



Cassandra Crossings, between February and November 2025

This text is subject to the [Creative Commons CC-BY-NC-SA](#) conditions.

Accurately translated using [Supertext.com](#)

A dinosaur...

Hello,

The ticket of the day is a dinosaur because it dates from the years 2005 to 2007. It is a systemic analysis of the attacks that hit the United Kingdom at that time.

It was revised, deemed fit for service and was extended with an epilogue describing the changes (or lack thereof) that had occurred in the intervening period.

We also took advantage of this review to analyse the social situation in the United States, a country that shares a common history and culture with the United Kingdom

We leave it to you to judge whether the situation has improved since...

Looking forward to seeing you here!

This text is subject to the [Creative Commons CC-BY-NC-SA](#) conditions.

Accurately translated using [Supertext.com](#)

Warning

All the demonstrations that will follow are based on the study of social interactions. This involves:

- **Story-telling:** human behaviours are described using situations that are plausible but not necessarily linked to specific historical events. When historical events are mentioned, the light shed on them is not necessarily based on academic studies; however, if a reference is available, it will be provided. Warning: reference studies are carried out according to Cartesian monadic paradigms, whereas our work follows Batesonian systemic rules. This explains the factual impossibility of making any comparison between these studies and our own.
- **Writing History:** contrary to what the majority believes, History is not written **BY** the winners, but it is written **FOR** the winners! This change of preposition has a much stronger impact than one would initially imagine. It explains that historians do not seek to describe the reality of facts but, depending on the audience they address, to seduce the powerful by selecting and colouring events in such a way as to guarantee the continuity of their working conditions. Indeed, a historian who finds himself too far from the mainstream of interpretations would later have many problems in exercising his passion, if he is still able to do so. This is why history books have systematically applied themselves to depicting the lives of the great men of this world, while neglecting the lives of the majority. In the context of this work, the focus was placed on the mass of the forgotten ones of 'official' histories, because it is the mass that makes up the population, that makes up the majority social groups that form the flow that will carry historical events.
- **The moon, the wise man and the fool:** as the proverb says, '*When the wise man points to the moon, the fool looks at the finger,*' here too, the important thing is to never lose sight of the goal of this work, which is to analyse and explain the origin and implementation of human behaviour in the light of its cultural background. This warning is all the more important because each of us tends to see the world through the prism of our own culture, that is to say, to believe that our own behaviour is universal or that the behaviour of our neighbour is different simply '*because the neighbour is like that...*'
 - Nothing is further from the truth. Every behaviour is individual, but every individual behaviour can only be socially tolerated if it is sufficiently close to the average behaviour of the social group to which that person belongs.
- **Probabilities** are also a key feature: for every example provided, there will always be a counter-example asserting that there is a behaviour opposite to the one described. The question is not to *judge* ONE BEHAVIOUR in itself but to consider the plausibility of THIS BEHAVIOUR, to define the social rules that authorise or restrain its expression and to define the probability of occurrence of this behaviour.
 - The behaviours studied will always be majority behaviours following the most frequent social rules, in order to determine which behaviours are the most plausible, even if it is always possible that another, less frequent, behaviour exists. But, in any case, each behaviour will always have to respond positively to the following question: whatever the probability of occurrence of a behaviour, there will always have to be social rules capable of explaining that behaviour.
 - Without an appropriate social rule, the analysed behaviour will be declared impossible under normal conditions, i.e. if it exists, it is pathological in the context of the social group concerned, unless it is part of the normal behaviour of another social group, in which case it will be necessary to explain why this behaviour was able to manifest itself in a social group in which it does not normally belong.



End of 2007

Systemic analysis of the attacks in the United Kingdom in 2005 and 2007

Preamble

Contrary to most opinions expressed so far, we assert that the criterion of Muslim religion played only an anecdotal role in the London attacks of July 2005 and the Glasgow attacks of June 2007.

We take the view that the root cause of these attacks is the segregationist policy that the British have, *willy-nilly*, pursued towards immigrants.

This segregationism stems from the compartmentalisation inherent in Anglo-Saxon societies. These attacks are therefore the result of a clash between two cultures that did not understand each other: the monolithic culture of some immigrants and the multipolar culture of the Anglo-Saxons.

This collision was difficult, if not impossible, to predict. However, once this collision is correctly identified, the means to deal with it are known and proven. Unfortunately, since these corrective measures have not been implemented, the cultural collision can occur again.

Index

.....	3
End of 2007.....	3
Preamble	3
Part 1: The historical background.....	5
From Antiquity to the Year 1000	5
Cultural segregation	5
The Norman invasion of William of Normandy (William the Conqueror)	5
Stockholm Syndrome and Catharsis	6
The Stratification of Anglo-Norman Society	6
Composure, Hooligans.....	7
The composure	7
Hooliganism	8
Group culture.....	8
Update 2026	9
‘Us’ vs. ‘Them’ in a Multipolar Culture.....	12
The case of the United States in the light of the preceding paragraphs	12
The United States and segregation.....	16
The United States and Anti-Intellectualism	17
The worldview of Citizen Trump and his administration	17
Rotten apples in the bosom.....	19
Part Two: The London and Glasgow Attacks	21
Multicultural vs. monolithic culture	21
The 2005 attacks.....	22
The 2007 attacks.....	22
Dr Mohammed Asha.....	23
Part Three: The responses to the attacks.....	24
The English response to terrorist acts (Editor’s note: Situation in 2007)	24
Origin of the crisis.....	24
Review of a social communication.....	24
The misguided involvement of religion as a determining factor	25
The reaction of the English political world	25
The Origin of Gordon Brown’s Error	26
What if new attacks were to be committed?	26
The hybrid solution.....	28
Implementation of the solution	28
Situation in Switzerland	29
ADDENDUM: Review of the situation in 2015.....	30
Situation in the United Kingdom	30
Situation in Switzerland	30
An anti-terrorism specialist speaks.....	30
Analysis of our 2007 findings.....	30
Part Four: Analysis of the Analysis	31
Systemic analysis vs. monadic causal analysis.....	31
Analysis of the analysis of the June 2007 attacks.....	31
Analysis Assumptions.....	33
Around Systemic Analysis	33

Part 1: The historical background

From Antiquity to the Year 1000

England has been a land of battles and invasions. It was first populated by the Celts. Then came the Romans who lingered there until the 3rd century.

