psychological damages" associated with the accident. We were communicating with the rental car company's representative, who was quite angry with the fact that we had admitted fault. "But the accident occurred at less than 5 miles per hour, and she didn't appear to have suffered injuries when she was talking with me. She is just making things up in order to cash in!" Of course everybody knew this, but the representative claimed, "Yeah she's lying, but it's her right!" The American people have been so spoiled that they actually believe lying and making things up is one of their fundamental "rights". The same with the One Dimensional Women in our story: as soon as they are granted "victim confidentiality", they use it as cover under which to lie to the detectives and make up horror stories about the suspect and forge evidences to frame him, and, if the detectives become suspicious of their horror stories and do not respond to their requests, they believe their "rights" have been violated. Lying and cheating and framing people is their "right", and, if law enforcement officers try to penetrate their lies, they have violated the women's "privacy". It has become part of the American soul to have no respect for words whatsoever. When Americans open their mouth, it is but shit which flies out – and they often believe they have a right to this. It is certainly because of this that American criminal justice system is so inaccurate – with a vast number of people falsely convicted and so many innocent people waiting on death row. It is thus no wonder that, within such a context, language could have lost its original capacity to represent an external reality that is independent of the speaking subject. The loss of comprehension for words' meaning is the breeding ground for pathological lying without shame, and vice versa.

At the end of this section, we must consider a possible omission. While we have focused on our theme of the "reeducation of the white males" to achieve the dominance of political correctness, we have concentrated only on the liberal white female (with their feminist ideologues in the background). We

---

43 See Daniel Estulin's *The Shadow Masters*.

44 From Bin Laden to Khalid Sheikh Mohammed to Abu Musa al-Zarqawi.

have not focused on the other “reeducators”. This is because it is our contention that others, such as the African American civil rights activists, have hardly accomplished anything to the extent to which the liberal white women have accomplished their objective. We dare assert that American political correctness is practically entirely created by liberal white women, other groups having played only negligible roles. Again, we are not talking about the imparting of legal rights, but about the changing of perception, about the absorption of a guilty complex by the white males. The only other group which has played a significant role in the creation of this “guilty complex” is Jewish activists. Thus, when we discuss the enforcement of political correctness in the United States, we really need only consider the liberal white females and the Jewish groups for social justice. We have nevertheless decided to omit the Jewish groups from consideration because we simply do not consider Jewish people's enforcement of political correctness to be problematic. Firstly, the Jewish people, while harshly punishing any white males for holding white male supremacist views toward any other groups whatsoever, are not “pretending to be victims”. They *have been* victims of genocide; what they have suffered is far worse than what white women have suffered in America, and they are not currently saying Antisemitism is rampant in American society. (In fact, when asked, they would almost always agree that American society is the least anti-semitic of all Western societies, something which American liberal women will never do.) The American Jewish people's assessment of their current situation is far more realistic than white women's of theirs. Secondly, asserting a victim status is not, for the Jewish people, the principal way to gain control of American society. While the enforcement of political correctness plays a certain role in Jewish lobby groups' control over United States' foreign policies, the control which the Jewish people have exercised on American society domestically hardly compares in scope with that exercised by the liberal white women. Finally, we must emphasize the most essential point: white women have gained prominence in American society because they are playing a major world-historical function in consumerizing American society to make possible the global division of labor and the global market. There is no such economic (hence world-historical) function corresponding to Jewish people's prominence in American society.<sup>45</sup>

### **Political correctness as “masses in revolt”**

In both the Introduction to “Subhuman meets...” and “Syrian scandal” we have lamented the postmodern human being who is so completely spoiled by prosperity, technology, and democracy as to become like a “spoiled child”, increasingly stupid and yet increasingly confident in himself or herself, unable to appreciate the greater wisdom of the government elites and thus fostering the emergence of an insidious form of “totalitarianism disguised through deception as democracy” which characterizes Western governments. Anyone who has read Ortega y Gasset's *La Rebelión de las Masas* will see the extraordinary similarity between his description of the modern Mass Man and ours of the postmodern Mass Man and Mass Woman. Let's briefly go over the similarities before considering the relationship between political correctness and the revolt of the masses.<sup>46</sup>

---

45 We thus disagree fundamentally with somebody like David Duke who attributes the fall of Anglo-whites in America to Jewish enforcement of political correctness. It is really the liberal white females who have caused the fall.

46 Other than Ortega's original work, we shall, in the following, also make use of the most excellent summary of his phenomenological study of modern mass society, Alain Laroche's “Philosophie morale et pensée politique chez Ortega



For Ortega y Gasset, the phenomenological description of any human society will reveal that this society is composed of two types of human beings, the masses and the elite, or the “nobles”. Alain Laroche's summarizes (ibid., p. 59 – 62):

La propriété « masse » désigne tout individu se sentant comme tout le monde, n'étant pas angoissé à cette idée et étant même heureux d'être identique aux autres. Ces personnes n'exigent d'elles-mêmes rien en particulier, puisque pour celles-ci vivre équivaut à être à chaque instant ce qu'elles sont déjà: il n'y a donc de leur part aucun effort de perfectionnement par rapport à elles-mêmes. La propriété « élite », au contraire, désigne les individus se percevant d'abord en tant qu'être singulier et exigeant d'eux-mêmes plus de choses que les autres, tendant toujours vers un perfectionnement, bien que la plupart du temps il sera impossible pour eux d'atteindre entièrement ces exigences supérieures.

More on the “elite” or the “noble”:

L'homme d'excellence est d'abord et avant tout individualiste, c'est-à-dire qu'il se considère comme un être individuel à part entière bien avant de se considérer comme un être « collectif ». Il n'accepte pas les valeurs ni les modes de vie du grand nombre et ses projets vitaux ne coïncident nullement avec ceux de la majorité. Il cherche à vivre de façon permanente au service de ses idéaux et personne ne peut l'empêcher de les réaliser. Il cultive ainsi sa différence, mais reste cependant toujours au niveau de la réalité sociale. En effet, être individualiste signifie ici la possibilité d'accomplir un développement personnel: si l'aristocrate est d'abord et avant tout individualiste, il possède inévitablement une dimension sociale puisqu'il est « individu » justement parce qu'il est un être social. On pourrait dire qu'il est « un » parmi les autres. Il va pratiquement toujours à contretemps et subit l'incompréhension des masses, représentant l'avant-garde avec tout ce que cela possède de positif et de négatif. L'homme d'excellence est d'une très grande exigence face à lui-même. Il ne répond pas à ces caprices ou à ses désirs primaires, mais fait ce qu'il doit faire et non pas ce qu'il veut faire: son unique projet est de réaliser son devoir-faire, son « quehacer », afin de toujours se perfectionner. Lorsqu'il a atteint ses objectifs, il en invente de nouveaux, de plus hauts rangs, toujours plus difficiles. Sa vie se calcule ainsi non pas par ses succès et ses résultats, mais par ses exigences et ses aspirations, par l'effort constant mis dans la tâche. La vie noble fait toujours référence à l'effort, à l'obligation, à la discipline: 'Cela est la vie disciplinée – la vie noble. La noblesse se définit par l'exigence, par les obligations, non pas par les droits. Noblesse oblige.'

....

