

9/11 and the art of fictional finalism

By Bo Filter

Famed psychologist Alfred Adler wrote about neurotic behaviour and its relationship to a feature he called "fictional finalism". In essence, falsely drawn conclusions lead to faulty or neurotic behaviour. Adler said that we tend to finalize our conclusions, not realizing that our premises and inferences are often faulty. Unaware of our errors, we have no sense of urgency to reassess and change behaviour. We stick with our conclusions, and because they are not true, they enter the realm of fiction, thus the term "fictional finalism".

In the Pentagon's Department of Psychological Warfare *fictional finalism* can be put to good use. Drumming up taxpayer support for profiteering in current and future invasions of other countries is bolstered by a public that has finalized the Pentagon's fictional account of trumped up charges against a foreign state. The process involved might be called the military art of fictional finalism.

The mechanics of *fictional finalism* appear to have been applied by the Bush administration on 9/11 with the help of psychological warriors from the Pentagon and public relations experts, of which there are hundreds of companies that vie for this kind of work. The fiction of foreign hijackers armed with plastic knives was finalized by Bush's entrapping statement that you are either with us or you are with the terrorists. You either accept the plastic knife theory or risk being prosecuted as a terrorist.

This classroom at a school in Haiti was replaced by a prefabricated shelter designed to withstand earthquakes and hurricanes. So, fictional finalism can be used in bullying the public into going along with a preplanned fiction. Such fictions are pretexts implemented in real life by militarized states through carefully crafted catastrophic events. These earthquake-like political charades are designed to terrify people and make them vulnerable to the *fictional final* stamp of approval by the voice of authority

like the president. Few are immune to such life-threatening ultimatums.

Without giving names, even left leaning scholars were terrified by Bush's ultimatum. Many headed for the hills, remembering the mass murder of lefties by Hitler. Their pens went silent. They found themselves unable to read revealing books like Michael Ruppert's *Crossing the Rubicon* or any of the well researched books by David Ray Griffin. When pushed to respond to rising criticism regarding their silence, several caved-in, fearing their reputations would be smeared and lost. So, they too began singing the hymn of Osama bin Laden and 19 disciples. Subsequently, some have gone along with the character assassination of those bringing forward new revealing facts about 9/11 that they dare not acknowledge to themselves.

Scholars who have abandoned science for the Bush administration's *conspiracy theory*, including fictional phone calls from airliners, as now acknowledged by the FBI, must restart from the beginning. For one, they need to provide examples of steel-structured skyscrapers that collapsed at free-fall speed prior to 9/11 due to fires. Such examples don't exist. This fact alone is strong enough to re-waken or ignite some peoples' curiosity. If skyscrapers can easily be brought down by fire, then no one would work in them. Their lives would be in constant danger. Stories would be everywhere: "Don't go into that building. Remember the skyscraper that suddenly collapsed last month from fire." People would be reminding each other of fires and collapses constantly. Yet, the fiction on 9/11 continues.

Unfortunately, fictional finalism is made harder to undo because of two other psychological mechanisms—the fear of being exposed as gullible and the fear of ostracism. We don't want to look stupid, that we are easily misled, so against all facts and new evidence people will set up a psychological *Berlin wall* to fend off attack against the Whitehouse conspiracy theory. Worse,

no one wants to be singled out and ostracized as a terrorist. This harkens back to the primal fear of being exiled from the pack and left alone in the jungle where one becomes easy prey to powerful predators. A dog pack mentality can be fomented because we would rather be lied to than left alone to defend for ourselves in a dark forest. So the fear of looking stupid and the fear of exile lend themselves to locking in finalism.

Finalism appears conclusive, eternal. Catastrophic events have been used by governments and tyrants in the past to mold public opinion, like Hitler's burning of the Reichstag as a pretext to end civil government. Such catastrophic events divide conclusively, like a hot searing knife, the past from the future.

