

**Addenda to  
“The causal connection between rationalization, McDonaldization,  
and increasing stupidity of human beings”**

**Lawrence C. Chin**

(Continually updated)

1.  
The Bilderberg's version of “sustainable civilization”

vs.  
British Old Lady's version

(31 October, 2017)

The other day, as I glanced over UN's new “sustainable development” program (*développement durable*: Agenda 2030), I was struck by a sense of unreality:<sup>1</sup>

Le 1er janvier 2016, les 17 Objectifs de développement durable du Programme de développement durable à l’horizon 2030 – adopté par les dirigeants du monde en septembre 2015 lors d’un Sommet historique des Nations Unies – sont entrés en vigueur. Au cours des 15 prochaines années, grâce à ces nouveaux objectifs qui s’appliquent à tous, les pays mobiliseront les énergies pour mettre fin à toutes les formes de pauvreté, combattre les inégalités et s’attaquer aux changements climatiques, en veillant à ne laisser personne de côté.

Les objectifs de développement durable s’appuient sur le succès des objectifs du Millénaire pour le développement (OMD) et visent à aller plus loin pour mettre fin à toutes les formes de pauvreté. Les OMD ont montré qu’établir des cibles à atteindre est efficace. Ces nouveaux objectifs sont uniques dans le sens où ils sont un appel à l’action par tous les pays – pauvres, riches ou au revenu moyen – en vue de promouvoir la prospérité tout en protégeant la planète. Avec ces objectifs, les dirigeants reconnaissent que l’élimination de la pauvreté doit s’accompagner de stratégies *qui renforcent la croissance économique* et répondent à un éventail de besoins sociaux, parmi lesquels l’éducation, la santé, la protection sociale et les possibilités d’emploi, *tout en luttant contre les changements climatiques et en protégeant l’environnement.* (Emphasis added.)

The mystery is: why does the UN always advocate further development or further growth (i.e. modernization, industrialization, making the rest of the world into something like Western consumer

---

1 At: <http://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/fr/development-agenda/>.

societies) when this clearly contradicts the principle of sustainability (when this will only harm our environment)? Why can't anyone notice the obvious fact that, when a nation is under-developed, like North Korea or Bolivia, it will never have this problem of sustainability in the first place. I soon understood what is going on here.

James Corbett has prepared another excellent exposition on the UN Agenda 2030 on 20 October, 2017.<sup>2</sup> The history of UN's sustainable development program demonstrates that it is really a Bilderberg program (hence started by Rockefeller back in the 1980s). The reasons why the Bilderbergers want to advocate *development* and *sustainability* at the same time – when unsustainability is a consequence of development in the first place: sort of like subsidizing the tobacco industry while funding campaign to persuade people to quit smoking – seem to be two: (1) modernization tends to decrease the desire to procreate among the population; (2) the Bilderbergers' conception of human being is as “consumer”.

(1) The Bilderbergers are Malthusians. Again, the crisis which confronts human civilization is fundamentally a problem of over-population in comparison to the natural resources available to sustain them. As I have summarized:

The way in which Nature works is like this. It promotes the species without care for the individual members of the species. This is why species are allowed to develop in which certain members are privileged and in which the females are made to bear all the burden of reproduction while the male do nothing else than contribute their genes – which is no work. The second way in which Nature works is that its promotion of the species is shortsighted. Or rather, the species are designed to be short-sighted in regard to their survival. The species are made by nature to breed. Their interest is to breed as much as possible to ensure the survival of the species. If there is room to have more descendants at the present moment, then the species will choose to have more even though in the long run it will end up having less. If the human species finds enough resources to support seven billion members at the present, it will do so, even though in the long run it will cause itself to collapse and end up with far less members. Species always over-breed, in other words. We find the same phenomenon in pet over-population in American society. Dogs and cats breed more than the environment can support them. A lot of the young die, but the overall survival of the species is ensured by the strategy of overbreeding. The misery of some of its members does not matter.

I was being Malthusian when I wrote this – and this is precisely the way in which the Bilderbergers would phrase the crisis as well. Human beings are over-breeding at the present moment – not just in China and India, but especially in the Muslim world and in Africa. Once oil runs out, the vast majority of human population will have to die due to insufficient food supply (and water will run out too). Before they die, they will rebel, launch revolution, create chaos, and destroy human civilization. The wars and revolutions accompanying this process of population bottleneck will be horrendous and it is

---

2 At: <https://www.corbettreport.com/episode-322-what-is-sustainable-development/>.

this which the Bilderbergers want to avoid. This is thoroughly Malthus.<sup>3</sup>