L'aristocrate se reporte toujours à une norme supérieure, se mettant à son service et vouant sa vie à celle-ci. Il vit donc dans une permanente servitude essentielle, s'accordant

---

y Gasset: à propos de la dialectique élite-masse” (UQAM, 2006).

beaucoup moins de liberté que les autres:

El hombre selecto o excelente esta constiluido por una necesidad de apelar de si mismo a una norma mas alla de él, superior a él, a cuyo servicio libremente se pane [... ] Contra lo que sue le creerse, es la criatura de selección, y no la masa, quien vive en esencial servidumbre. No le sabe su vida si no la hace consistir en servicio a algo trascendente [... ] Cuando ésta, par azar, Je falta, siente desasosiego e inventa nuevas formas mas diflciles, mas exigentes, que le opriman... (“Vida noble y vida vulgar, o esfuerzo e inercia”)<sup>47</sup>

---

47 More of Orega's own words (“El hecho de las aglomeraciones”; with Louis Parrot's translation in French): “El concepto de muchedumbre es cuantitativo y visual. Traduzcámoslo, sin alterarlo, a la terminología sociológica. Entonces hallamos la idea de masa social. La sociedad es siempre una unidad dinámica de dos factores: minorías y masas. Las minorías son individuos o grupos de individuos especialmente cualificados. La masa es el conjunto de personas no especialmente cualificadas. No se entienda, pues, por masas, sólo ni principalmente «las masas obreras». Masa es el «hombre medio». De este modo se convierte lo que era meramente cantidad -la muchedumbre- en una determinación cualitativa: es la cualidad común, es lo mostrenco social, es el hombre en cuanto no se diferencia de otros hombres, sino que repite en sí un tipo genérico. ¿Qué hemos ganado con esta conversión de la cantidad a la cualidad? Muy sencillo: por medio de ésta comprendemos la génesis de aquella. Es evidente, hasta perogrullesco, que la formación normal de una muchedumbre implica la coincidencia de deseos, de ideas, de modo de ser, en los individuos que la integran. Se dirá que es lo que acontece con todo grupo social, por selecto que pretenda ser. En efecto; pero hay una esencial diferencia.”

“La notion de foule est quantitative et visuelle. En la traduisant, sans l’altérer, dans une terminologie sociologique, nous y découvrons l’idée de masse sociale. La société est toujours l’unité dynamique de deux facteurs, les minorités et les masses. Les minorités sont des individualités ou des groupes d’individus spécialement qualifiés. La masse est l’ensemble de personnes non spécialement qualifiées. Il faut donc se garder d’entendre simplement par masses les seules « masses ouvrières » ; la masse, c’est l’homme moyen. C’est ainsi que ce qui était une simple quantité – la foule – prend une valeur qualitative : c’est la qualité commune, ce qui est à tous et à personne, c’est l’homme en tant qu’il ne se différencie pas des autres hommes et n’est qu’une répétition du type générique. Mais qu’avons-nous gagné à cette conversion de la quantité en qualité ? C’est bien simple. La qualité nous a fait comprendre la genèse de la quantité. Il est évident, et même enfantin, que la formation normale d’une foule implique une coïncidence de désirs, d’idées, de manières d’être, chez les individus qui la composent. On objectera que ceci se produit pour tous les groupes sociaux, aussi sélectionnés qu’ils se prétendent l’être. En effet, mais il y a ici une différence essentielle.”

“En los grupos que se caracterizan por no ser muchedumbre y masa, la coincidencia efectiva de sus miembros consiste en algún deseo, idea o ideal, que por sí solo excluye el gran número. Para formar una minoría, sea la que fuere, es preciso que antes cada cual se separe de la muchedumbre por razones especiales, relativamente individuales. Su coincidencia con los otros que forman la minoría es, pues, secundaria, posterior, a haberse cada cual singularizado, y es, por lo tanto, en buena parte, una coincidencia en no coincidir. Hay cosas en que este carácter singularizador del grupo aparece a la intemperie: los grupos ingleses que se llaman a sí mismos «no conformistas», es decir, la agrupación de los que concuerdan sólo en su disconformidad respecto a la muchedumbre ilimitada. Este ingrediente de juntarse los menos, precisamente para separarse de los más, va siempre involucrado en la formación de toda minoría....

“En rigor, la masa puede definirse, como hecho psicológico, sin necesidad de esperar a que aparezcan los individuos en aglomeración. Delante de una sola persona podemos saber si es masa o no. Masa es todo aquel que no se valora a sí mismo -en bien o en mal- por razones especiales, sino que se siente «como todo el mundo» y, sin embargo, no se angustia, se siente a saber al sentirse idéntico a los demás. Imagínese un hombre humilde que al intentar valorarse por razones especiales -al preguntarse si tiene talento para esto o lo otro, si sobresale en algún orden-, advierte que no posee

In other words – to speak of the two fundamental types of human beings from our standpoint – the “noble” (the true “aristocrats” or the “elites”) are those who are striving during their whole life to realize their human potentials while the “masses” are those who do not attempt to do so, but are content with doing no more than putting food into their mouth and defecating into the toilet, and going along with whatever is the majority opinion. (It is for this reason that academics have had the habit of calling Ortega an “existentialist” like Sartre.)<sup>48</sup> You can see that, in our story, the “philosopher suspect” is the quintessential “noble” while the “One Dimensional Women” who are trying to be recognized as his “victims” are precisely “Mass Women”. Even while the suspect has his hands full reconstructing the secret business which the women are perpetrating behind his back, he is still studying and writing

---

ninguna cualidad excelente. Este hombre se sentirá mediocre y vulgar, mal dotado; pero no se sentirá «masa».”

“Dans les groupes dont le caractère est justement de n’être pas des foules, ni des masses, les coïncidences affectives de leurs membres consistent en quelque désir, en quelque idée ou idéal qui, de lui-même, exclut le grand nombre. Pour former une minorité, quelle qu’elle soit, il faut que tout d’abord chaque membre se soit séparé de la foule pour des raisons spéciales, plus ou moins individuelles. La coïncidence qui l’unit aux autres membres formant la minorité est donc secondaire, postérieure au moment où chacun d’eux s’est différencié de la masse; elle est en grande partie, par conséquent, une coïncidence « à ne pas coïncider ». Il y a des cas où ce caractère de différenciation du groupe apparaît au grand jour: les groupes anglais qui se dénomment eux-mêmes « non-conformistes » sont composés d’individus qui ne s’accordent que dans leur « non-conformité », vis-à-vis de la foule illimitée. Cet élément qui produit l’union du petit nombre, pour mieux le séparer du grand nombre, est toujours implicite dans la formation de toute minorité...”

“La masse peut donc, à la rigueur, se définir en tant que fait psychologique, sans même attendre que les individus apparaissent sous forme de groupements. En voyant un individu, nous pouvons affirmer s’il appartient ou non à la masse, s’il est masse ou non. Un individu fait partie de la masse, lorsque non seulement la valeur qu’il s’attribue – bonne ou mauvaise – ne repose pas sur une estimation justifiée de qualités spéciales, mais lorsque, se sentant comme tout le monde, il n’en éprouve cependant aucune angoisse, et se sent à l’aise, au contraire, de se trouver identique aux autres. Imaginez un homme modeste qui, essayant d’estimer sa propre valeur, se demande s’il ne possède pas quelque talent, dans tel ou tel domaine et constate, en fin de compte, qu’il ne possède aucune qualité saillante. Cet homme se sentira médiocre, vulgaire, peu doué, mais il ne se sentira pas « masse ».”

“Cuando se habla de «minorías selectas», la habitual bellaquería suele tergiversar el sentido de esta expresión, fingiendo ignorar que el hombre selecto no es el petulante que se cree superior a los demás, sino el que se exige más que los demás, aunque no logre cumplir en su persona esas exigencias superiores. Y es indudable que la división más radical que cabe hacer de la humanidad es ésta, en dos clases de criaturas: *las que se exigen mucho y acumulan sobre sí mismas dificultades y deberes, y las que no se exigen nada especial, sino que para ellas vivir es ser en cada instante lo que ya son, sin esfuerzo de perfección sobre sí mismas, boyas que van a la deriva.*”

“Quand on parle de « minorités d’élite », il est courant que les gens de mauvaise foi dénaturent le sens de cette expression et feignent d’ignorer que l’homme d’élite n’est pas le prétentieux qui se croit supérieur aux autres, mais bien celui qui est plus exigeant pour lui que pour les autres, même lorsqu’il ne parvient pas à réaliser en lui ses aspirations supérieures. Il est indéniable que la division la plus radicale qui se puisse faire dans l’humanité est cette scission en deux classes d’individus: *ceux qui exigent beaucoup d’eux-mêmes, et accumulent volontairement devoirs sur difficultés, et ceux qui, non seulement n’exigent rien de spécial d’eux-mêmes, mais pour lesquels la vie n’étant à chaque instant que ce qu’elle est déjà, ne s’efforcent à aucune perfection et se laissent entraîner comme des bouées à la dérive.*”