After the Romans, the island went through a troubled period that saw it invaded in turn by the Angles, the Saxons, the Jutes and the Frisians, Germanic peoples originating from a triangle whose points were the Netherlands, Denmark and Northern Germany.

These tribes, well organised and tenacious, will gradually push the Celts back to Cornwall, Wales and Scotland. At the end of the 8th century, particularly cruel invaders, the Vikings, landed and plundered, reducing the population to slavery.

They conquered all of northern England up to the Thames.

During this entire period, the population lived under the threat of invasions and wars between local lords. The movements of the population led to the mixing of these various peoples, sometimes by choice, sometimes by force, the victors reducing the vanquished to slavery.

Cultural segregation

Despite these successive invasions, the various groups have always maintained their very lively cultural characteristics.

For example, 25% of the population of Wales still speaks Celtic and in some parts of Scotland the vernacular language is Celtic, which shows the strength of cultural isolation.

The maintenance of these cultural divisions over such a long period led sociologists to believe that the genetic make-up of the present population of Britain must surely reflect the ancient peoples that had succeeded one another over the centuries.

The development of low-cost genetic analysis methods has provided sociologists with a new research tool that has allowed them to scan the English population to confirm their intuition.

To their great surprise, they found that the English population showed a very high degree of genetic homogeneity, in stark contrast to the cultural diversity. Contrary to the hypothesis that served as the basis for this study, even if there are correlations linking certain genetic traits to well-defined socio-cultural groups, the overall picture is that of a relatively homogeneous society.

In conclusion, even if cultural cleavages remain active at the group level, genetics has shown that at the individual level, populations have mixed very well.

This proves that the cultural incorporation of an individual is not fixed but, on the contrary, extremely dynamic, and can evolve greatly depending on the vicissitudes of the life of a given individual. A given individual can even completely change cultural group during his or her life.

The Norman invasion of William of Normandy (William the Conqueror)

In 1066, the Duke of Normandy, William II, known as 'the Bastard' because he was born to a concubine, invaded England to defend his right of suzerainty, which was being challenged by his brother-in-law Harold.

William defeats Harold and England will experience a period of turmoil during which William's (now 'the Conqueror') power will be constantly challenged. While William had been rather moderate and magnanimous after the invasion by leaving the existing hierarchies in place, he will get tired of these constant struggles. He will take the decision to dispossess all the rebels and give their lands and titles to his men.

This decision will ruin a large number of Anglo-Saxon lords and landowners, many of whom will flee abroad. William will freeze the new organisation by instituting feudal law, which he will bring from French Normandy. English cultural stratification thus came about, not because of the incessant wars and invasions that had taken place since Roman times, but because of an administrative decision dictated by the weariness of one man, and it was to take deep root.

The study '[*The fine-scale genetic structure of the British population*](#)' by Stephen Leslie *et al.* published in Nature #309 Vol. 519, March 19, 2015 clearly demonstrates that the number of people involved in this conquest is too small to have left a measurable genetic trace.

On the other hand, the social changes brought about by the arrival of the Normans will profoundly disrupt English society and cause it to break up into entities with schizophrenic interactions.

What the traumas of war did not bring about, the administration will succeed in bringing about: the resentment of dispossession, ruin and dishonour will be the most solid stabiliser of social segregation.

Viewed from this angle, the English separation seems all the more strange since science has proven that the genetic contribution of the invaders was quickly lost in the background noise of the existing groups.

Stockholm Syndrome and Catharsis

We strongly suspect the intervention of a phenomenon that we have found no trace of in any sociological writing: the absence of social catharsis following wars.

Guillaume showed a very particular trait of character: according to some writings, during his entire reign, he is known to have only one political death sentence!

This magnanimity was certainly the key element in the social stratification of the population of Great Britain. After winning a victory, it was common for the victor to consolidate his power by committing (or allowing to be committed) some arbitrary massacre of the vanquished with impunity.

As horrible as this tactic seems to us, it had a positive result: it generated a Stockholm syndrome in the losers, which allowed them to undergo social catharsis by blaming the victims of these massacres for the misfortunes that had occurred.

For the record, Stockholm syndrome requires at least one arbitrary act and one irrational explanation:

- The arbitrary act being, in the case of wars, the massacre of certain people without an objective reason.
- The irrational explanation is the fate that is invoked to 'justify' the choice of victims. This explanation is necessary for the success of catharsis because it allows the survivors to accuse the dead ones of being 'responsible' for their fate and, by extension, responsible for all the misfortunes that have occurred.

The victims were the scapegoats that allowed the rest of society to move on and continue life by forgiving the victors for their crimes; forgiveness that was the first step towards their integration into the new society resulting from the transformations caused by the war.

The more arbitrary their death appears, the easier it is to designate them as scapegoats: God or fate had caused their death for reasons unknown to the survivors, but for reasons that must have been good, since they allow the justification of their death.

The Stratification of Anglo-Norman Society

Due to the very small size of his army, William did not proceed with the usual massacres. The survivors found themselves without the possibility of designating scapegoats. Catharsis could not take effect.

English society has therefore stratified into layers, the main ones being:

- The Normans, victors and new owners of the riches.
- The high-ranking Anglo-Saxons, nobles and bourgeois who made a pact with the Normans and were rewarded for betraying the rest of the people.
- The Anglo-Saxons of high extraction, nobles and bourgeois ruined by the Normans' takeover of their possessions.
- The Anglo-Saxons of low extraction who had suffered the full brunt of the war's consequences, poverty, famine, death, etc...

The Norman victors were able to establish their dominant position in the new society that emerged from this invasion. Being of a different culture than the invaded and not numerous enough to avoid mixing, they settled and genetically mixed with the rest of the population while maintaining a social distance.

The Anglo-Saxons of low social standing saw no change in their way of life, apart from the usual consequences of a war. Their lives continued as before.

On the other hand, for the Anglo-Saxons of high extraction, the situation was completely different!