The Bilderbergers want to keep the industrialized civilization going – since, insofar as they are composed of capitalists and industrialists, supplying products and services to power our industrialized civilization is the meaning of their life and the source of their power and wealth – while maintaining it on the sustainable level. They want to have their cake and eat it at the same time. For them, industrialization (development) does not necessarily contradict the goal of sustainability because, as low birth rate in Western societies and Japan has proved, the consumerization of society (the ultimate goal of development) tends to decrease people's desire to procreate. The current over-population problem is the consequence of our world's being only half-industrialized, so that the part that is not industrialized continues to have exponential growth of population which will then cause problems in the future for the part that is already industrialized but which does not suffer from the problem of over-breeding (the spread of wars and revolutions to the developed countries). Once the Islamic world and Africa are modernized to the same level as the West, the birth rate in these regions will decline so that, while development seems to create the problem of unsustainability in the short run, in the long run it will dissolve the problem. (Population growth is already slowing down in China and India; and these two nations are under the wise administration of a centralized government in any case which has the power to adjust population growth to its economic means.) Again, the Bilderbergers are Malthusians: They are so intent on developing the under-developed nations because modernization will cause the people in these countries to value “virtue” and “happiness” in Malthus' sense.<sup>4</sup>

(2) This is where we will agree with the Bilderbergers in one respect but differ from them in another –

---

3 An excellent short exposition of Thomas Robert Malthus' ideas is Judy K. Morris, “Professor Malthus and His Essay”, in *Population Studies: Selected Essays and Research*, Rand McNally College Publishing Company: Chicago, 1975. (1) Malthus was concerned, not with over-population, but with the nature's check on over-population – misery and vice: famine, war, diseases, and so on. (2) The check is inevitable given the principle of population growth: “Unchecked population growth accelerates faster than the greatest increase of food that man is able to wrest from the earth on a sustained basis” (p. 115). This is because (in Malthus' own words) “population, when unchecked, increases in a geometrical ratio. Subsistence only increases in an arithmetical ratio. A slight acquaintance with numbers will show the immensity of the first power in comparison to the second” (p. 124). (3) Malthus was a conservative, and believed that the poor had nobody to blame for their condition but themselves, and was against the Poor Law. He didn't believe in any doctrine about the “rights of man” which stipulated any inherent human rights to subsistence without the need to labor. By providing for the poor, the government had ensured their unchecked growth (by “removing any need for prudent doubts among those poor who might otherwise hesitate to marry” (p. 128)). There was then the danger of mob violence – revolution, rebellion, social upheavals and chaos, and the destruction of civilization. “The poor, who quite rightly disliked their position, tended to blame the government in power, and this was the seed of revolution. The prevention, Malthus said, was to teach the poor the true cause of their condition – imprudent marriage...” (p. 129). “With typical bluntness, he said it was necessary to ‘impress as strongly as possible on the public mind that it is not the duty of man simply to propagate his species, but to propagate virtue and happiness; and that, if he has only a tolerably fair prospect of doing this, he is by no means called upon to leave descendants’” (p. 128). How applicable are these advices to the peoples in the Muslim world and Africa!

4 Two excellent documentaries on over-population which I recommend are: “Wer entschärft die Bevölkerungsbombe”, ZDF, 01.07.2009; and “Aldous Huxley und sein Wiedersehen mit der 'Wackeren neuen Welt'”, hosted by Dr. Heinz Haber. Huxley's particular concern is that over-population might lead to a certain kind of scientific totalitarianism. This is not Malthusian.

where BOL's program is congruent with the Bilderbergers' on one issue but distinguished from theirs on another.

The agreement is over the need to overcome this harmful “democracy” – the need for the technocratic elites to impose their solutions on the dumb masses without discussion. James Corbett, although the smartest among all the conspiracy theorists, nevertheless can only come to the shallow understanding that this entire sustainable development business is really just the big capitalists' (the Bilderbergers') attempt to monopolize world's natural resources and to deprive ordinary citizens of any control over them. These conspiracy theorists simply don't have any idea of the scale of the crisis facing our civilization, completely engrossed in the petty problem of how to protect their civil liberties and property. Since people are dumb and selfish, it's far better to take away all remaining natural resources from their hands and bring them under centralized administration by the technocratic elites to ensure their most efficient use: sustainable development.

The Bilderbergers, knowing that ordinary citizens cannot be expected to understand the problem, are going about it in the Straussian manners: duping people onto the right path. Again, this is necessary because ordinary citizens are too dumb. Again, we must side with the Bilderbergers on this point. BOL's team is presumably in agreement with the Bilderbergers in this respect: ordinary citizens are simply unfit to be invited to a discussion about how to keep our civilization sustainable.

We however run into conflict with the Bilderbergers on another point – on the problem of people's brain development.

That the Bilderbergers are practicing Straussianism is indication that they simply have no interest in the problem that people are too dumb. Their vision of the human being, their fundamental premise, is that the human being is a *consumer* – a consumer of their products and services. It is quite fine with them if ordinary citizens are only good for holding a petty job in the economic cosmos and consuming products and services and can't understand anything else. This is in complete congruent with their very premise in “sustainable development” (complete modernization of the whole planet so that there is this high tech consumer society everywhere).