Then Ortega clarifies: “La división de la sociedad en masas y minorías excelentes no es, por lo tanto, una división en clases sociales, sino en clases de hombres, y no puede coincidir con la jerarquización en clases superiores e inferiores. Claro está que en las superiores, cuando llegan a serlo, y mientras lo fueron de verdad, hay más verosimilitud de hallar

philosophy and perfecting his foreign language skills in order to transcend the American society in which he is caught – he will never be content with speaking the same language as everyone else and not understanding anything like everyone else, especially when this society has so disgusted him – while the women are perfectly content with spending their whole days exploring the law enforcement system in order to harm people using the system and reading garbages in English on the Internet and chatting with other idiots on social media, never being bothered by their complete immersion in American society and non-comprehension of the world beyond. (It must be recognized that our story is a story more about the revolt of the masses than about “sexism” or “racism” or “reverse sexism”: these shallow and stupid women, riding on political correctness, somehow believe they are superior and should be in charge, not understanding their lower ranking in the natural hierarchy of this universe.) Now any human society, so Ortega's phenomenological description continues, is characterized by the relationship between the masses and the elites. The natural function (“destiny”) of the masses is to realize their inferiority and allow themselves to be guided by the (intellectual) elites, and the natural function of the (intellectual) elites is to make their superiority known to the masses and guide these (perhaps via the political elites, which are not the same as the real, or intellectual, elites). A harmonious society is precisely one in which the destiny of each species is fulfilled, i.e. one in which the masses are aware of their limitation (or stupidity) and consciously consent to being guided by the elites, knowing that this is for their own good. You can see that, when we have posited the best society to be a sort of enlightened “hybrid” authoritarianism, we are basically agreeing with Ortega on this point.

For Ortega, the crisis of modernity consists in the “revolt of the masses”, which is a form of imbalance in the relationship between the masses and the elites. Since the beginning of the twentieth century, the “mass man” (*hombre-masa*) has experienced a qualitative change. They are no longer like the mass men in the previous eras. They are in revolt. They are no longer aware of their own limitation, and are not interested in being guided by the elites. This is also exactly what we have complained about in the Introduction to “Subhuman meets...”. Compare his characterization of the modern mass man with our characterization of the contemporary stupid, over-confident, and yet powerless Americans:

---

hombres que adoptan el «gran vehículo», mientras las inferiores están normalmente constituidas por individuos sin calidad. Pero, en rigor, dentro de cada clase social hay masa y minoría auténtica. *Como veremos, es característico del tiempo el predominio, aun en los grupos cuya tradición era selectiva, de la masa y el vulgo.*”

“La division de la société en masses et en minorités d’élites, n’est donc pas une division en classes sociales, mais plutôt en classes d’hommes, et cette division ne peut coïncider avec un tableau hiérarchique en classes supérieures et inférieures. Il est évident que l’on trouvera dans les classes supérieures, lorsqu’elles sont devenues vraiment supérieures, une plus grande quantité d’hommes qui adopteront le « grand véhicule », que dans les classes inférieures, normalement constituées par des individus neutres, sans qualité. Mais on pourrait trouver à la rigueur une masse et une minorité authentiques dans chaque classe sociale. *Comme nous le verrons, une des caractéristiques de notre temps est la prédominance de la masse et du médiocre, jusque dans les groupes où la sélection était traditionnelle.*”

48 Thus Ortega (La época del señorito satisfecho): “Toda vida es lucha, el esfuerzo por ser si misma. Las dificultades con que tropiezo para realizar mi vida son precisamente lo que despierta y moviliza mis actividades, mis capacidades. Si mi cuerpo no me pesase, yo no podría andar. Si la atmósfera no me oprimiese, sentiría mi cuerpo como una cosa vaga, fofa, fantasmática.” Parrot: “Toute vie consiste dans la lutte et l’effort pour être soi-même. Les difficultés auxquelles je me heurte pour réaliser ma vie éveillent et mobilisent mes activités, mes capacités. Si mon corps n’était pas pesant je ne pourrais pas marcher. Si l’atmosphère était sans résistance, mon corps me semblerait vague, spongieux, fantomatique.”

Lo propio acaece en los demás órdenes, muy especialmente en el intelectual. Tal vez padezco un error; pero el escritor, al tomar la pluma para escribir sobre un tema que ha estudiado largamente, debe pensar que el lector medio, que nunca se ha ocupado del asunto, si le lee, no es con el fin de aprender algo de él, sino, al revés, para sentenciar sobre él cuando no coincide con las vulgaridades que este lector tiene en la cabeza. (I. “El hecho de las aglomeraciones”)

Il en est de même dans tous les domaines, et plus spécialement dans l’ordre intellectuel. Je fais peut-être erreur, mais quand l’écrivain se propose de traiter un thème qu’il a longuement étudié, il doit penser que si le lecteur moyen – qui ne s’est jamais occupé du sujet – le lit, ce n’est pas dans le but d’apprendre quelque chose de l’auteur, mais au contraire pour le censurer, si le texte ne coïncide pas avec les lieux communs dont sa tête est pleine.

“Unskilled and unaware of it”: ordinary people's bizarre overestimation of their own intelligence, as if they were intelligent enough to have opinions of their own on things. Ortega further echoes us when he describes the present generation as a people “much simpler”:

Y, en efecto, el tipo medio del actual hombre europeo posee un alma más sana y más fuerte que la del pasado siglo, pero mucho más simple. De aquí que a veces produzca la impresión de un hombre primitivo surgido inesperadamente en medio de una viejísima civilización. En las escuelas, que tanto enorgullecían al pasado siglo, no ha podido hacerse otra cosa que enseñar a las masas las técnicas de la vida moderna, pero no se ha logrado educarlas. Se les han dado instrumentos para vivir intensamente, pero no sensibilidad para los grandes deberes históricos; se les han inoculado atropelladamente el orgullo y el poder de los medios modernos, pero no el espíritu. Por eso no quieren nada con el espíritu, y las nuevas generaciones se disponen a tomar el mando del mundo como si el mundo fuese un paraíso sin huellas antiguas, sin problemas tradicionales y complejos (p. 46).

Et de fait, le type moyen de l’Européen actuel a une âme plus saine et plus forte que l’homme du siècle passé, mais elle est beaucoup plus simple. Aussi produit-il souvent l’impression d’un homme primitif surgi inopinément au milieu d’une vieille civilisation. Dans les écoles dont s’enorgueillissait tellement le XIX e siècle, on n’a pas pu faire autre chose que d’enseigner aux masses les techniques de la vie moderne ; on n’a pas réussi à les éduquer. On leur a donné des instruments pour vivre intensément, mais pas de sensibilité pour les grands devoirs historiques. On leur a inoculé violemment l’orgueil et le pouvoir des moyens modernes, mais non l’esprit. Aussi ne veulent-elles rien avoir de commun avec l’esprit ; les nouvelles générations se disposent à prendre la direction du monde, comme si le monde était un paradis sans traces anciennes, sans problèmes traditionnels et complexes.