They were all literally caught between a rock and a hard place. Some were able to retain all or part of their former wealth by agreeing to play the game of the victors. Others, by choice or by force, found themselves completely stripped of their possessions. As losers, they could not demand anything from the new nobility that had replaced them in all the social functions dedicated to the rich and the noble.

But, as social catharsis could not develop due to the absence of arbitrary massacres, they also found themselves isolated in the face of the Anglo-Saxons of low extraction!

If William had respected the warrior customs and had massacred a certain percentage of this nobility, the rest of the nobles could have taken his misfortune with philosophy, realising that the loss of their social status and wealth was compensated by the fact that they were still alive!

Similarly, the low-born Anglo-Saxons might have considered those of the dead who were previously the dominant class in the social hierarchy as responsible for their own bad luck and, consequently, responsible for the chaos that followed the war.

Social catharsis could have taken place: the Anglo-Saxon society as a whole, the common people and the ruined upper class could have discharged their resentment on the dead. This would have opened the way to reconciliation between the Anglo-Saxons of high and low birth in the first instance, and then between the Anglo-Saxons and the Normans. This process would have taken a few decades but would have allowed the establishment of a unified society. Instead, the society found itself trapped in a frozen situation, none of the groups present having the desire or the interest to attempt the unification of the groups in question.

Composure, Hooligans

Following the social unrest that followed the Norman invasion, the original Anglo-Saxon society (leaving aside the Norman society that had imposed its feudal customs on the Anglo-Saxons) found itself split into two main groups: the common people on the one hand; and on the other, the nobles and the bourgeois who had been stripped of their social status and wealth. The third layer of the social hierarchy, the new nobility that emerged from the conquest, is not included in this study.

From a purely economic point of view, the two groups should have lived in fairly similar conditions. However, from a psychological point of view, the situation was completely different:

- In the eyes of the common people, nobles, regardless of their wealth or poverty, were responsible for the social chaos and were therefore rejected and hated.
- In the eyes of the ruined nobles; even if they lived in conditions similar to the common people, they did not forget their former wealth and did not want to mix with the *commoners*.

This fusion with the rest of the Anglo-Saxon society would have appeared to them as the ultimate capitulation, the recognition of a total defeat in the face of the invaders who had become overlords.

As neither side had an interest in seeking a change in the situation, it continued long enough to become part of Anglo-Saxon culture.

The composure

Let's examine what the potentially conflictual confrontation of two Anglo-Saxons of unspecified origin might bring. Since no physical characteristics (skin colour, height or build) allow one to determine whether the opposite person is of high or low social standing, each will remain aloof and refuse to collaborate with the other. Neither will take the first step towards a mutually beneficial engagement.

It seems to be common sense to assume that such an attitude should quickly disappear since it hinders behaviours based on compassion, solidarity and empathy.

It is a misunderstanding of the systemic nature of things. To establish a pattern of reserve and refusal of solidarity, it is enough for a small number of people to refuse to play by the implicit rules of social cohesion (solidarity is an implicit, spontaneous behaviour; it cannot be explicitly required, as it would lose its spontaneous nature)

Behaviour always goes from the implicit spontaneous to the explicit constrained, it is in a way the application of gravity on social behaviours. And just as a stone does not roll towards the top of the mountain, a behaviour does not return to its old spontaneous implicit expression.

In a multipolar society, the composure is explained by the fact that when an unpleasant event occurs to you, you do not know, at first, whether the witnesses are '*on your side*' or '*on the other side*'. In case of doubt, it is better to display a very neutral attitude that gives you time to think and allows you to gauge the witnesses according to their attitude.

By displaying a phlegmatic attitude, the victim avoids revealing their social group to others and therefore, shifts the choice of displaying this affiliation to the witnesses.

If a witness decides to display a benevolent attitude, for example because he or she is a member of the same social group, the victim may lower his or her guard. If no witness is benevolent, the choice of composure avoids putting oneself in a disadvantageous position with respect to them. Composure is therefore a good survival strategy since it minimises the risk of aggravation. And since it is a good strategy, it perpetuates itself...

Hooliganism

Hooliganism is a form of ritual violence between small social groups, and is the result of the recombination of the same factors in a different configuration: the strong segregation of English society, linked to the difficulty of determining the social group of an individual on the basis of their appearance alone, means that a group develops, as a reaction to the uncertainty of appearances, an extremely strong cohesion.

If one member of a group is in danger, the rest of the group will quickly intervene. The difficulty of identifying other parties to the conflict, but also, in some cases, the obviousness of membership (e.g. sports fans), reinforces the cohesion of the group and leads it to consider any witness who is not part of the group as potentially hostile.

The group will thus develop a very powerful, extreme and segregationist attitude that will allow it to be extremely brutal towards non-members, since the latter, not being members of the group, have no social or human value in the eyes of the group members; this psychology was brilliantly portrayed by the American-British director S. Kubrick in the film '*A Clockwork Orange*.'

Group culture

The sedimentation of Anglo-Saxon society has had the effect that it naturally led individuals to group themselves into ever smaller organisations in order to be humanly manageable, in other words, to become sectarian. And history shows us that the Anglo-Saxons have been very prolific in this area.

Several religious sects formed in England before emigrating to America. And the Americans themselves are specialists in group culture.

The best example of the existence of a multipolar culture in Anglo-Saxon societies is the *melting-pot* myth cherished by the Americans!

Indeed, the very concept of a melting pot can only arise in a society divided into numerous subgroups, for one cannot dream of bringing together what has not first been separated.

A monolithic society will never dream of any kind of melting pot, the very concept is by definition completely foreign to it, given that the primary characteristic of such a society is to be '*one and indivisible*'.

This group culture has so thoroughly shaped Anglo-Saxon civilisation that when a small group of like-minded US citizens decided to invade Iraq in 2003, they formed an incredibly cohesive group that became totally impervious to outside opinion.

Similarly, when T. Blair, united by cultural affinity with G. W. Bush, joined this group, he did so with a degree of determination that is incomprehensible to us Continental Europeans of monolithic cultural tradition.