Our program, or BOL's program, is based on a different vision of what a human being is about: an intelligent human being who understands what is real and reaches common understanding with his fellow human beings as to what is real through communicative actions. The human being is, according to this vision, only secondarily a consumer. This is where BOL's program collides with Bilderbergers' program. Whereas the Bilderbergers' dilemma is: how to keep the human being as a consumer while his or her consumerist life-style can be made to go on indefinitely; the BOL's position is that the human being is *not* primarily a consumer, but a perceptive and communicative being, so that, once this latter is primary, civilization is automatically sustainable.

Because we are philosophers, we envision a world most suitable for intellectuals – a world where

everybody can understand something of what the philosopher is saying; because the Bilderbergers are industrialists, they envision a world most suitable for capitalists and industrialists – a world where everybody continues to buy their products and services. For us, what's even worse than the upcoming collapse of industrial civilization and human population bottleneck is the McDonaldization of society thanks to incessant marketization and globalization whereby nobody is capable of thinking anymore and communication has become impossible. We find this situation so horrifying that we wish to leave this world and immigrate to outer-space. But this problem hardly even registers itself in the mind of the Bilderbergers. They couldn't care less whether ordinary people are becoming more and more like non-thinking robots.

BOL's plan is to make what Colin Wilson has termed the “Outsiders” into the majority, so as to deprive the consumerist culture of its very human resources base. The Bilderbergers will definitely find this idea horrifying. The “Outsiders” will not be so interested in buying their products and services to keep the high tech consumerist civilization going. The Bilderbergers' sustainable development program is premised on keeping the human majority the way they are.

BOL's program is about eliminating the very root cause of consumerism, hence its battle cry against the leftist tradition of human rights and women's rights. Like the Convivialist and Degrowth movement, it's about no-growth of industrial economy. The Bilderberg's program, on the other hand, is about keeping the leftist tradition and continual growth of industrial economy within sustainable limits.

## 2.

### The characterization of the “Outsider”

(1 November, 2017)

Wiegel has defined the “Outsider” and Wilson's self-conception in this way: “[Wilson] divided men into a minority of courageous resisters and a majority of conforming nonresisters. The latter brand the minority 'outsiders' because they do not understand them. This insight began to obsess the young man. Inevitably he identified himself as one of the minority destined to solve the problem of how such outsiders might survive in a culture dominated by nonoutsiders. The plight of these mavericks seemed to him so critical that he capitalized the name of the category.”<sup>5</sup> It seems that the Straussian philosopher is an Outsider (since the Straussian philosopher is always preoccupied with the problem of how to survive in society), but not every Outsider is a philosopher (in the Straussian sense). The conforming nonresisters are however the typical consumers.

Wilson's characterization in his *The Outsider*: the Outsider stands for Truth. He is not merely an artist: many artists are not outsiders but are perfectly normal (conformists). The Outsider *sees deeper* and is characterized by a feeling of unreality (de-realization in psychiatric parlance). He sees disorder in reality where every conformer sees only order, and feels that the truth must be told. His fundamental attitude is non-acceptance of life, of human life lived by human beings in a human society. “Such a life

---

<sup>5</sup> *Colin Wilson*, Twayne Publishers: Boston, 1975, p. 21.

is a dream; it is not real.” He is troubled by a greater need than in the case of non-outsiders. *He seeks a course of action in which he can express himself.* “Freedom lies in finding a course of action that gives expression to that part of him that is not contented with the trivial and unheroic” (Hemingway). “The Outsider's first business is self-knowledge.” “The Outsider is not sure who he is. 'He has found an “I”, but it is not his true “I”.' His main business is to find his way back to himself.” Wilson suggests that, while the Outsider is a misfit in Western societies, he is less so, fits in better, in the traditional societies of China and India which are built on the contemplative kind of life. The Chinese and the Indians think more like an Outsider in Western societies.

In the Outsider, the conscious and the unconscious are in constant contact. “... the Outsider would seem to be a basically religious man, or imaginative man, who refuses to develop those qualities of practical-mindedness and eye-to-business that seem to be the requisites for survival in our complex civilization...” (p. 261). This is why the Outsider is antithetical to consumerism and compatible with sustainable civilization.

The Outsider can be either cold-blooded, entirely objective toward the world, like Barbusse's hero or Camus' Meursault, or overly expressive like Ninjinski, in which case he is prone to become insane. In the former case, he can be a (Straussian) philosopher, novelist, or poet – this is how he expresses himself – or he can seek to express himself through crimes, sex-crimes (like the voyeurism of Barbusse's hero), and murder. (In Hesse's *Steppenwolf*, the man is divided into a civilized man (poetry and music) and a wolf-man (rapist). If he can reconcile the two sides, he will have “more abundant life” than the non-outsiders.) As a third possibility, he can be the spiritual guru founding a new religion, a new religious sensibility, a new spirituality. (In the case of George Fox or Ramakrishna.)