So does Ortega's characterization of the modern “mass man” as like spoiled children also echo our own

description of the postmodern Americans:<sup>49</sup>

Esto nos lleva a apuntar en el diagrama psicológico del hombre-masa actual dos primeros rasgos: la libre expansión de sus deseos vitales -por lo tanto, de su persona y la radical ingratitud hacia cuanto ha hecho posible la facilidad de su existencia. Uno y otro rasgo componen la conocida psicología del niño mimado. Y en efecto, no erraría quien utilice ésta como una cuadrícula para mirar a su través el alma de las masas actuales. Heredero de un pasado larguísimo y genial – genial de inspiraciones y de esfuerzos – el nuevo vulgo ha sido mimado por el mundo en torno. Mimar es no limitar los deseos, dar la impresión a un ser de que todo le está permitido y a nada está obligado. La criatura sometida a este régimen no tiene la experiencia de sus propios confines. A fuerza de evitarle toda presión en derredor, todo choque con otros seres, llega a creer efectivamente que sólo él existe, y se acostumbra a no contar con los demás, *sobre todo a no contar con nadie como superior a él*. Esta sensación de la superioridad ajena sólo podía proporcionársela quien, más fuerte que él, le hubiese obligado a renunciar a un deseo, a reducirse, a contenerse. Así habría aprendido esta esencial disciplina: «Ahí concluyo yo y empieza otro que puede más que yo. En el mundo, por lo visto, hay dos: yo y otro superior a mí.» Al hombre medio de otras épocas le enseñaba cotidianamente su mundo esta elemental sabiduría, porque era un mundo tan toscamente organizado, que las catástrofes eran frecuentes y no había en él nada seguro, abundante ni estable. Pero las nuevas masas se encuentran con un paisaje lleno de posibilidades y, además, seguro, y todo ello presto, a su disposición, sin depender de su previo esfuerzo, como hallamos el sol en lo alto sin que nosotros lo hayamos subido al hombro. Ningún ser humano agradece a otro el aire que respira, porque el aire no ha sido fabricado por nadie: pertenece al conjunto de lo que «está ahí», de lo que decimos «es natural», porque no falta. Estas masas mimadas son lo bastante poco inteligentes para creer que esa organización material y social, puesta a su disposición como el aire, es de su mismo origen, ya que tampoco falla, al parecer, y es casi tan perfecta como la natural (p. 51).

Tout ceci nous amène à noter deux premiers traits dans le diagramme psychologique de l'homme-masse actuel : la libre expansion de ses désirs vitaux, par conséquent de sa personne, et son ingratitude foncière envers tout ce qui a rendu possible la facilité de son existence. L'un et l'autre de ces traits composent la psychologie bien connue de l'enfant gâté. De fait, celui qui se servirait de cette psychologie comme d'une grille à travers laquelle il regarderait l'âme des masses actuelles, ne se tromperait guère. Le « nouvel homme moyen », héritier d'un passé très ancien et génial – génial d'inspirations et d'efforts – a été « gâté » par le monde qui l'entoure. « Gâter », c'est ne pas limiter le désir, c'est donner à un être l'impression que tout lui est permis, qu'il n'est tenu à aucune obligation. La créature soumise à ce régime ne fait pas l'expérience de ses propres limites. A force de lui éviter toutes les pressions du dehors, tout heurt avec les autres êtres, on arrive à lui faire croire qu'elle seule existe, à l'accoutumer à ne pas compter avec les autres, *et surtout à ne*

---

49 In both “Subhuman meets...” and “Syrian scandal”.

*pas admettre que personne puisse lui être supérieur.* Ce sentiment de la supériorité d'autrui ne pouvait lui être donné que par un individu qui, étant plus fort que lui, l'eût obligé à renoncer à un désir, à se restreindre, à se contenir. Cet homme aurait appris ainsi cette discipline essentielle : « A ce point, je m'arrête, et un autre que moi commence, qui peut plus que moi. Dans ce monde, à ce qu'il semble, nous sommes deux, moi et un autre qui m'est supérieur ». Le monde environnant enseignait quotidiennement cette sagesse élémentaire à l'homme des autres époques ; le monde d'alors était si rudement organisé que les catastrophes y étaient fréquentes, et qu'il n'y avait en lui rien de sûr, rien d'abondant ni de stable. Mais les masses nouvelles se trouvent devant un paysage plein de possibilités et, de plus, sûr, et tout préparé, tout à leur disposition, sans qu'il leur en coûte quelque effort préalable, de la même manière que nous trouvons le soleil sur les hauteurs, sans que nous ayons eu à le monter sur nos épaules. Aucun être humain n'est reconnaissant à un autre de l'air qu'il respire, parce que l'air n'a pas été fabriqué par personne ; il appartient à l'ensemble de ce qui « est là », de ce que nous affirmons « être naturel », parce qu'il ne nous manque pas. Ces masses trop gâtées sont tout juste assez bornées pour croire que cette organisation matérielle et sociale, mise à leur disposition, comme l'air, provient de la même origine, puisqu'elle ne fait pas défaut elle non plus, à ce qu'il semble et qu'elle est aussi parfaite que l'organisation de la nature.

The most important diseases these “spoiled children” suffer is the inability to recognize the possibility that somebody might be superior to him or her in intellect and so the necessity of paying attention and listening to someone who might know better. Ortega calls this disease “intellectual hermetism”:

Ya sé que muchos de los que me leen no piensan lo mismo que yo. También esto es naturalísimo y confirma el teorema. Pues aunque resulte en definitiva errónea mi opinión, siempre quedaría el hecho de que muchos de esos lectores discrepantes no han pensado cinco minutos sobre tan compleja materia. ¿Cómo van a pensar lo mismo que yo? Pero al creerse con derecho a tener una opinión sobre el asunto sin previo esfuerzo para forjársela, manifiestan su ejemplar pertenencia al modo absurdo de ser hombre que he llamado «masa rebelde». Eso es precisamente tener obliterada, hermética, el alma. En este caso se trataría de *hermetismo intelectual*. La persona se encuentra con un repertorio de ideas dentro de sí. Decide contentarse con ellas y considerarse intelectualmente completa. Al no echar de menos nada fuera de sí, se instala definitivamente en aquel repertorio. He ahí el mecanismo de la obliteración (p. 56).

Je sais bien que beaucoup de ceux qui me lisent ne pensent pas comme moi, ce qui est naturel également et confirme le théorème. Car même si, tout compte fait, mon opinion se trouvait erronée, il resterait vrai que beaucoup de ces lecteurs aux opinions contraires n'ont pas réfléchi cinq minutes sur une matière aussi complexe. Comment penseraient-ils comme moi ? Mais en se croyant le droit d'avoir une opinion sur ce sujet, sans un effort préalable pour se la forger, ils donnent une preuve exemplaire de leur adhésion à cette façon absurde d'être homme, qui est d'appartenir à ce que j'ai nommé la « masse rebelle ». Voilà ce que

j'appelle précisément avoir l'âme oblitérée, hermétique. Il s'agirait dans ce cas d'un *hermétisme intellectuel*. L'individu trouve dans son esprit un répertoire d'idées toutes faites. Il décide de s'en tenir à elles et de considérer comme complète sa provision d'idées. Ne trouvant rien à désirer en dehors de lui, il s'installe définitivement en lui-même. C'est le mécanisme de l'oblitération.

He concludes:

Si atendiendo a los efectos de vida pública se estudia la estructura psicológica de este nuevo tipo de hombre-masa, Se encuentra lo siguiente: 1., una impresión nativa y radical de que la vida es fácil, sobrada, sin limitaciones trágicas; por lo tanto, cada individuo medio encuentra en sí una sensación de dominio y triunfo que, 2., le invita a afirmarse a sí mismo tal cual es, dar por bueno y completo su haber moral e intelectual. *Este contentamiento consigo le lleva a cerrarse para toda instancia exterior, a no escuchar, a no poner en tela de juicio sus opiniones y a no contar con los demás*. Su sensación íntima de dominio le incita constantemente a ejercer predominio. Actuará, pues, como si sólo él y sus congéneres existieran en el mundo; por lo tanto, 3., intervendrá en todo imponiendo su vulgar opinión sin miramientos, contemplaciones, trámites ni reservas, es decir, según un régimen de «acción directa».