The terrorist act of 9/11 was a molding or searing event, the exact type of machination and matching thesis for which Philip Zelikow received his doctorate degree. His career has been paid for by the military-industrial-complex that is enriched by war and the fomenting of war by staged catastrophic events. In fact, Zelikow was executive director of the Thomas Kean commission, which rubberstamped the hijacker plastic knives conspiracy theory coming from the White House.

How do we know this? Zelikow wrote the final report before the commission really got into gear, just as witnesses were being called for testimony. In other words, the plastic knives theory was pre-ordained by the Commission's handlers—the Bush administration. All the members of the commission, including Zelikow, were hand-picked by the Bush administration. Why would anyone expect to see a different conclusion than the media touted clan of mountain cave dwellers, when the commission is run by the very same people who originated the theory? To contradict themselves would be to expose themselves.

The situation seems hopeless, but fictional finalisms can unravel and heal. When people undergo treatment for neurosis, they

have to be exposed to their own finalized fictions. Becoming disillusioned is a key factor in healing, and being exposed to the facts sometimes can come from the most unexpected sources. The Bush administration conspiracy theory was weakened by none other than Vice-President Dick Cheney. On a 2006 Tony Snow program, Cheney admitted that they never were able to "make the case" against Osama bin Laden. Tony Snow quickly tried to cover up this *faux pas* by correcting Cheney that he must have meant to say Saddam Hussein. Cheney thanked him nervously and they both laughed nervously, then Snow immediately changed the subject to something entirely different. If the case had been made so concretely against either of Hussein or bin Laden, a few of the absolute facts would have rolled off the tip of their tongues. Instead they ran together figuratively over the hill into a valley beyond where the sensitive subject of who did 9/11 would go out of sight from the audience.

Many facts are now coming to light and the first suspect of 9/11 Osama bin Laden has become the least likely candidate as revealed by comprehensive investigators and researchers on the subject. We need a genuine forensic crime scene investigation, which still has not taken place in the nine years since 9/11. Since the Bush government became a suspect, we cannot expect federal authorities to initiate a genuine investigation. Neither will there be one coming from the Obama administration as they work for the same military industrial complex. Independent crime scene investigators and lawyers armed with forensic science will have to initiate a public judicial inquiry.

When the truth of 9/11 is fully exposed, we will witness a mass healing to a significant degree of a fictionally finalized mass neurosis. Disillusionment will be the key to this healing.

Bo Filter is an independent social scientist concentrated on applied psychology and author of *The Cause of Wars and Aggression*, www.globaljusticepublishing.com

New times displace old traditions

By Jim Taylor

France has boldly gone where no nation has gone before. On September 14, the French Senate voted 246 to one to ban face coverings. France's lower house, its National Assembly, had approved the legislation in July.

International news media treated the law as if it dealt exclusively with Islam and women. That may have been France's intent -- but it's not what the law says.

The law simply prohibits people from covering their faces in public. It offers a host of exemptions for health, work, or safety. So motorcyclists and welders may still wear helmets. Construction workers may protect themselves from toxic dust. Surgeons may wear masks in operating rooms.

In fact, the law makes no mention of Islam. Nor of burqas, niqabs, hijabs, or

chadors.

Burqas, a head-to-toe covering, and niqabs, which leave only a slit for the eyes, are now illegal. But so are the balaclavas favoured by punks robbing the local 7-11. As are the bandanas worn by violent demonstrators to conceal their identity.

The hijab, covering only hair and neck, remains acceptable. So does the chador, which covers only the body.

I will probably get blasted from some quarters for saying this, but I think France is right. Even if it acted for the wrong reasons.

It's entirely possible that France based its ban on racism and bigotry -- especially given their decision to deport the Roma, the gypsies.

Until recently, France was mainly white-skinned. Not anymore. Immigrants from France's former north-African colonies are

predominantly darker-skinned. And Muslim -- upsetting the religious equilibrium in a predominantly Roman Catholic nation.