Wilson's examples of the Outsiders: (1) The Outsider as a nihilist/ empiricist in literature: Barbusse's hero; H. G. Wells; Sartre's Roquentin; Camus' Meursault; Hemingway's Krebs; Harley Granville-Barker: either a (Straussian) philosopher or a cold-blooded criminal. Hermann Hesse's Haller (*Steppenwolf*) is one also. (2) The neurotic Outsider: T. E. Lawrence, Van Gogh, and Ninjinski. (3) Nietzsche and his Zarathustra; Dostoevsky with his *Notes from Underground* and others. (4) The Outsider as religious pioneer: George Fox, William Blake, Ramakrishna, and Gurdjieff. Wilson ends his essay with Hulme's *Speculations*.

Wilson's description of the Outsider is overly complicated but, in this sense, comprehensive. In my writings I have provided a simplistic way of conceiving the problem of the Outsider:

I have described the problem in a preliminary fashion in my blog post from July 6, 2014. Here I need to elaborate on the discussion there. The problem of my brain physiology may be illustrated through an analogy. Everyone is familiar with the phenomenon that, in every human society, most of the people are right-handed, while there always exists a small minority who are left-handed or ambidextrous. After examining the brain-scans of the sample of human populations who had been “chipped” from 2010 onward, the

Macrospherians must have noticed a similar phenomenon in human brain functioning patterns. The brain functioning patterns of the majority of human beings fall into one type, while there is always a small minority whose functioning patterns fall into another, alternative type. This is important because I happen to belong to the other, alternative type. Perhaps this “alternative” type is more creative, artistic, and sensitive to environmental stimuli, etc., and, for this reason, prone to paranoia and depression as well. When the Macrospherians had simulated sustainable civilization, it may be that they had noticed that, if this “alternative” type – frequently found among artists, for example – were more frequent among human populations rather than in the minority, the world would turn out to be a far better place.

The Outsider is therefore one of those whose special type of brain functioning is to the prevalent mode of brain functioning what left-handed and ambidextrous people are to the prevalent right-handed people. I have also heard about this Gary Lachman who talks about the division of the human race into a left-brain majority and a right-brain minority, of whom the sensitive, creative, imaginative, and artistic type belongs to the latter.<sup>6</sup> This might be an over-simplified mis-characterization of human brain physiology according to neurologists, but the idea of the Outsider is there.

### 3.

#### Marketization, rationalization, and McDonaldization (1 November, 2017)

A. Donald's “The Wal-Marting of American psychiatry: an ethnography of psychiatric practice in the late 20<sup>th</sup> century” (*Culture, Medicine and Psychiatry* 25: 427 – 439, 2001) is immensely relevant to our critique of the rationalization, and dummification, of American psychiatry. The author did not use critical theory language, but is basically speaking about the *Verdinglichung* of American psychiatric practice due to marketization. Her language supplements ours.

The older, pre-rationalized psychiatry where the clinicians got to know the patients as persons is called “psychosocial” psychiatry. It is our claim in our critique that the doctors were only able to devise DSM categories through “psychosocial” psychiatry – that this is the only possible way to arrive at a correct understanding of the patient's condition.

Her characterization of the rationalization process in American psychiatry: “... the notion that since mental illnesses are specific entities (to wit; managed care is the heir of the above history) then the practical treatment of each mental illness can be rationalized and streamlined just as the production of products in industry has been streamlined and made economically efficient...” (p. 429). That is, McDonaldization (increased transactions within a shorter time, ostensibly for the sake of greater profit but covertly, according to our critique, in order to dispose of extra human labor) has favored the development of a specific way of conceiving mental illness, the patient, the causes of mental illness,

---

6 *The Secret Teachers of the Western World*, Penguin: New York, 2015.

and the proper way to treat it, which then coincide with pharmacological companies' interests, and which amount to *Verdinglichung* in the parlance of critical theory.

The new rationalized treatment methods congruent with pharmacological companies' interests are called “managed care”, which operates by creating different treatment protocols (standardized procedures) for each mental disorder now objectified into a sort of entity, a sort of “algorithm”. The protocol ensures the fastest treatment – McDonaldized – and it of course basically amounts to making the patient swallow the right pill.

A. Donald names these “managed care” methods: Total Quality Management (TQM) which consists of Optimal Treatment Planning, Utilization Review, and Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI). The managed care industry has put forward “Optimal Recovery Guidelines” (ORG) as “rational templates for the treatment of specific illnesses”. Namely, the treatment protocols.

The *Verdinglichung* of mental disorders and their treatment: each mental disorder is divorced from the patient and objectified and standardized into an algorithm. “Madness has become an industrialized product to be managed efficiently and rationally in a timely manner as it passes through the hands of clinic workers” (p. 435). This, thanks to marketization, or for-profit psychiatry, i.e. marketization has re-shaped the way in which mental illness is conceptualized: “Thus managed care algorithms represent more than they claim, for they do not represent an advance in scientific knowledge of the Natural world of mental illness so much as they reproduce a moral ideology and actively encourage a notion of personhood and a psychiatric science more suitable to business and consumer culture” (ibid.).