Si l'on étudie la structure psychologique de ce nouveau type d'homme-masse, en tenant compte des répercussions qu'il provoque dans la vie publique, on y relèvera les caractéristiques suivantes : en premier lieu, l'impression originaire et radicale que la vie est facile, débordante, sans aucune tragique limitation; de là, cette sensation de triomphe et de domination qu'éprouvera en lui chaque individu moyen, sensation qui, en second lieu, l'invitera à s'affirmer lui-même, tel qu'il est, à proclamer que son patrimoine moral et intellectuel lui paraît satisfaisant et complet. *Ce contentement de soi-même l'incite à demeurer sourd à toute instance extérieure, à ne pas écouter, à ne pas laisser discuter ses opinions et à ne pas s'occuper des autres*. Cet intime sentiment de domination le pousse constamment à occuper la place prépondérante. Il agira donc comme s'il n'existait au monde que lui et ses congénères. Aussi – en dernier lieu – interviendra-t-il partout pour imposer son opinion médiocre, sans égards, sans atermoiements, sans formalités ni réserves, c'est-à-dire suivant un régime d' « action directe ».<sup>50</sup>

---

50 In another place, Ortega describes: “el mundo organizado por el siglo XIX, al producir automáticamente un hombre nuevo, ha metido en él formidables apetitos, poderosos medios de todo orden para satisfacerlos – económicos, corporales (higiene, salud media superior a la de todos los tiempos), civiles y técnicos (entendiendo por éstos la enormidad de conocimientos parciales y de eficiencia práctica que hoy tiene el hombre medio y de que siempre careció en el pasado). Después de haber metido en él todas estas potencias, el siglo XIX lo ha abandonado a sí mismo, y entonces, siguiendo el hombre medio su índole natural, se ha cerrado dentro de sí. De esta suerte, nos encontramos con una masa más fuerte que la de ninguna época, pero, a diferencia de la tradicional, hermetizada en sí misma, incapaz de atender a nada ni a nadie, creyendo que se basta; en suma: indócil. Continuando las cosas como hasta aquí, cada día se notará más en toda Europa – y por reflejo en todo el mundo – que las masas son incapaces de dejarse dirigir en ningún orden. En las horas difíciles que llegan para nuestro continente, es posible que, súbitamente angustiadas, tengan un momento la



A closed mind is part of the same structure with selfishness, self-centeredness, stupidity, and overconfidence in the self. You can see how much Ortega's description of the Mass Man still holds true of contemporary Americans – who feel so entitled and so confident in themselves that it has become impossible for the elite to ever explain to them what the real problem is. Most importantly, closed in upon herself or himself, the Mass Woman and Mass Man have lost the capacity to be directed by an elite. You have seen in our story how the “philosopher suspect” is constantly frustrated by the fact that nobody around him – judges, district attorneys, his own public defenders, and his acquaintances at the church – is capable of interacting with him as he is, but how everybody is only capable of interacting with the preconceived ideas in his or her mind about him: this is because everybody he encounters is a “Mass Man” or “Mass Woman”. What we have previously been concerned with, the mind's self-enclosure due to the loss of the ability to correlate words with their referents in the reality outside it, is here described in different terms, according to its psychological dimensions. Namely, when a human being is spoiled by “prosperity” – has experienced no hardship in life – and “equality” – is told that nobody is above him or her, which s/he misunderstands as meaning more than “equality before the law”, but “equality in capacities and talents” – s/he has the tendency to become excessively self-confident and thereby lose the capacity to listen to and learn from the external reality and other people. In our description of Americans' lawlessness with the use of language, this excessive self-confidence has merely translated into the loss of the ability to reflect on the meaning of words. Overconfident, the Mass Women and Mass Men are never skeptical of the referential capacities of the discourse they have retrieved from the mass media around (from the culture industry). Political correctness is the premier Modus Operandi of Mass Women and Mass Men, i.e. creatures who have lost the capacity to relate to an external authority and an external reality: radically imposing on the whole society mediocre conception about social justice (“White women are victims”; “White men are privileged”) and not permitting any discussion (any attempt to find the referents of words in the external reality). It is a form of “direct action”. While Ortega, by “direct actions”, refers to the violent manner in which the fascists

---

buena voluntad de aceptar, en ciertas materias especialmente premiosas, la dirección de minorías superiores. Pero aun esa buena voluntad fracasará. Porque la textura radical de su alma está hecha de hermetismo e indocilidad, porque les falta, de nacimiento, la función de atender a lo que está más allá de ellas, sean hechos, sean personas. Querrán seguir a alguien, y no podrán. Querrán oír, y descubrirán que son sordas” (p. 55). Parrot: “le monde organisé par le XIXe siècle, en produisant automatiquement un homme nouveau l’a doté de formidables appétits, de puissants et multiples moyens pour les satisfaire – moyens d’ordre économique (hygiène, santé moyenne, supérieure à celle de tous les temps), moyens civils et techniques (j’entends par là l’énorme somme de connaissances partielles et de bénéfiques pratiques que possède aujourd’hui l’homme moyen, ce dont il manqua toujours dans le passé). Après l’avoir doté de toute cette puissance, le XIXe siècle l’a abandonné à lui-même; l’homme moyen suivant son tempérament naturel s’est alors refermé sur lui-même. De sorte que nous nous trouvons en présence d’une masse plus forte que celle d’aucune autre époque, mais, à la différence de la masse traditionnelle, hermétiquement fermée sur elle-même, incapable de prendre garde à rien ni à personne et croyant se suffire à elle-même – en un mot indocile. Si les choses continuent comme elles se sont succédées jusqu’ici, on remarquera, chaque jour un peu plus, en Europe, et par répercussion dans le monde entier, que les masses sont incapables de se laisser diriger dans aucun domaine. Quand viendront les heures difficiles qui se préparent pour notre continent, il est possible que subitement angoissées, elles aient un instant la bonne volonté d’accepter, dans certaines passes critiques, la direction des minorités supérieures. Mais cette bonne volonté échouera là encore, parce que la texture intime de leur âme est faite d’hermétisme et d’indocilité, parce qu’il leur manque, de naissance, la faculté de prendre en considération ce qui est au delà d’elles, qu’il s’agisse de faits ou de personnes. Elles voudront suivre quelqu’un et ne le pourront pas. Elles voudront entendre et s’apercevront qu’elles sont sourdes.”

and communists – the direct consequences of the Mass Men which liberal democracy and technology have produced since the nineteenth century – imposed their ideologies on the whole society, what qualifies as “direct action” in postmodern America is precisely political correctness, the violent (not physically, but legally and in terms of social pressure) manner in which liberal white women impose on everybody else the notions about human beings and the world which they have invented to glorify themselves and keep themselves above everyone else (that they could do the world a lot of good but are unfair kept down by evil monsters).

The problem is that the masses are guiding the pronouncement of morals rather than being guided by an elite. Recall a scene from the movie “The Joy Luck Club” in which the white mother-in-law makes a racial stereotype statement to the Chinese American woman and the son of the mother (Andrew McCarthy as “Ted Jordan”) defends her, “Mother, this is the first time I’m ashamed of you.” The Chinese American woman falls in love with him for his heroic standing up against conventional racism – because there is so much understanding in his act of the heart of another human being. None of that exists today in the public condemnation of racism because everybody is now capable of it and it looks more like a witch-hunt (mass hysteria) to demonstrate one’s own moral superiority. Mass participation has corrupted goodness after the stupid masses have hijacked it and repeated it and forced it upon others without understanding. The masses should never have had a hand in making a stand against sexism or racism; they should only be guided by an elite to do so.<sup>51</sup>

We have noted that “victimology” – that being victimized is a sign of moral superiority, and that white women have been victimized by a system of white male domination – is the value system of the masses, those average persons who have no special talents on which to build an estimation of their self-worth. It’s much like the “slave morality” in Nietzsche’s *The Genealogy of Morals*. We can see that, within the framework of Ortega y Gasset, victimology, and the consequent race for various categories of people to compete for “victim status”, are the most natural developments when the masses, spoiled and over-confident, have lost the desire and ability to recognize, listen to, and let themselves be guided by, somebody intellectually and morally superior to them (i.e. the “elite”). In our story and in our past writings, we have been concerned with the problem of how consumerism has favored the development and dominance of “victimology”; how “victimology” is leading to an Opposite World where the

---

51 (June, 2016:) In the midst of Donald Trump’s campaign for president in 2016, there emerges a group “Chinese Americans for Trump”. What has made some Chinese Americans so enthusiastic about Donald when he has made so many disparaging comments about China (how China has “raped” America and so on)? These Chinese Americans are not offended partly because China is nowadays a strong nation. When you know that everybody knows that your country is strong, you give less thoughts about others’ insults against it. But these Chinese Americans admire Donald as an “Alpha male”, someone who has the *courage* to say what no other politicians dare to say. Namely, he appears “heroic” – ironically, for speaking what borders racism – just as “Ted Jordan” appears heroic back in the old days for speaking *against* racism. This is a very instructive lesson for us: speaking against racism has lost all its heroic garb because everyone is capable of it nowadays and it (as political correctness) has become something which the majority imposes *through force* upon any minority who might deviate from it. When, back then, anti-racism was in the minority, it was asserted with reason, understanding, and, most importantly, *courage*. Nowadays, when anti-racism is in the majority, it is asserted without reason and understanding and entirely through force. Like “direct action”. As political correctness, anti-racism has become *unreason* and something quite unheroic and disgusting, a mere “following the herd”.