Inevitably, there's a backlash from those who see the social standards they used to take for granted being eroded.

But although I suspect their motives, I support the French decision. It recognizes that cultural and religious practices often outlive their original purpose.

The burqa and niqab, for instance, are an accident of history, not an article of faith. The Muslim Council of Canada states flatly that they have "no basis in Islam". Abdel Muti al-Bayyumi, of the Al-Azhar mosque council in France, asserts that nothing in Islamic law or the Qur'an requires a full-face veil.

Rather, they came because, in Mohammed's time, women were considered a man's property. And not just in Islam. The Hebrew scriptures, the Christian Old Testament, also take for granted that women have rights only through the male head of the household. If the husband or father died, an unattached woman became a nobody.

To protect her, Hebrew law required the nearest male relative, usually the husband's brother, to take the widow as his own wife, thus putting her under his protection.

In effect, the only safe place for a woman was secluded within her husband's tent.

The burqa or niqab enabled the woman to take the tent with her.

Don't scorn these notions. Vestiges linger, even in western society.

My mother, for example, always wore her long hair coiled in a bun. She let down her hair -- literally -- only when alone with my father.

Not long ago, women still covered their hair with hats when they went to church.

In my youth, girls rarely attended a prom without an escort. Unaccompanied females were considered fair game. (Some still are -- consider the gang rape in Pitt Meadows, with pictures of the crime being widely circulated on Facebook.)

Some of these social restrictions have largely been abandoned. Others haven't.

Before refrigeration, food inspection,

and high-temperature dishwashers, Moses' prohibitions on eating pork and mixing dairy and meat products would have dramatically reduced trichinosis, salmonella, and botulism.

Today, many of those dietary restrictions become meaningless. Many Jews ignore them -- just as many Catholics ignore the Vatican on birth control. But those edicts are still upheld as essential, a characteristic defining a particular people.

Similarly, the Sikh turban, the Hindu bindi, become rallying symbols for the faithful, whether or not they still make sense.

Customs -- including religious customs -- evolve from specific contexts. Problems arise when those customs don't fit their new context; they become enshrined, untouchable, unquestionable, immutable....

Traditional attire is no longer necessary to protect women in France or in Canada. But in Kandahar or Tehran, a woman might risk her life by appearing in a western bikini.

I don't see the French law discriminating against women. If anything, it favours them. A woman's fine for wearing unlawful head covering is about \$200. A man who forces a woman to wear a head covering can be fined \$30,000 and spend a year in jail.

And if a husband refuses to let his wife go out without head covering, as some fear might result, he can be charged with forcible confinement.

Automobiles once had to be preceded by runners waving a warning flag or a lantern. Victims of leprosy once had to clang bells and chant "unclean, unclean". Priests used chicken entrails to divine the future.

These practices seem ludicrous today, but in their time and place, they probably made sense. Fortunately, we have had enough sense to leave them behind.

Even if they did it for the wrong reasons, France had the courage to expect its citizens to leave behind another outdated custom.

Copyright © 2010 by Jim Taylor. He writes a weblog which can be found at <http://edges.canadahomepage.net/>

Victoria-Swan Lake New Democrats

Stay in touch!

You can reach your executive
by emailing President Edward May at edwardmay@gmail.com
or by writing to Box 282
1681 Hillside Avenue, Victoria, BC V8T 2C1

Victoria Labour Council

219-2750 Quadra Street, Victoria, BC V8T 4E8
Ph: 250-384-8331 FAX: 250-384-8381 Email: vlcbc@telus.net
The VLC, representing affiliated unions in the Greater Victoria area,
holds its regular monthly meeting the third Wednesday of each month at 7 pm
at the BCGEU Auditorium, 2994 Douglas Street.
All delegates are invited to come out and meet the Executive:
Mike Eso, President; Stan Dzbik, Treasurer; Kim Manton, Secretary