Rationalization is then characterized as the replacement of the patient as a human being with a description of behavior, like an algorithm. This is *Verdinglichung* of the patient. A. Donald focuses her attention only on the dehumanizing effects of such rationalization (for both the patients and the clinicians). The clinicians are cited as complaining about the growing distance from authentic clinical experience, including knowledge about the patient as a person. Donald mentions nothing about the more serious problem, the proliferation of mis-diagnoses, i.e. dummification, under such rationalized, and rarefied, regime. Nor how much this accords with the currently dominant cognitive style of information-processing in which thinking and understanding have evaporated.

#### 4.

#### A comment on Nancy Fraser

(1 November, 2017)

There might in the future be a debate about how close Nancy Fraser's critique of feminism has come to our foundation stone, our Feminist Ethic and the Spirit of Consumerism. A word may be in order here to prevent confusion in the future. Fraser's critique is to ours what Poincaré's solution to the paradox of the constancy of the speed of light is to Einstein's – aside from the fact that, while Poincaré's solution predates Einstein's, Fraser's critique is posterior to ours. From her 2009 piece, “Feminism, Capitalism,



and the Cunning of History”,<sup>7</sup> to her lectures on Karl Polanyi from 2010 onwards, she has never given up her conviction that the second wave feminism emerged as an authentic resistance movement against patriarchal domination in its latest form of (what she has called “state-managed” or “state-organized”) capitalism and that, it is only when this “state-managed” capitalism transitioned to neoliberal capitalism (disembedding the market from the society) that the latter has “recuperated” elements of second wave feminism to legitimize itself and magnify its scope. In other words, her view is that second wave feminism's contribution to the development of neoliberal global free-market system is but an historical accident. Ours, on the other hand, is much more consistently Marxist (or historical materialist) in that we see the second wave feminism – along with the whole leftist counterculture movement – as being *directly produced* by capitalism in order to help transform the former “state-managed” and “national” form into the latter “neoliberal” and “global” form (in Fraser's terminology). Feminism's congruence with capitalism is therefore hardly an historical accident, but lies within the very essence of feminism itself. Ours, in other words, is far more radical than Fraser's – just as Poincaré has never gone beyond the traditional notion of space and time whereas Einstein, in explaining the constancy of the speed of light from whichever perspective, has had to revolutionize the concept of space and time altogether (“spacetime continuum”). Whereas Fraser is stuck in her traditional notion that resistance is resistance against power, we are in the advanced state in recognizing the new Foucauldian notion that resistance is always the reinforcement of power. Whenever resistance wins, it is because it is part of power; it is only genuine resistance when it is easily crushed by power without any chance.

## 5.

### The problem with generalization (19 November, 2017)

The other day I watched the interview which Anderson Cooper conducted with Ms KA in October 2016. Ms KA (an American white female) accused Donald Trump of groping her in a night club many years ago. She sounded reasonable and without exaggeration, and so I presumed she was telling the truth, which had only saddened me very much. Refer to what I have said elsewhere:

My story, the story of my life, i.e. *The Secret History*, as you have seen, is nothing less than an indictment of the United States, a chronicle of the evils which United States has perpetrated on me.... and then of the grotesque stupidity, brutality, hypocrisy, and selfishness to which ordinary Americans, in the privileged form of white females, have degenerated. In my experience, United States is nothing other than the latest version of Nazi Germany. And yet I know that, when I shall attempt to share my story with the rest of

---

7 At: [https://www.newschool.edu/uploadedFiles/Faculty/NSSR/Fraser\\_NLR.pdf?n=4644](https://www.newschool.edu/uploadedFiles/Faculty/NSSR/Fraser_NLR.pdf?n=4644). Here Fraser talks about state-organized capitalism's four axes around which it is organized, economism, androcentrism, Étatism, and Westphalianism; the second wave feminism's revolutionary response to each of the four axes; neoliberalism's “resignifying” (recuperating) feminism according to these four axes (how the second wave feminism contributes to neoliberalism in each of these four domains); and feminism's possible reform as re-adjusted response to these four axes. When she talks about feminism's “uncanny double”, she also seems to echo our complaint that leftist revolution today is all about regurgitating empty words without meaning anything substantial.

humanity, I will find myself utterly incompatible with the majority of them because this is not the common experience of America and Americans in most parts of the world... How should this be accounted for? Am I wrong? Am I a deviant? To clarify what is going on here, I have been thinking of writing a novel on the model of George Orwell's *Animal Farm* and Hannah Arendt's *Eichmann in Jerusalem*. Imagine that animals have effected a revolution and overthrown those human beings who have hitherto had dominion over them. Now imagine them putting human beings on trial for the crimes the latter have ever committed against them. Some animals will come to the stand to give horrifying testimonies about the evils which human beings have perpetrated against them: how human beings have encapsulated animals in test tubes for life and purposely injured them to test the safety of consumer products; how human beings have imprisoned animals in cages for life and physically abused them while training them for circus shows; how human beings have raised animals for food, imprisoning them in severely overcrowding conditions and hurting them and then killing them in the most gruesome fashions: factory killing; how human beings have, with their industrial way of life, caused the extinction of millions of species, etc. But then some animals will come to the stand to paint an opposite picture of human beings. These animals are former pets of human beings. They tell stories about how human beings have loved them and taken care of them and indulged them as if they were their own children. Then stories also emerge about some human beings' effort to prevent other human beings from torturing and exploiting animals in laboratories and factory farms. (Those animal rights activists.) As you can imagine, a public debate would certainly ensue among the liberated animals as to what human beings really are given such contradictory testimonies. Are human beings evil or good? Or maybe both?