But, once the group culture of the Anglo-Saxons is taken into account, it becomes obvious that T. Blair had no other choice than to link his fate to that of G. W. Bush and that contrary criticism could only strengthen the cohesion of the group.

From the outside, it seems incredible to show such stubbornness, but it is the nature of group dynamics to lead to such situations, because challenging a group decision leads to the group breaking up.

There is thus no psychological difference between a group of hooligans 'united like the five fingers of the hand' and the inhabitants of the White House (Editor's note: between 2003 and 2007, the date on which this text was written). The group dynamics are identical.

And the current situation (Editor's note: in 2007) is insoluble because any systemically logical proposal to resolve this conflict contradicts the assumptions that led to the declaration of war.

Therefore, the first person to propose such a solution would find themselves caught in an inextricable conflict of loyalty between themselves and the rest of the group.

This reality is currently (2007) demonstrated by the position of the Democrats on the war in Iraq. As a political group, they are trying to implement a different position from that of the Republicans, allowing them to attract the potential voter by offering an alternative to the Bush doctrine.

But at the same time, they must show solidarity with the Republicans by supporting this war in the name of their membership in the group of American citizens of which they are a subset.

The Republicans' position is no less uncomfortable, as they too must show solidarity with their president on behalf of their Republican affiliation, while at the same time declaring themselves hostile to the war, since it is increasingly viewed negatively by the public.

The intellectual and linguistic contortions of candidates who promote their opposition to the war while promising not to relax the effort until the goal is achieved, highlights with spectacular acuity the constraints to which these people are subject in the exercise of 'Neither yes nor no, quite the opposite !'

The only psychologically acceptable solution is therefore to keep pushing forward, for both Democrats and Republicans...

++++

Update 2026

Is it necessary to describe the current situation in the United States?

Isn't the behaviour of MAGA people perfectly logical in the light of the explanations above?

Are they not the striking demonstration of these group dynamics born of the original British culture?

Asking the question is answering it...

We will now focus the analysis on a crucial point in this situation: when two neighbouring social groups exhibit broadly identical behaviours, they merge.

The logical corollary is that when a part of a society secedes, its first move will be to adopt markedly different behaviours. These differences may be only symbolic, that is, without real utility, but they are nonetheless crucial because they serve as identification signals for each group.

For example, until the Reformation, churches in Switzerland were particularly decorated and painted. One of the first decisions of the Protestant schismatics was to break, smash, and cover all these ornaments that were a testament to the old faith...

Similarly, it is still very easy to tell if one is in a Catholic or Protestant village today: one only needs to look at where the cemetery is located...

If the cemetery is located outside the village, surrounded by a wall and shrubs, then it is a Protestant cemetery. If the cemetery is located next to the religious building, more or less in the centre of the village, we are in Catholic territory!

There is no economic or hygienic justification for locating this infrastructure in one place or another. There could be a sociological explanation for this difference: one could assume that Catholics want to keep their dead close to their church in order to exorcise the belief in life after death or to ensure that their religious community continues to exist after death. The different location of Protestant cemeteries would suggest that Protestants have the opposite view.

'Entia non sunt multiplicanda praeter necessitatem', the Ockham's Razor reminds us that there is no need to multiply hypotheses: the simplest explanation is that there is no sociological difference in the perception of death between the practitioners of these religions, but the need to break with the old religion and establish the new one had to be clearly marked so that everyone knew which side they were on, and the location of the cemetery is a particularly explicit social marker.

This demonstration is not as anecdotal as it seems: it clearly shows the importance of the distinction between *'Them'* and *'Us,'* whoever these *'Them'* or *'Us'* may be...

For the remainder of the demonstration, we will study these concepts within the framework of a monolithic culture, that is, a culture that considers all individuals in this community to be equal and part of the same whole, somewhat like the French Republic *'one and indivisible.'*

We will deal with the case of multipolar cultures in a later stage.

The only point to remember is that, in any culture, there is always the 'Us,' that is, all the elements that form the world we know and master (for which we have the appropriate social codes) and the rest (for which we do not have the appropriate social codes), these are the 'Them'.

In a monolithic culture, the 'Them' are disturbing because they are not 'Us,' this itch is accompanied by bizarre acts such as 'racist' jokes or other acts of denigration.

These actions all have the same social significance: *'I don't know you and I'm afraid of you. I exorcise your presence with actions that should ridicule you (so that I no longer fear you) or make you flee (so that I am no longer bothered by your presence).'*

Eventually, the 'Them' do not integrate, it is the 'Us' that get used to them and integrate them into the community. The monolithic culture has finished 'digesting' the newcomers and now considers the 'Them' to be 'them,' then 'us,' and finally, 'Us'. This incorporation is a very slow continuum that begins with the integration of isolated individuals (which is expressed in social language by the interjections *'Don't say I'm racist! If you want to know, I even have some 'Them' friends!'*), before expanding to the integration of classes of individuals.

This brings us back to the previous example: people who remain permanently in the 'Us' state of mind and who do not integrate any foreign individuals are very rare; the majority of people will integrate foreigners without too much difficulty, each at their own pace. There is a more or less large minority that will be able to integrate individuals without any problem but will be unable to move on to the stage of integrating classes. And even if these individuals never show the slightest 'racist' behaviour, it must be noted that they will never consider non-indigenous people (migrants) as anything other than a nuisance.

That's the theoretical part.

The practical application is very interesting because it is necessary to take into account not only the characteristics of individuals, but also the way these characteristics interact and evolve according to the situations.

Whether we consider the majority part of society (the indigenous 'Us') or the minority (the foreign 'Them'), there are good people and there are bad people.

Good people are naturally trusting and welcoming, while others are suspicious and closed-off. Between these two caricatures, there is a whole range of people who will be more or less one or the other. And we should not overlook the influence of social pressure: there are people who are very kind when you meet them one-on-one, but who can become intolerant when they are in a group. It doesn't matter whether the rest of the group is tolerant or not, these people can become as sectarian as possible if they see it as socially advantageous.

And we haven't even looked at the situation from the point of view of the minorities!

Naturally, these present the same behavioural diversity as the majority.

