

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

**Lawrence C. Chin**

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 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

---

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

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

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

---

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

3 An excellent short exposition of Thomas Robert Malthus' ideas is Judy K. Morris, “Professor Malthus and His Essay”, in

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.

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

---

*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!

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>4</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 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,

---

<sup>4</sup> Colin Wilson, Twayne Publishers: Boston, 1975, p. 21.

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

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>5</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, 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

---

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

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

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>6</sup> to her lectures on Karl Polanyi from 2010 onwards, she has never given

---

6 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



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 transited 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 always is 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.

---

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.