What I have left unsaid is this. It is not simply a debate which will ensue, *but utter animosity and antagonism between those animals who have escaped laboratories and factory farms and those other animals who have been humans' pets or rescued by animal rights activists*. One side will insist that humans are evil while the other side, that humans are saints. In the novel, the animals from the two sides will probably end up killing each other. There reigns simply a massive confusion as to whether humans are good or evil. The confusion results from every animal's attempt to generalize from its own experience. *Every* human being has to be *either* "good" or "evil". Hence the ensuing debate – the irresolvable difference. The same thing with my experience with the Secret Society women. If my story enters the public domain, it will contradict the prevalent notion that women, even just white women, are victims of men's sexism. But my story is: a guy, even if just an Asian guy, is victim of women's, even if just white women's, sexism against men. People will then get confused just like the animals in the preceding thought-experiment. What's going on? (1) Perhaps we should heed my professor friend's clarification: "A victim can also victimize other people." Namely, instead of being such a wonderful creature, any victim will also victimize others the first chance s/he gets. "Today's victim is tomorrow's victimizer". When victims don't behave to protect their victim status, they create confusion. (2) Or perhaps it is as I have noted elsewhere: Ms KA here perhaps, while complaining about the one instance where she was victimized, has overlooked the other instances where she was privileged over others,

including men, even white men. (3) No. *The confusion results because, again, I'm trying to generalize (as if my case applies to everybody in my category) and everybody else is also trying to generalize (as if the prevalent notion also applies to every case).* Human beings simply cannot make sense of their experience – make meaning out of it – without generalizing. What is desperately needed is an objective study to determine how often women are victims of men's sexism and how often men are victims of women's sexism. And that's in America only – for the situation is different in every country. It will only cause further confusion when one generalizes from America to Germany, or from Germany to America, *as if there were so much in common between a nation which runs massive trade deficits each year and another which runs massive trade surplus each year.* (Historical materialism.)

6.

Breaking through society's polarization  
(19 December, 2017)

I wish here to comment on one of my observations in my essay about postmodern society's “polarization”:

Neither side is able to notice the truth, that their “grand narrative” is partial and inaccurate because they have been cherry-picking their evidences and have therefore arrived at different partial views of reality – like those blind men describing the elephant some of whom are holding onto its tail while others are groping its nose. Again, while this has always been a feature of human society – different factions' inability to understand, and communicate with, each other – my impression is that the problem is a lot worse today. The typical mind today is more closed off to other minds in two ways: the information it holds in itself is solidified into fundamentalist doctrines and cannot be permuted and related to the reality outside – this is because it is an information-processing mind, not a thinking and feeling mind; secondly, people are considerably more arrogant, more confident, than before such that they simply see no need to understand other people. The last thought that will ever occur to the postmodern man or woman is the doubt: “Why does he think differently than I do? Perhaps he knows something that I don't... Let me hear him!”

I have lately come upon two women, one writer and the other film maker. First, Rebecca Solnit, the author of *Men Explain Things To Me* and the inventor of “Mansplaining”, has recently published a collection of essays, *The Mother of All Questions*.<sup>8</sup> I have heard that, in one of the essays, amidst the recent furor over sexual violences against women started by Weinstein's case, she has quite dismissed men's fear of being falsely accused, as if it were purely paranoia over nothing. Such attitude is of course quite common among the “victim feminists”. Given my experience – my Guinness World

---

<sup>8</sup> I first came across it in a review at Deutschlandfunk Kultur: Kathrina Döbler, “Frauen, ergreift das Wort!” (18.12.2017): [http://www.deutschlandfunkkultur.de/rebecca-solnit-die-mutter-aller-fragen-frauen-ergreift-das.950.de.html?dram:article\\_id=406278](http://www.deutschlandfunkkultur.de/rebecca-solnit-die-mutter-aller-fragen-frauen-ergreift-das.950.de.html?dram:article_id=406278).

Record as the most falsely accused man in the history of humankind while not being legally allowed to even know that I have been accused at all – I naturally align myself with men's rights advocates who embody the concern over false accusations. Such sneering from the feminists is naturally the gravest insult to me. They believe that women's experience of being sexually assaulted is all there is, just like the blind women, holding onto elephant's long nose, insist that “elephant” is but a big, long tube, while we men who have been victims of false accusations about sexual assaults are like the blind men holding onto elephant's tails who couldn't help but note that “elephant” is more like a thin rope. The blind women are louder, have the audience and trust of every (blind) bystander around, call us blind men “liars”, and would exterminate us if they could so that the story “The elephant is like a big, long tube” can reign forever unchallenged. The blind women's story reigns supreme today because women are on the ascendancy in the Western world under global consumerism (historical materialism), and yet they call themselves “silence breakers” – “Silence is broken”, so runs the title of the first section in Solnit's book. We blind men of course are the ones who are really being silent about our unfortunate experience. Who will ever bother to hear us and believe us? Only now do I understand Chinese women's experience during the imperial time: being blamed as the “fountain of disasters” while being victimized.