In short, what is denounced as racism is in fact normal behaviour of assimilating difference. This remark should not, however, be taken as a justification for racism. It is a re-framing, and this re-framing is important because it allows all parties involved to become aware of the ins and outs of this issue.

This behaviour is all the more normal as it has a stabilising function and preserves the sustainability of the community and of the individual.

We will now debunk the myth of the injunction *'One is not born a racist, one becomes one !'* which has been used to make many people feel guilty. In early childhood, a human being is very open and his curiosity has no limits. He approaches any other person without hesitation, regardless of their appearance or behaviour. This stage of intellectual development is very important in allowing the child to accumulate a maximum of formative experiences while the psyche is still free of preconceptions. During this period, the child dares everything and must be constantly supervised and corrected by his parents to avoid any mishaps.

After this phase of unlimited exploration, comes the need to stabilise and integrate all these experiences into a coherent world view. Behavioural change occurs when the child becomes capable of abstraction – that is, capable of conceiving other points of view than his own, which, according to J. Piaget, occurs around the age of 7.

During the stage from 7 to 12 years of age, the child begins to be capable of abstract reasoning, even if he needs concrete support to realise his reflection. The intellectual constraints are so intense in learning to master the functions of abstraction that he is no longer able to simultaneously accumulate other exploratory experiences. The absence of biases of early childhood is now followed by a period of rejection of all 'abnormalities'. The child who rejects an opening to a human being of a different appearance, of a different culture than his own is not necessarily racist, he is simply at a stage in his development where the experience of the novelty is an emotional and intellectual burden that is too far beyond his capabilities.

In the next stage, adolescence, abstraction will be freed from the limitations of the concreteness and the individual will again be able to open up to the unknown. Simultaneously, the social environment will play a major role in the maturation of his or her character. Depending on the social influences the individual experiences, he or she will become more or less capable of mastering interactions of the 'Us' vs. 'Them' type.

At this stage, if the individual's psyche has already taken its definitive form, it will not stop evolving, but the guidelines are established. However, there is still no question of 'racism' in this description. The only conclusion we can draw so far is that the attitudes of acceptance or rejection of the novelty are idiosyncrasies that are not pathological. They are normal constituents of every individual's psyche.

Under the guise of good intentions, wokism has caused much more confusion and damage than it has had a positive influence. Racism has never been and will never be the rejection of the other. The rejection of the other is a tactic of self-preservation in the face of the unknown; as a survival strategy, it must be respected and accepted. In the face of a rejection attitude, it is completely counterproductive to pull out the crucifix and launch anathemas. On the contrary, one must show empathy and attention to the person who is unable to spontaneously trust a stranger and accompany the discovery of the other until the person can overcome their initial rejection.

++++

Racism is a seizure of power, a subjugation of the other in the name of belonging to a supposed majority. The basic argument of the racist is that he belongs to a majority fraction which, as such, is entitled to impose its domination on the other.

There is no racism in the invective 'N... !,' there is racism in the attitude that blocks any response from the person being insulted.

There is no racism in the epithet – whatever it may be – hurled at the other, there is racism in the denial of equality that prohibits the other from making their voice heard.

Rejection demonstrations must remain tolerated because they are safety valves for frustration, and every engineer knows that a blocked safety valve is only the precursor to an even more devastating explosion.

On the other hand, the denial of equality is unjust because it denies the humanity of one of the protagonists and this denial must cease.

In this regard, wokism has certainly committed its most serious mistake by demanding '*that everyone be equal except that some will be more equal than others!*'

There is a far greater denial of equality in this Orwellian injunction than in any racist slur because the racist knows how to be insulting – that is even the primary purpose of racism – whereas the woke act ostensibly in the name of love of humanity. There can be no justification of any kind for an injunction that places one human above another as a matter of principle, regardless of the ideology that supports this desire.

And that's all. Period.

++++

'Us' vs. 'Them' in a Multipolar Culture

A multipolar culture is not the juxtaposition of several cultures in a placid cohabitation. Rather, it is a perpetual cold war where each party surreptitiously elbows its way to maintain its place in the sun and, if possible, to increase its psychological influence over others to improve its condition.

This struggle is very real – everyone wants a bigger share of the common pie – but it must also be very discreet to avoid the denunciation of the increase in influence by one or other of the competing groups, because the social sanction would be as brutal and humiliating as in the Goose Game : the one who is caught with his hand in the cookie jar has to move back several steps!

Within one of the cultures, there is no difference from monolithic cultures: everyone has expectations and needs that translate into rights and duties towards other members of their own group.

On the other hand, compared to other groups, it's almost the law of the jungle!

In the game of being more equal than others, all tricks are allowed within the limits of explicit and implicit social rules. The only social law that remains is to get "not caught". But as long as appearances are preserved, there is no longer any friend or brother.

That's the theoretical part.

The flaw of such a representation of the multipolar society is that it is totally static. However, a society is never static and the consideration of social dynamics shows that the evolution of such a society is full of surprising behaviours.

The crucial element of this type of society is that the power relations and group affiliations, as shown by the genetic study of the population of the British Isles, are in constant reconfiguration.

As a result, social relations between individuals are also constantly redefined according to circumstances. There may be individuals who remain for their entire lives confined to social relations as unchanging as those within a monolithic society because they have virtually no social interaction outside their reference group. These are often people who are quite low down the social scale.

The higher a person climbs the social ladder, the more opportunities he or she has for interaction and the greater the demands for social fluidity, and the greater the potential for social conflict – the archetypal example being the business lunch between lawyers, where the invited lawyer will accept the invitation with great pleasure, enjoy the meal and, the next day, will not hesitate to file a complaint against his colleague for moral distress on the grounds that the quality of the meal humiliated him in the face of the abundance offered by his colleague!

Social fluidity is also an excellent indicator of adaptation to the demands of social life.

The case of the United States in the light of the preceding paragraphs

When the Americans freed themselves from royal tutelage, they immediately felt the social obligation to mark the change in a way that was sufficiently explicit to leave no doubt between the subjects of the Crown and the new free citizens.

