

## Pseudomorphosis

### Insights from Terrorism

Behaviour is determined by the country people inhabit. "Country" here does not refer to state, nation, society, language, i.e. civilisation, but refers to nature, i.e. geographical features, mountains, valleys, rivers, plains, climate, vegetation, wildlife, and the landscape with its unknown potential for past and history.

The traditional countries of immigration provide the example. The Indians of North America were hunters and scavengers who either dwelled in walled villages, now called pueblos, or roamed the prairies with no housing any more firm than their tepees. The "discovery" of America by Christopher Columbus presented them with the revolutionary technological advancement of the horse. This purely technological progress enlarged the extension of their native behaviour without changing the structure of this behaviour.

Modern Americans are heirs to the Christian European civilisation. In the old country they were settled and lived in societies that had replaced long ago tactical (walled towns) by strategic (military organizations) measures of protection. As immigrants, or conquerors, though, they soon adopted the behaviour pattern of the natives. These they made extinct with no intention whatsoever to acquire their modes of subsistence. Nevertheless, the emerging society, on an appropriately higher level of technology, adopted the behavioural structure of the extinct stone age civilizations. They now live in walled villages, called "neighbourhoods," and roam the vast plains in their mobile homes as hunters and scavengers, now hunting jobs and scavenging income opportunities instead of nuts and game. The mode of subsistence of the nuclear age Americans differs from that of the stone age Americans only substantially, while structurally and systematically it remained constant. As this form of subsistence did neither get imported from the old country nor was intentionally adopted from the natives, the acquisition of this form of civilization obviously is the result of coping with the land as such. Behaviour got transplanted from one ethnic group to a totally different ethnic group by simply the latter filling in the geographical location of the former. It follows that for each country there is a behaviour pattern that gets unconditionally imposed onto immigrants and conquerors regardless as to which extent these manage to maintain any of their traditional cultural acquisitions, e.g. their language. With the possible exception of the Chinese there is no ethnic group that would be immune against this dictatorship of the geographical environment. - This mechanism of behaviour transplant I call the **Geo-Imperative** (with reference to behaviour), or the **Domain Condition** (with reference to systems).

In the present epoch of global migration this is of course of utmost relevance to the prediction of behaviour of ethnic groups. It all depends on recognizing the behaviour that typically originates from a certain country. Unfortunately, there is no simple and direct reading this off from the face of "Mother Earth" (Toynbee). Rather, it has to be inferred from the behaviour of the natives who inhabit this face. Western Europe has become an immigration country for the peoples of the world. No longer do they "look upon this city" (of Berlin, Ernst Reuter), they fill into these cities. There, they become Germans, Frenchmen, Englishmen by grasping, like children watching their parents keenly, the essence of Germanship, Frenchmanship, Englishmanship. Like any learning process, this takes its time. Not the generation of the very immigrants, neither the one of their children, who were still born in the old country and were moved to Europe as minors, but only the third generation, the one of the grandchildren born in the new country starts comprehending by succumbing to the respective geo-imperative. Maintaining their cultural distance from us natives fosters their learning process which would fail if they tried merely to copy our behaviour. "True" Germans, Frenchmen, Englishmen will become of those who defend their cultural heritage with teeth and claws. European emigrants, too, who never thought highly of church nor king in their old country became true to

their former kaiser or queen and well-versed Christians, once in Africa or wherever. South Rhodesia under Ian Smith is but one well remembered example of a colony not only "very British," but much more British than Great Britain herself. - See Somerset Maugham's "The Outstation" for a pertaining century old satire.

Immigrants, thus, will become better Germans, Frenchmen, Englishmen than we ever were, the more they cling to ill comprehended vestiges of their inherited civilization. I here keep recounting the nations each, instead of just speaking of Europeans, because, as has been said, the very character of the individual country is decisive. The strong differentiability between them is a hallmark of Europe. Russians don't differ from Petersburg to Wladiwostok. The distance between Basques and Polish is one third of that, but worlds lie between them. - An American popular encyclopaedia of the 1960ies describes the Germans as follows: The boys wear leather shorts, the girls sport braids, and the adults sit outdoors to long tables where they drink beer and sing songs. - It is of no relevance whether this cliché is true or not, what counts is that there is a different one for each country in Europe. This gives proof of the typifying force that countries exert on their inhabitants. This typifying force, in Germany, will certainly not bring Muslims to wearing leather shorts. It will produce a behaviour that captures the essence behind this overt behaviour of the natives. This production of the essence has to overcome the conservative forces of the inherited culture. It will succeed only if the product is more essential of the acquired culture than the behaviour of the natives used to be. The bringing about of this essence is what is called **pseudomorphosis** by Oswald Spengler ("The Decline of the West").