The second woman is very different, a certain Cassie Jaye, who, while a committed feminist, confronted the men's rights advocates, and eventually learned to listen to them. This is the blind woman who has actually listened to the blind men's story and realized that the true reality about “elephant” is not to be had unless blind women's and blind men's stories – and other blind people's stories as well about the same elephant – are pieced together. She made the film, “The Red Pill”, as a result, and was denounced by the “feminists”, i.e. the blind women.<sup>9</sup> The feminists are motivated by their black-and-white grand narrative (“Women are always good and always victims”) and their thirst for power, and so have no appetite for truth. The blind women do not want to know, do not really care, what elephant is really like. And yet a few blind women, like Ms Jaye, do. That's encouraging.

Again, society's increasing polarization can only be broken by the art of listening and the desire to know the truth rather than simply to acquire power. This is not about finding women who will side with men's experiences, but about finding the truth. I recall the famous debate between Alice Schwazer and Esther Vilar. Esther, who professed to be a “webliche Feministin” and to have never found any signs that “women were oppressed”, isn't any more recommended than Alice, since she had made no attempt to understand why Alice believed what she believed and to piece together divergent testimonies into a total view.

This is the place where I can further formulate my status as an “Outsider”. The Outsider, because he is more sensitive to reality, sees that, people, society, and its institutions are not actually what they pretend to be, and so feels alienated, becomes a critic, and wants reform. The rest of the population, because they are less sensitive, don't see anything wrong with anything, and so never heed the plea of the Outsider for reform. Because the insensitive crowd is in the majority, nothing really changes for the

---

<sup>9</sup> As she has described her experience in a TEDx Marin talk in Kenfield, California: <https://youtu.be/3WMuzhQXJoY>.

Addenda to “Rationalization, McDonaldization, and increasing stupidity”  
Lawrence C. Chin  
November 2017. Continually updated.

better. In every country during every age there appears this Outsider who severely criticizes his country as hypocritical, morally degenerate, and corrupt while everybody else thinks s/he lives in a perfect country or great civilization. For early twentieth century China, the most prominent example of this Outsider as critic is the famous novelist Lu Xun (鲁迅). For ancient Israel and Judah, the Outsiders were the Prophets. Meanwhile, I have heard that Pierre Choderlos de Laclos with his *Laisons dangereuses* was the Outsider critic of the aristocracy of his time and place, Cervantes with his *Don Quixote*, of the contemporary society of his time.<sup>10</sup> And Li Baojia (李寶嘉) with his *Officialdom Unmasked* (官場現形記) and Cao Xueqin (曹雪芹) with his *The Dream of Red Chamber* (紅樓夢), of the aristocracy of late imperial China, while Wu Jingxing (吳敬梓) with his *The Scholars* (儒林外史) mocks the whole foundation of Chinese society, including the examination system. I can name an endlessly series of examples here. With my essay on rationalization and McDonaldization, I am acting as Lu Xun or the Prophet for America: while everyone else sees America as the greatest and the most perfect country, I see nothing but corruption and hypocrisy. While everyone else sees the recent furor about sexual assaults against women as “justice breaking through”, I see nothing but hypocrisy and injustice.

The Outsider is, according to the example I have frequently used, somebody who sees colors while the rest of the population are color-blind and see only a black-and-white picture. The Outsider is also, as is the case with me, somebody who *knows* that everybody around has only a partial view of reality while being full convinced s/he has a total view on things.

## 7.

### Right-wing politics with left-wing goals: my ultimate concerns (2 January, 2018)

I have recently composed an open letter to Richard Spencer (“A Chinese American's Open Letter to Richard Spencer”). The letter was meant to be a farce on the leftist progressives, in that, for example, the leftist progressives' agenda (no restriction on immigration) is obviously environmentally costly when they love the environment so much, while the far right activists, without even thinking about the environment, are actually promoting an agenda that is beneficial to the environment. Even so, this doesn't mean that the suggestions in the letter cannot be taken seriously by the Alt-Right and identitarian members. Let me use the central issue about immigration to illustrate the situation. If you Google “immigration is environmentally costly”, you will find that many rightwing activists have been

---

<sup>10</sup> Stanley Appelbaum ed., *Selections from Don Quixote: A Dual Language Book* (Dover, 1999). In the introduction the editor says of Cervantes:

[Don Quixote] was then read by many as a mighty tragedy, written by a man born out of his time, grievously disappointed in his own career, both military and literary, and in the decline of his country (economic woes, revolt of the Netherlands, debacle of the Armada, etc.).