More than 700 years after what we have defined as the triggering event of the segregation of British society, at the time when the Americans separated from the English, it is certain that the population had integrated 2 key elements of social stability:

- It is socially very energy-consuming to always have to defend one's position and social belonging. It is by far preferable to display more or less marked indifference towards members of social groups other than one's own.
- As a result, social practices arising from this awareness have gradually incorporated the notion of social energy savings.

Instead of more or less energetically confronting an interlocutor from another group, it has become normal to distance oneself from him or her with the avowed social goal of minimising the risk of conflict.

This is how British composure and exquisite politeness were born, socio-cultural monuments raised to the glory of understatement and euphemism...

The Americans, for their part, have 'chosen' to distinguish themselves by being as brutal, direct and intrusive as possible, in order to make it clear that they would now be very different from their former masters. However, if they have been able to display a roughness of character that indeed sets them apart from the polished education of the English, there is another point on which they had and still have no influence: the multi-polar culture, a group culture aimed at dividing the community into as many sub-elements as possible, has remained as fully active in the territories across the Atlantic as it was in the British Isles.

Multiculturalism has even been amplified and strengthened to the point of rupture. From the secession of the United States in 1776 and for 2 centuries, the major groups were easy to differentiate: there were the Whites – the Caucasians even if this term is particularly ill-suited to unify in a single concept all the diversity of the physical attributes of the humans who make up this group – there were the Asians, there were the Blacks or coloured people and finally, there were the Natives, the real Americans.

At its founding, American society was, like the rest of the Western world, slave-owning, but the seeds of anti-racism were already germinating and the evolution of society was slow but inexorable, sometimes developing into serious crises such as the American Civil War of 1861 to 1865.

Even if the official history proceeds by large strides between key dates, the situation 'on the ground' was not so clear-cut because the social forces at play are very resistant.

It took almost a century for progressive forces to become powerful enough to overcome (almost everywhere) the social inertia that implicitly rejected this paradigm shift.

The social paradigm shift related to the civil rights struggles has disrupted the US social order. As early as the 1950s and even more so in the 1960s, attitudes towards segregation began to change and its acceptance began to decline.

It has now been nearly 50 years since racial segregation is no longer publicly defensible and it is now certain that the point of no return has been crossed for good, but segregationism is far from being eradicated.

One of the first consequences of crossing the point of no return is that the inhabitants of the United States implicitly had to find new social rules for defining and segregating society.

Indeed, the rule of segregation according to external appearance having become taboo, it was no longer possible to refer to it in a socially acceptable manner.

Faced with the constraint of a rule that is easy to apply and, if possible, as 'obvious' and relevant as the previous one, the Americans chose the criterion that was most in line with the narrative of social success: the external signs of wealth.

The shift to the primacy of wealth over skin colour allowed those who had progressed up the social ladder on the basis of their material possessions to feel that they were being fairly rewarded for their success. In this sense, the new social order could be seen as more coherent than the previous one.

The systemic reality is, however, quite different: society has exchanged an absolute and intangible criterion for a very relative one.

In the original American society, segregation based on 'race' was easy to control – it was enough to look at the person – and this criterion was structurally rigid, it did not change according to circumstances. This rock-solid character naturally influenced American social behaviour, including their political actions. The United States of that time were also psychologically rigid:

- God had placed the white man in the Alpha position of all social or political creation.
- The United States naturally became the Alpha of global politics, the best proof being their access to the atomic weapon, a symbol of ultra-power.
- The attitude of the United States at the time was very reliable, patriarchal and Manichean. In their reading of the world, there were good and bad people, friends and enemies, capitalists and communists, men at work and women at home, etc.
- And in the face of these displays of strength and will, many countries have seen a providential Mother Hen and have rushed under her wings to take advantage of her generosity and protection at a lower cost...

The United States did not become the world's policeman by the will of God but because this task corresponded to their psychological aspirations and because the historical circumstances were favourable.

As long as conditions remained favourable, the United States fulfilled this role to the general satisfaction of the states that placed themselves under its protection and the Americans themselves assumed the constraints of this role with competence as long as this remained aligned with their psyche.

These social paradigms not only influenced US politics but also its industrial production. If, e.g., we choose to examine consumer electronics up to the 1980s, Japanese products were perceived as very gadgetised and rather low-end, European products were a reliable mid-range, and American products, well, they put a man on the moon!

The marketing pitch for them was as simple as it was effective: 'It's American, it's good!'

As for the industrial reality, it was simple: American products were not the most advanced on the market, but they were solidly built according to tried and tested methods – some would say 'grandfather's methods...' – and that was exactly what these products from a patriarchal industrial environment were all about.

The marketing that promoted these products was a reflection of their environment:

- The products were solidly built and designed to last an eternity and a half, much like the 'father' who was supposed to preside over the fate of the company.
- The speech was factual and explanatory.
- The evolution was slow and measured, improvements were introduced with caution and careful consideration.
- The whole environment exuded paternalism and the tranquillity of a world where everything had a well-defined and stable place.

But the 80s were also the years of the swan song of this industrial world.

The social change associated with segregation has a counterpart in the economic world, the adaptation of economic paradigms has been faster than social change but it still took several decades for it to take over the old order.

The change became apparent in the 1980s. The first manifestation of the change in progress was the decline of family management. In the old configuration, the model organisation was the family business, the older it was, the more it inspired confidence because it had certainly successfully overcome many crises.

The family business's flaw was its predictability and rather low ROI, the majority of the profit being reinvested in the maintenance of the production tool and in the remuneration of employees, both to retain them and to motivate them to maintain the quality claimed by the company.

In the 1960s, when it was no longer possible to be 'old-fashioned racist' – even if this term is inaccurate, as we explained in the previous paragraph, we already claimed that Americans are not racist but segregationist – society adapted and replaced the criterion of segregation by appearance with the criterion of segregation by money.

The main consequence of this new segregation is that it is relatively easy to influence: to progress on the social ladder, one just has to increase one's income.

The impact of this new approach has been developing over several decades in the business world. Companies run according to the old patriarchal model tended to prioritise customer satisfaction through product durability. Indeed, in a patriarchal world, quality is synonymous with solidity, like the father who must remain reliable in all circumstances over a very long period, and product developments must be slow so as not to confuse the user by suddenly changing the interface when passing from one generation to the next.