Let us consider England for an illustration. Compared to all other European countries tradition in England is of a remarkable consistency. The blood of William the Conqueror rolls in the veins of the present queen. This means that only a single form of subsistence is possible for people living on England's soil. The correlation between "blood and soil" is extremely tight, where "blood" ofcourse stands for "behaviour pattern." Substrate of this single possible behaviour pattern is a people composed of peasants (Angles and Saxons) and sea nomads (Vikings), with the latter ones having installed themselves as elite on top of the former ones, leading England through history by maintaining and cultivating their inherited civilization as pirates and conquerors.

This civilization is being conquered by peoples from old static high civilizations of Muslim religion. They are landlubbers, and conquests across the deep seas are incomprehensible to them. They are incapable of thinking strategically. The pirateous policy and history of the British they comprehend as being tactical in nature. From this perspective a policy of "balance of power" appears as pure terrorism: At some time, damage is done to this party, at some time good is done to some other party, and neither action appears to make any sense at all. The geo-imperative, or essence of being British, in the eyes of the neo-British is terrorism. And this is what they show off to document their integration into the new civilization.

Terrorism of the Leeds type is the consequence of a learning process. Any learning process consists of an interaction between the contents to be acquired and the personality of the student. Germans, who immigrate into Great Britain do not become terrorists, but turn into devoted subjects to Her Majesty. There they find the sovereign they missed in Germany oh so badly, with that sovereign either having quit or having lost any reputation. In short, beyond the Channel they find those values to make their empty skulls buzz with (cf. Wittgenstein, Popper, Dahrendorf). Muslims, though, are already in possession of their set of values, and are unable to recognize any in the British society. All they notice is a very secular and very flexible greed for power, which they try to adopt. The greatest power anyone can possess is the discretion at the lives of others, and this discretion they exert, to show what good Englishmen they have become.

Applying this model to Germany leads to equivalent findings. We Germans think deeply and act widely. Our neo-Germans study quietly at some university for years, if not decades, then to be off

across the oceans to incinerate some stupid buildings. This is no new behaviour pattern at all, but simply a copy of the one of the natives. Germany lacks the one-dimensionality of the British history. There are a number of Germanies in Germany, and this necessarily lengthens the learning process. More than three generations will be necessary to understand and adapt to the geo-imperative. Besides, the nature of the learning process is different. British mentality is based on a dynamic concept time. Time is understood as progress, and the (19th century) attempt to decree its end results from this concept. The Muslim is convinced that the flow of time is the work of the devil. God decreed time to be Eternal Present. Which is akin to German thought. Augustine taught the same. Germany and Iran, e.g. are therefore much closer in their modes of thought than Germany and England. A mentality based on the flow of time is unable to comprehend "guilt." The incapability of remorse was a prerequisite for establishing the Commonwealth of Nations, from where terrorism now originates.

### Modeling

If there is any truth in the above hypotheses, then it should be possible to model the causes and conditions of terrorism, i.e. have a computer predict time and place of the next blow. What we need to model first is the geo-imperative of the country or domain. This being space, the task is to model imagined space. Second, we need to simulate the process by which a mentality invades a new domain. What is to be noted here is that both items are different things. Descartes was right in his differentiating the "res cogitans" from the "res extensa," and in his postulate of the independence in principle of the two. The Cartesian Turn consists of declaring the immanence as necessary, and the transcendence as contingent, which is exactly the other way around as scholasticism would have it.

- (1) The domain is the realm of necessity.
- (2) Mind is the realm of contingency.
- (3) The biological principle of ubiquitous penetration applies to matter.
- (4) The principle of entropy applies to cognition.

Structural causation runs from life to matter to cognition, which discards all efforts as fruitless to build a mind by copying it from a brain. - From these first principles all modeling would have to depart. While the structural properties of domain and mentality are known, the empirical question focusses upon the adaptational changes the inherited structure, or mentality, undergoes by acquiring a new domain.