That's an exact description of me. I'm born out of my time, disappointed in everything I have done, and in the decline of America itself (people's increasing dummification, society's increasing McDonaldization, all this hypocrisy in society's increasing intolerance of sexism and racism).

for many years arguing against immigration on ground of environmental cost, both to the US itself and to the world at large. I would then be suggesting that the Alt-Right adopt the agendas which many previous rightwing groups with leftist goals have already advanced but which today have no place in the public domain in order to seize the moral high ground away from the leftist progressives. I shall use two particular references that I have found in this way as the nexus of my following discussion, Eric Neumayer's “The Environment: One More Reason to Keep Immigrants Out?” (*Ecological Economics*, 59 (2), pp. 204 -207) and Jason DinAlt's “The Environmental Impact of Immigration Into the United States” (*Carrying Capacity Network's Focus*, Vol 4, No. 2, 1997). (Neumayer is pretty much a critic of the Carrying Capacity Network (CCN) represented by the latter.)

In my manifesto on leftist conservatism (and in the Spencer Letter as well) I have mentioned the obvious fact that leftist “accepting immigrants” and “respecting other cultures” are bad for the atmosphere by promoting massive transportation of peoples across oceans using fossil fuel engines. The CCN adds the additional argument that immigration to USA means, ultimately, the creation of more of these environmentally costly Americans:

... whereas immigrants consume few resources and produce little pollution in their home country, once they come to America (or any other developed country for that matter) they consume more resources and produce more pollution since they command greater wealth and adopt a different lifestyle.<sup>11</sup>

The overall increased environmental destruction ranges from increased CO2 production with the acquisition of motor vehicles made possible in the new country, to the wasting of more lumber and acres and the consumption of more meat which the immigrants couldn't otherwise attain in their backward home country.<sup>12</sup> Neumayer, the critic, is fond of pointing out other respects in which immigration is good for the environment, such as sending money home which encourages development in the home country and having less children in the new country after assimilation, both of which lead to decreased population growth in the long run (which is obviously good for the environment). The two sides can go on and on about the increase or decrease of environmental cost of mass immigration, and we cannot make a judgment unless scientists gather together to conduct a definitive, full range study of the environment costs and benefits of the mass migration which characterizes our current world.<sup>13</sup>

I would simply like to make two points to make my position clear. First, my leftist conservatism is precisely aimed at Neumayer's *ethical* objection to CCN's position:

I would define eco-fascism as a position that holds that some people have the right to

---

11 Neumayers' summary, *ibid*.

12 DinAlt, *ibid*.

13 I mention here nothing about CCN's major concern about the carrying capacity of the United States, since this doesn't have immediate implication for our earthly environment in its entirety. Because it has nothing to do with the environmental issue – not directly – I also mention nothing about Neumayer's objection to restricting immigration as a way to protect developing nations from “brain drain”.

consume a lot of resources and pollute much based on nationality, citizenship or race, but all the rest, which is the vast majority of people, do not have this right. And to ensure this, they need to be kept where they are. The position of CCN and its supporters is not identical to eco-fascism as defined above since they deny of course that, say, Americans have the right to consume lots of resources and pollute much at the expense of people from other nations. However, if the American way of living really is a danger to the global environment, then this way of living needs to be changed. Full stop. To say that as long as this way of living is not or cannot be changed, immigrants should stay outside is, to repeat, not eco-fascism, but it will find support among eco-fascists since the immediate conclusions with respect to restrictions on immigration are the same.<sup>14</sup>

Neumayer's presupposition is that, since Americans are doing bad things, other people should be allowed to do bad things too – that equality is a greater good than the preservation of our environment for the sake of the survival of our, and other, species. Leftist conservatives don't share such goal. It's of course sad that everybody, in America and elsewhere, wants only consumption in life, and moreover wants to be equal when s/he has less than others (but not when s/he has more than others). At issue here is the notion that those people in poor countries are so important that their request, not for education or intelligence or wisdom but for gluttony, must be granted. The leftist conservative is disgusted by this situation. Most people on the planet are “worthless eaters” – putting food in their mouth and digesting it in their stomach is their sole mission on planet earth – and one should not be so concerned that they are poor or aren't equal to other people who are not so poor. The leftist conservative despises such wanton attribution of supreme importance to those human beings who aren't much more conscious of life than their pets.

My greater passion in adopting rightwing means for leftist ends is however not about the environment, but about the human brain. Globalization and immigration must be rolled back in order to shrink humanity's economic existence. Economic growth and consumerism, at least at this stage, kill our brain. I intuitively see a connection between globalization, mass immigration, multiculturalism, and McDonaldization. Whenever a society or interaction sphere is getting too large, people become dumber or less attentive, and it becomes difficult for geniuses to be recognized. The decline of the quality of work throughout American society in the past thirty years has occurred in tandem with demographic change through immigration, although I have no proof, and can't be certain, that the McDonaldization of American society couldn't have happened without mass immigration. It's just a hunch. Since Neumayer and the leftists like him hold their position because they care about equality and don't care about brain development, there is no point in arguing with him – since we really just want different things in life.

---

14 Neumayer, *ibid.*