However, in this patriarchal universe, it is relatively difficult to extract a high income, in other words, to rise quickly in the social hierarchy. This rise can only be achieved by a small part of the company – the management – and the means to achieve it are constrained by the economic organisation of the company.

Since the patriarchal family organisation did not allow for this wealth extraction, it was necessary to move to an organisation that made this extraction possible. This business model is that of the joint-stock company (JSC). In the family business, the profit is reinvested in the tool; in the JSC, the profit is redistributed to the shareholders and, when the shareholders are satisfied, they are more likely to better remunerate the management.

Since the 1980s, the actual goal of management has ceased to be the long-term survival of the company – which was the assumed goal of the family business – but rather to ensure that management and shareholders receive ever-increasing income, even at the expense of the company.

Since the amount of value that can be extracted from a company is finite, the possibilities to diverge a certain amount to the benefit of management and shareholders are also limited.

- The first option is to let staff wages stagnate. There is also the option of lowering the requirements for hiring new employees, with less-qualified employees potentially being paid less. These lower wages are likely to create a vicious/virtuous cycle:
 - o Less well-trained staff are paid less.
 - o Lower-paid staff are more likely to give up and never reach the threshold to get a seniority increase.
 - o These departures increase the turnover in favour of staff who are always less trained and less paid.
 - o From a production quality perspective, this is a vicious cycle because it is likely to decrease production quality.
 - o However, the search for sustainable quality of production is the very nature of the family business and not that of the JSC. For a JSC, this reduction in the wage bill is the result of a virtuous circle and the reduction in quality is 'just' a perhaps regrettable side effect.
- The second option is to adapt the products:
 - o It is possible to reduce the diversity of products. A more limited assortment implies a simplification of industrial processes and a concomitant reduction in production costs.
 - o Simplifying the product range leads to a simplification of the distribution and sales processes.
 - o From the customer's point of view, there is a reduction in choice, which is a loss of diversity. But from the management's point of view, the financial gains are a success.
 - o Another point of improvement in the financial outlook, after having decreased the quality of the products, is to optimise marketing to increase sales through more frequent product renewal. This strategy is known as 'planned obsolescence.'
 - o However, this strategy may alienate the company's customers due to the perception of lower quality. This can be addressed through carefully targeted marketing campaigns.
- One possibility is to sell assets perceived as non-essential:
 - o The reduction in the product range leads to a decrease in the need for real estate space, the sale of these assets generates financial gains that are pleasing to both shareholders and management.
- A final option is to outsource production to external partners:
 - o The abandonment of the entire production apparatus and the transfer of this production to other manufacturers allows for significant savings, for example, by moving production to regions where production costs are significantly lower.
 - o Financial gains are proportional to the reduction in costs; however, such a strategy implies the loss of industrial know-how and the loss of control over production circumstances. If the designated partner also chooses to increase its gains by reducing its production costs, for example, by choosing lower quality raw materials, the company may not notice the concomitant quality drop and thus lose reputation for its production.

Business leaders will all declare that the stated purpose of their work is to bring the best products to their customers and that any crises are obviously beyond their control and could not be the result of their actions.

For example, one of the first actions taken by the managers who took over the direction of Boeing at the end of the 1990s after the merger with McDonnell Douglas was to fire nearly 2,000 component quality control engineers.

The impact of this decision was not immediate; rather, this event should be seen as a first indication of a shift in management's focus away from safety issues.

It took more than 20 years to see this shift of focus take a dramatic turn when 2 Boeing 737 Max planes crashed after the angle of attack sensors malfunctioned. We described these accidents in our already published **Study in Social Reverse-Engineering**.

For cost-saving reasons, Boeing used only one sensor to determine the behaviour of the aircraft in the event of excessive pitch-up. The disadvantage of using only one sensor is that in the event of a failure of the sensor, the system is unable to ensure the expected safety.

This episode is far from unique in US industrial history and proves that between the claimed discourse and the facts, there is no obligation of consistency.

A picture is worth a thousand words: we can compare the behaviour of the managers concerned with that of a young man who approaches a young woman in a public place. He will naturally start by complimenting her on her appearance and making her understand that his interest is noble and likely to lead to a long-term relationship. He acts in this way because he knows that a straightforward and brutal approach, 'I simply want to have sex with you tonight and then you disappear from my life,' will have the merit of presenting his expectations in the most direct way and in accordance with his real intentions, but is likely to earn him a slap on the cheek instead of a kiss on the neck...

For your information, in Germany during the 1950s to 1970s, the wage ratio between the lowest salary in a company and the highest was around 30, meaning that the boss earned up to 30 times more than his lowest-paid worker.

Currently in the United States, the ratio can exceed 1,000, which means that the lowest-paid worker will have to work for nearly a millennium to earn what his CEO earns in 12 months...

++++

The United States and segregation

Segregation has never been abandoned, not because Americans are inherently racist, but because American society is multipolar.

The transition from a monolithic society to a multipolar society is relatively simple, it only requires a minority to adopt social behaviours that hinder the manifestations of cohesion and solidarity.

On the other hand, the return of a multipolar society to a monolithic society is practically impossible because it would require an overwhelming majority of society to be aware of the significance of multipolar relations and their modes of expression and for this majority to consciously decide to change its behaviour in order to recreate the original monolithic society.

Because of the multipolar nature of American society, segregation had to remain active to ensure the sustainability of society, this social rule being the irreducible foundation of social stability.

The transfer of segregation from the racial criterion to the criterion of financial power has led to the transformation of the economic world to favour the production of financial wealth and its appropriation by shareholders and management.

The consequence of this transfer has been the gradual disappearance of the middle class. 'The rich have become even richer and the others have been dispossessed.'

The MAGA movement has built its success on this resentment and the implicit promise of resurrecting the old order even if, as explained above, it is already too late by several decades to hope for any chance of success.

The positioning of the citizen Trump in this social reality is very interesting: everything in his behaviour indicates that he has particularly well integrated the new social hierarchy based on external signs of wealth and power. Like many other compatriots, he also demonstrates a very high degree of flexibility in applying the rules of segregation to the local circumstances of social life. In other words, he adapts his framework for understanding the social position of the people he interacts with in a very short time.