incompetent takes up the leadership position in society and the competent is relegated to the margin; and how it's the feminist ideology which has, in the United States, led the way for the unqualified masses to replace the better qualified few with themselves. Here we see that, with Ortega, the excessive confidence, and thence self-enclosure, of the Mass Men and Mass Women has led to the same result, the sovereignty of the unqualified (“la soberania del individuo no cualificado”)<sup>52</sup>, or what we have called the “Planet of the Apes”. In conclusion, we thus see how prosperity and equality (the capitalist system, liberal democracy, and technological progress) have spoiled the masses of unqualified and resulted in their self-enclosure, which leads to the development and dominance of “victimology” (the “sacralization of victims”), which leads to further waste and squandering, which reinforces the capitalist and consumerist system which has created the prosperity and equality in the first place. In the process, the masses become ever dumber and more and more lose touch with reality, the human mind becomes increasingly simplified in accordance with the increasing simplified life under society's pressure to speed up consumption and increase waste, and planet Earth is increasingly running out of resources without anyone becoming capable of understanding the consequences.

If Ortega were alive today, he would certainly rank among the paleoconservatives in America and the far right parties in Europe and work strictly against the liberals in both continents. While he would hold dear “equality before the law” as all conservatives do, he would decry as “injustice” the liberal program for social justice, the extension of “equality before the law” to “equality of conditions” (manufacturing equality in material possessions and talents through redistribution of wealth and social engineering tactics like affirmative actions). This is because:

*Comment faire pour déterminer quand le sentiment démocrate dégénère en conception plébiscite? Selon notre philosophe, cela se passe lorsqu'on cherche à rompre l'inégalité politique à tout prix et à niveler les privilèges. Celui qui s'irrite de voir des êtres égaux traités de façon inégale, mais qui demeure imperturbable lorsqu'il voit des êtres inégaux traités de manière égale ne serait pas démocrate, mais bien plébéien. L'égalité dans tous les secteurs de la vie est ainsi l'un des pires maux dont peut souffrir une société puisque cela permet à des hommes « moins excellents » d'avoir le même poids que des hommes « plus excellents », la forme la plus extrême de cette sympathie pour la plèbe étant pour Ortega la doctrine socialiste. (Laroche, *ibid.*, p. 100.)*

How he has spoken to our heart! Of course what we have seen is that the “equality of conditions” is not only injustice in the sense of giving the less competent the same weight as the more competent, but also in that it will actually result in an “Opposite World”, where the less competent rule society while the more competent are pushed to the margin. We are elitists just like Ortega, and, while admitting, with the liberals, that blacks should be compensated because they have sacrificed their past to enable the whites to advance a little further to be at where they are today, we will strictly deny compensation in the form of affirmative actions, but will provide compensation in the form of, e.g., extra tutoring for black students after school. This “equality of conditions” – achieved through social injustice and lowering the standards especially for the less competent – is another political correctness which

---

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 30.

destroys the natural valuation of human beings according to their merits. We have, in this communication, however, concentrated on “women as victims” and not on the other most insidious form of political correctness, “equality”.

In *La Rebelión de las Masas* Ortega is worried that this “Mass Man”, taking all the fruits of civilization for granted (as if they grew on trees) and unable to be directed by somebody superior, might not be in the position to sustain all the achievements of civilization that surround them.<sup>53</sup> Eighty years have passed by, and we now know that he is somewhat wrong in this respect. More and more of the machines that make up our civilization are built by other machines and through increasing specialization and division of labor among human engineers, who no longer have to understand anything outside their specialty in order to together perpetuate the whole. It is the earth's capacity to sustain the growth of human civilization which is overlooked, and it is the intellectual achievements of past humanity which is unsustainable, will be forgotten, by the newer generations of stupid and closed-minded human beings. In this essay we have tried to advocate the re-installation of the “lost white male” in the leadership position of American society. This is because they are the only group, and the most appropriate group judging by merits, who can take down, and replace, “white women's rule” in the advanced regions of the United States (“blue states”), and because white women's rule is the pivot around which the global consumerist market turns. The return to “white male rule” means a *re-masculinization of society* that will be the cultural correlate of “reindustrialization” which, perhaps when combined with similar revolutions elsewhere, e.g. the far right revolution in Europe, China's reorientation of its industrial capacities away from the production of consumer products, etc., could break up globalization. Taking down “white women's rule” in Anglophone nations is the first, and most important, step in saving the human brain worldwide and saving the earth from over-exploitation.

### **Can China's, Russia's, and European far right's search for an alternative to Pax Americana become the cure for American export of political correctness?**

In our past communications we have continually warned about the American export of political correctness, how it is Americans' attempt to export a promotion of consumerism which is deadly to the already overly exploited earth's resources base and the healthy development of the human brain. In the present communication we have dived a little deeper to elaborate why political correctness is antithetical to a healthy human brain functioning: political correctness typically manifests a one-dimensional attachment to words to the exclusion of their relationship to the external reality, resulting in a mind that is self-enclosed and thus loses touch with reality and truth. We are warning that, while United States exports its McDonald to oversea, it might also be exporting McDonalidization, which, while promoting multinationals' profits, is deadly to the quality of work by severely sacrificing the

---

53 For example: “Si es evidente que había en él algo extraordinario e incomparable, no lo es menos que debió de padecer ciertos vicios radicales, ciertas constitutivas insuficiencias cuando ha engendrado una casta de hombres -los hombres-masa rebeldes- que ponen en peligro inminente los principios mismos a que debieron la vida. Si ese tipo humano sigue dueño de Europa y es, definitivamente, quien decide, bastarán treinta años para que nuestro continente retroceda a la barbarie. Las técnicas jurídicas y materiales se volatilizarán con la misma facilidad con que se han perdido tantas veces secretos de fabricación. La vida toda se contraerá” (p. 47).

human mind's relationship to truth and reality. We are also warning that, when United States exports its digital technology culture and promotes “democracy” and human rights aboard, it is exporting its version of “Mass Women” and “Mass Men”, those with an excessive confidence and a closed mind who are only capable of repeating words on their mouth and interacting with the ideas in their own mind – the result being that humanity as a whole is increasingly caught up in the environment crisis it has created without the possibility of developing the necessary intelligence to save itself.

We seem to have, on the other hand, defended some of the politically incorrect actors (like the AfD) as possibly the return to reasonableness and a connection to reality. In this juncture, we shall now return to the question concerning the coexistence of conflicting “conventions” in a single society. Today, the only possible legitimate stance against feminist agendas, “white women's culture”, or the politically correct culture industry is the other convention of the religious right, and this only in respect to a limited number of issues, i.e., issues concerning women's rights to abortion and family values (nuclear family, traditional gender roles, denial of homosexuality) which are directly relevant to God's commands and which do not explicitly invoke the concept of inequality. Outside this limited number of key issues, even the religious right has had to respect the fundamental assumption of women's equality with men, such as equal pay for equal work, or women's very right to work. Here we touch upon an important point.

There has occurred a raising of the standard in the convention of the “red states” in the United States after partial absorption of the political correctness (“convention”) of the “blue states”. When the counter-culture becomes mainstream, the area that is opposed to the counter-culture is necessarily affected as well. Today no Republicans and none of their constituencies will oppose women's going to work side by side with men in the public domain; none of the conservatives and traditionally minded will ever, as a matter of course, require women to stay home and raise babies. The conservatives have partially absorbed the political correctness which the “radical liberals” have attempted to impose on the whole society, “red states” as well as “blue states”, so that their baseline has been raised. “Gender equality” is now even taken for granted by the conservatives as well; it is now the baseline for the Republicans and their constituencies, the common ground between the liberals and the conservatives. The same has happened in Europe: none of the European far right parties, while promoting family values and denouncing abortion, will question women's right to work side by side with men in the public sphere or “equal pay for equal work”. Nowadays the conflict between the left and the right evolves only around the area above the baseline (right to abortion, LGBT's equality with heterosexual people, etc.). When the Republicans attempt to export their version of the American way to the rest of the world, part of the export, it must be emphasized, is in fact the political correctness which they have absorbed from their liberal enemies. Take, for instance, George W. Bush Institute's Women Initiative, chaired by Laura Bush. The talk is exactly identical to the liberal export (such as is heard from Hilary Clinton): “women's rights are human rights” and the unreflective “full participation of women in society makes the world better”. The issue is difficult because we of course do not disagree with “gender equality” or the removal of restraints which suppress the development of human potentials in women, especially in areas like the Middle East or Africa where women are without doubt being kept down. The danger lies in the unquestioned and unreflective consideration as “good” of women's

mobilization for the public sphere: what consequences will this have on the already overly exploited resources base of our planet earth? (Namely, what is the cost on the environment for the development of women's human potential?) How will it contribute to the McDonaldization of human society in these Third World regions, and hence to the death of the human brain everywhere on earth? (Namely, is women's mobilization for the public sphere really the way to develop their human potentials?) As the liberals and their feminist ideologues continue to institute “reverse sexism” back home in America, will the “baseline” of the American right be raised again? Which will mean the raising of the baseline in the rest of the world – ever toward “reverse sexism” in every corner of the world. Imagine the tremendous expenditure of natural resources and the waste of brain the rest of humanity, outside the Western zone of “trash can”, will be forced to practice.

When we condemn the United States for exporting political correctness, it becomes increasingly unimportant to distinguish between the Democrats and the Republicans in “American”. One does not usually associate the political correctness prevalent in the US interior – which at least the Republicans resist from time to time, usually on religious grounds, in order to please their constituencies – with the political correctness which the United States is attempting to impose on China and Russia and the rest of the world – which the Republicans will only want to enforce because, here, demonizing America's competitors hoping to either bring them under Pax Americana or push them off the cliff overrides every other priority. And yet we must realize that the political correctness which the United States enforces within its interior is identical to the political correctness which the United States enforces in the international domain, even though, in the former case, controversy is permitted on religious grounds whereas, in the latter case, both the Democrats and the Republicans are quite united. It is thus proper to demonize the United States as the “Satanic exporter of political correctness” without considering the division between Democrats and Republicans, just as there are not much distinctions among the George W Bush Institute, the Human Rights Watch, and Hillary Clinton's “women's rights are human rights”.

We have been trying to identify the connection between, on the one hand, the increasing “rationalization” of society which the critical theorists and George Ritzer have warned about and, on the other, political correctness and feminization of Western society. For us, both are part of the same package. For us, what Americans are really trying to export to the rest of the world is “American unreason”. For this reason, when we see the Chinese authority arresting the so-called Feminist Five<sup>54</sup> and then witness Hillary Clinton and Samantha Power, together with many young American liberal women, condemning China's actions, we are naturally on the side of the Chinese and condemning United States and Americans for attempting to impose that “American consumerist unreason” on the Chinese people. “Those Americans want to teach Chinese women to see their society as their enemy (as their 'debtors'), to waste their society away, and they want to teach Chinese women and men to be dumb and thoughtless and yet over-confident – Over our dead body!” We are very concerned with the way in which feminist scholars in China are looking up to “American master”, in the same way in which the French feminists used to do back in the 1970s and 1980s.<sup>55</sup> We are opposed to the Feminist

---

54 Arrested on 8 March 2015 for attempting to raise awareness of sexual harassment on the bus. They are: Li Tingting (李婷婷), Zheng Churan (郑楚然), Wei Tingting (韦婷婷), Wang Man (王曼), Wu Rongrong (武嵘嵘).

55 荒林, 诸葛文饶, “西方女性主义理论在中国的传播和影响” (<http://www.literature.org.cn/Article.aspx?id=51447>).

Five and the new generation of Chinese feminists chiefly because they, with their unreflective and overzealous adoration of American feminist masters, represent a doorway for the American virus to enter into China. (Of course, according to our very theoretical framework, unless China has become the consumption center of the global commerce, these American feminist works can never become as influential in China as they have in the United States.) We continue to advocate the enlightened position that women from diverse parts of the world do not, and cannot, form a definable class. Our position is opposed to both “Feminism Without Borders” and the mainstream Western feminist position to which Feminism Without Borders has raised objection and which it attempts to correct.<sup>56</sup> Women activists in China must construct a Chinese feminism that is unconnected and fundamentally irreconcilable with American feminism and liberal NGOs. Again, we favor the development of a indigenous feminism in China.

We are inclined favorably toward the European far right and the American religious right because they, by promoting “family values” (Familienwerte) and opposing homosexual marriages (Homoehe), are trying to restore the traditional nuclear family which used to form part of the package of the production phase of capitalism. The values which the religious right (both in North America and among the

---

“西方女性主义理论在中国的传播分为四个阶段，第一阶段是 20 世纪 80 年代初，这个阶段是对西方理论的初步介绍，中国理论家的理论作品还处在酝酿准备阶段；第二个阶段是 1988、1989 年，这个阶段主要是西方经典女性主义作品的译介，而以李小江为代表的中国理论工作者也开始了自己对于中国性别问题的思考；第三阶段从 1990-1995 年，这个阶段翻译著作数量较少，但有特色、有针对性的文章、讲稿被引入，对女作家和女理论家有较大的启示作用；第四个阶段是从 1995 年之后，世妇会在中国的召开，世界女性主义资源大量、密集地进入中国，具体表现为译介作品的大量出现；学术界的积极应对；社会性别理论的引入以及本土学者积极的理论构建：他们重新解读女性文学作品，运用西方女性主义理论，联系中国本土的实际，建构妇女自己的文学史和文学经典，并试图构建真正的女性诗学。”

56 See Chandra Talpade Mohanty's *Feminism Without Borders: Decolonizing Theory, Practice Solidarity* (Duke University Press, 2003). Mohanty has recognized what we have emphasized, which is the error which mainstream white women feminists of America and Western Europe has made by seeing women around the world as representing a definable, even if vaguely, class, sharing a common condition. She has recognized that women, because they belong to different races, classes, ethnic groups, and nationalities, face very different conditions whereas the most typical feminist, the middle-class white woman, would like to theorize about all women based on her own experiences as if the fact of being a woman is so primary that the rest could only introduce negligible variations into the common conditions. Nevertheless, she proposes adjustments in theories to take into account the differences introduced by factors of race, class, ethnicity, and nationality in order to unite all women in the same feminist camp and praxis. She thus calls herself an “antiracist feminist”, a firm believer in the politics of solidarity. A good way to conceptualize the situation is to see our position (the irreconcilableness between women from different nations, cultures, classes, and races) at one end of the spectrum, hers at the middle (there are differences but these are reconcilable), and the mainstream Euro-American white women feminists (gender identity being primary over all other identities) at the other end. She also advances two other observations which we find relevant. “First, the increasing, predominantly class-based gap between a vital women's movement and feminist theorizing in the US academy has led in part to a kind of careerist academic feminism whereby the boundaries of the academy stand in for the entire world and feminism becomes a way to advance academic careers rather than a call for fundamental and collective social and economic transformation... Second, the increasing corporatization of US culture and naturalization of capitalist values has had its own profound influence in engendering a neoliberal, consumerist (protocapitalist) feminism concerned with 'women's advancement' up the corporate and nation-state ladder. This is a feminism that focuses on financial 'equality' between men and women and is grounded in the capitalist values of profit, competition, and accumulation. A protocapitalist or 'free market' feminism is symptomatic of the 'Americanization' of definitions of feminism – the unstated assumption that US corporate culture is the norm and ideal that feminists around the world strive for” (p. 6).

European far right) espouse are detrimental to the American enterprise of global consumerism. (Excuse us, Mohanty and all other feminists, it's not liberal women's values: not the strive for the equality of conditions and a supposed feminine connection to nature.) For this reason, we applaud it when American evangelicals attempt to export the values of the religious right to the rest of the world.<sup>57</sup> This is much more wholesome than the export of political correctness by American politicians and political machineries from both the left and the right. Nevertheless, we must keep in mind that the values of the religious right is as much “convention” as the political correctness of the American left. That is, unreflected values, which, when reduced to mechanical repetition of words and performance of duty, does the brain only harm and no good.<sup>58</sup> For this reason, we have always found it a little unsatisfactory with Russia's championing of conservative Christian values around the world. The convention at the right is however for us preferable because is at least “conservational” when it comes to our planet (that it belongs to the previous stage in the development of capitalism), is antithetical to “victimology” and more open to judging people according to their merits, and does not seem to perpetuate any system of oppression. (After its baseline has been raised, it is no longer “male chauvinist” or “racist” while it certainly does not constitute any “reverse sexism”.) What we really want the world to adopt is our own values, our “European/ Russian New Left” of which, every time we debunk the values of the American left, we reveal a little more at the same time. Our value system is by now: “brain feminism” (together with “sex-strike feminism”), valuation of human beings based on merits, reciprocity based on the Golden Rule (none of the double standard, “doble moral”, which American liberal women perpetrate against everybody else in the “blue states” and which the United States imposes in its favor in all international relations), the guidance of the masses by the elites, and, as seen here, “lawfulness with language”: namely, a cautious assessment as to whether words spoken correspond to reality, i.e. *adequaetio intellectus et rei*.

We all know that both Russia and China, and BRICS in general, have been attempting to formulate an “alternative” to the US model. The European far right can be said to be doing the same. As usual, we wish that they would adopt our “New Left” program. This is difficult because our program is proper to

---

57 The most illustrative example is the World Congress of Families. See Hannah Levintova, “How US Evangelicals Helped Create Russia's Anti-Gay Movement”, *Mother Jones*, 21/02/2014. American evangelicals have also been instrumental in the anti-gay campaign in Uganda. C.f. the case of pastor Scott Lively: Mariah Blake, “Meet the American Pastor Behind Uganda's Anti-Gay Crackdown”, *Mother Jones*, 10/03/2014.

58 What is called “convention” here is thus what John Stuart Mill has referred to in his *On Liberty* as the set of preferences or likes and dislikes of the majority in a society which governs that society in the form of laws or public opinions: “... but when an opinion on how people should behave isn't supported by reasons, it can count only as one person's preference; and if 'reasons' are given, and turn out to be a mere appeal to a similar preference felt by other people, it is still only many people's liking instead of one person's. To an ordinary man, however, his own preference (with other people sharing it) is not only a perfectly satisfactory reason but is the *only* reason he has for most of his notions of morality, taste, or propriety – except for notions that are explicitly written in his religious creed, and even that is something he interprets mainly in the light of his personal preferences.” Then: “The likes and dislikes of society, or of some powerful part of it, are thus the main thing that has in practice determined the rules that societies have laid down for general observance under the penalties of law or opinion.” The key here is that preferences are not grounded in reason. Our essay is basically bemoaning the fact that, while the counter-culture revolution arose in the beginning as a *reasoned* opposition against mere preferences, the political correctness into which it has today fossilized is not any the less simply a set of preferences – all the reasons having been forgotten.



the intellectual elites and so unrealizable for the masses. For example, it is unrealistic to expect the masses to practice “lawfulness with language”, because, being born without much intelligence, the vast majority of people will never know how to really correlate words with the external reality. It is simply unrealistic to expect most people to be capable of interacting with the reality outside their mind rather than only with the contents of their own mind. What is realizable, perhaps, is for the stupid people who constitute the majority of humanity to come to a comprehension of the fact that they are stupid and so should be guided by an elite (the best form of society, *politea*, according to Ortega y Gasset). When that happens, the masses will be susceptible of being guided by an intellectual elite when it comes to describing social reality with words in the formulation of a “convention”.

In other words, we would like to condemn the United States for exporting “Mass Man” and “Mass Woman” along with political correctness, but the two issues only converge in United States and Western Europe. While China has been touted as representing an alternative for achieving prosperity – it has done so without going the route of liberal democracy – it has nevertheless developed a mass society (“Mass Man” and “Mass Woman”), simply because this is what economic prosperity entails. We thus see that Ortega is not quite correct in attributing the creation of “Mass Man” to the twin motors of liberal democracy and the capitalism associated with technological advances. The latter alone can create “Mass Man”. Government policies might not be capable of countering the problem of mass society. It could be that only a worldwide social movement can be up for the task.

Nevertheless, China, Russia, and the European far right parties should they come to power, might do a lot to halt the advance of American political correctness simply through the ordinary channels of geopolitics. We have been so fearful of the politically correct climate in the UN, where bureaucrats find every possible way to create women's programs (UN Women, UN Resolution 1325, the UN International Women's Day, the continual Commission on the Status of Women, etc.) simply because this “sounds good” without any conception of whether it would really do the world, as well as the women themselves, a lot of good. The reigning situation is really the same as “mindlessly repeating words without consideration of their meaning” which has been the general condition in American society. We can easily imagine Russia, China, and the new European nations led by far right elements questioning all this “presentation without substance” that is rampant in UN programs. Among these new players, China has most successfully represented an alternative to the American model. In its diplomatic relations with other nations, China has most distinctly refrained from imposing on them all these ethical, but in fact merely politically correct, concepts of “human rights” while it has, along with Russia and India, severely criticized the US for using these politically correct notions as a cover under which to advance political dominance within the interior of other nations (including the “color revolutions”). In its dealing with African nations, China consistently makes no mention of African regimes' supposedly bad human rights records while pursuing the purchase of raw materials, but, on the other hand, barter instead of paying cash, which has prevented the corrupt dictators there from robbing their people of the profits gained from the sales. Actions count more than words!<sup>59</sup> In commentaries on international relations China is also increasingly adopting the fairness principle rather than hypocritically arguing solely from its own geopolitical interests such as the United States has always

---

59 Again, Tanguy Struye de Swielande, *La Chine et les grande puissances en Afrique*.

done. (The Golden Rule, that is.)<sup>60</sup> China has publicly disavowed the US approach “What is in US' interests is in the world's interests” and promoted the alternative “win-win” approach, or “cooperation for mutual benefits”. In other words, China has consciously been cultivating “reasonableness” and “fairness” as the alternative to the American approach. It is quite imaginable, then, to see China adding to its repertoire our approach “reasonableness and fairness instead of political correctness”. The same with Russia and the European far right parties. Here lies our hope.

### NOTICE

In this essay we have spoken of the natural function of language as the representation of objects and processes in the external world. This is like the simple “correspondence” theory of language which, for example, logical positivism (the Vienna Circle) has formalized and which you see every deep-thinking philosopher, from Heidegger to Habermas, criticizes as too simplistic and “derivative”.<sup>61</sup> This essay is of course not the proper place where to engage ourselves in a deeper characterization of language. The “correspondence” model is sufficient to bring into relief the “American lawlessness with language”.

### RESERVATION

#### **Rethinking “white female domination” in the “blue states” (September, 2016)**

I have asserted throughout that, in the middle level of American society, white females have become the dominating class. Meanwhile, liberal white women themselves continue to point to the dearth of women in the higher echelons (in the CEO level and in politics) as evidence for their “disadvantagedness”. There is another way of thinking to reconcile the two mutually contradictory perceptions. The feminist revolution – whose goal is to substitute white female rule for white male rule in all domains of society – has succeeded and completely changed things in the middle level, but has not yet succeeded in the upper echelons. In other words, American society has been, in the past three decades, changing from white male ruled to white female ruled, but the change is not yet completed – probably because it's easier to change things in the middle level than in the upper level. The upper echelons are more resistant to change.

---

60 Fu Ying, “How China sees Russia: Beijing and Moscow are close, but not allies”, *Foreign Affairs*, Jan./ Feb. 2016.

61 Pinzani, *ibid.*, p. 55, “... Korrespondenztheorie der Wahrheit... nach der Theorie als wahr bezeichnet werden können, wenn ihren Hypothesen empirisch feststellbare Tatsachen entsprechen...”