In this regard, Citizen Trump is far from the idiot sometimes portrayed by the media. It would be much more prudent to consider him the ultimate avatar of the American produced by the current social environment.

As we described in our **Study in Social Reverse-Engineering**, his attention span is limited to 2 items of consideration. Once these characteristics are integrated into the analysis of his behaviour, everything becomes clear and his alleged lack of reliability is only the result of a Eurocentric analysis that fails because its criteria cannot *ipso facto* be aligned with the criteria of US society.

European decision-makers should above all understand that the Citizen Trump has categorised his partners according to their possession of the atomic weapon. He then sorts his partners according to the number of nuclear warheads. This explains what the European media take to be a submission to Moscow, when in fact it is a logical decision once the right criterion is applied.

This explanation also applies when it comes to understanding the attitude of Citizen Trump towards the Chinese, the Israelis or the French...

This framework also explains the attitudes of citizens Vance (vice-president) and Rubio (secretary of state) towards Europe and NATO. These two citizens are fully aligned with their president but they enjoy playing Good Cop / Bad Cop with European leaders and it seems that they are doing a good job!

European leaders, especially in the German-Scandinavian countries, would do well to understand that the absence of nuclear weapons makes them totally uninteresting and trivial in the eyes of Citizen Trump and his administration; no matter what the behaviour claimed by the leaders of his administration, only real behaviour counts.

The United States and Anti-Intellectualism

In his Newsweek pamphlet of mid-January 1980 '*A Cult of Ignorance*' which was the belated response to his 1956 apology '*Education, A By-Product of Science Fiction*' published in Chemical & Engineering News (C&EN), science fiction writer and biochemistry professor Dr Isaac Asimov violently attacked American anti-intellectualism illustrated by the well-known aphorism '*My ignorance is worth as much as your education!*'

He attributed it to the pioneer era, assuming that these people lived in such harsh conditions that elitist leisure activities such as reading were out of the question.

As has already been amply explained, US society is multipolar and very segregationist. Each individual exists only in relation to his or her reference social group for which he or she has social codes and has no consideration for others, for whom he or she does not even bother to take an interest in their possible social codes. Literally, in the eyes of any individual, individuals from other social groups are as important as a stone or a dead leaf.

Isaac Asimov was born in the USSR in 1920 and emigrated to the United States in 1923, so he grew up in a family of monolithic culture. In such a culture, everyone is related to and/or competing with everyone else.

It is impossible for societal anti-intellectualism to take root in such an environment, because everyone can see firsthand how the most intelligent individuals overcome the vicissitudes of life better than others because of their various talents. And since everyone is competing with everyone else, it goes without saying that intellectual competition will be valued. Isaac Asimov, a worthy son of this environment, always sought to shine at the top of the intellectual heap, and he was quite successful.

Unlike a member of a monolithic culture in contact with all other members of his culture, the individual member of a multipolar culture is in contact only with members of his group. Because the group is small, intellectual competition is limited because no one wants to risk being ostracised for ridiculing any other member of the group through the use of his intelligence.

The small size of the group therefore has the effect that not only is intellectual competition not encouraged, but it is even implicitly rejected in the name of group cohesion.

Dear old Isaac Asimov was wrong, anti-intellectualism is not an individual inclination but a particularly effective group strategy, but given his academic and literary career, we can forgive him his error in judgement.

The worldview of Citizen Trump and his administration

As explained above, Citizen Trump ranks his political relations according to their possession of atomic weapons, subsidiarily according to the number of their nuclear warheads. Countries that are devoid of these are therefore worthless in his eyes.

This is particularly evident in his relations with Ukraine, which has been resisting an unprovoked attack for the past four years. But this does not prevent the US president from demanding that Ukraine cede part of its

territory because its aggressor, a nuclear power, is in an incomparably stronger position in the mind of Citizen Trump.

Another example is the attitude of Citizen Trump towards his northern neighbour: Canada. In his relations with China, another nuclear power, Citizen Trump seeks to take the upper hand to benefit his country, which is a noble intention.

To do this, it needs to restrict the economic outlets of the Chinese as much as possible, both to weaken them and to open up new markets or strengthen existing shares.

This is how Citizen Trump ordered the Prime Minister of Canada on how to behave towards Beijing under threat of sanctions, even though Canada is a sovereign country.

There is no inconsistency in the attitude of Citizen Trump towards Canada as long as the situation is viewed through the right lens:

- In the eyes of the Citizen Trump, China is his privileged partner because China is a nuclear power.
- Canada is only a secondary object, a tool in his fight against the commercial power of China. A carpenter never asks the opinion of his hammer before using it, and Citizen Trump has no intention of inquiring about the Canadian aspirations in this regard.

This reification of certain partners based on immediate national interests is by no means a speciality of the current administration or even the US; the submarine crisis between France and the AUKUS alliance countries clearly demonstrates that multipolar cultures are focused on their own interests without any long-term consideration for the overall stability of the relationships in question.

As explained in our previous **Study in Social Reverse-Engineering**, the inability (or low ability) of Anglo-Saxon cultures to plan the future in many stages leads them to make decisions that may be useful in the short term but prove detrimental in the long term.

This behaviour is by no means exclusive to current administrations; it has always been the case, but as long as the framework of reference was centred on the sharing of Western democratic values, this behaviour could not be highlighted.

In other words, the more it has changed, the more it has remained the same!

The countries of continental Europe would do well to always keep this reality in mind when engaging in any kind of relationship with one of these Anglo-Saxon countries.

As for Citizen Trump, he is far from being as bizarre as some would have us believe. In fact, when we select the correct frame of reference, Citizen Trump is the pure product of his culture, the archetype of the normal American, that is, someone who is in every respect in conformity with what is expected according to the real, explicit and implicit codes of his cultural environment.

Citizen Trump, according to the rules of his own cultural group, is not a UFO but an extraordinarily normal individual. This explains why he manages to be so in tune with the expectations of his group and why his influence is so powerful on US society. He has so intimately integrated all the social injunctions of his society that he is permanently in fine tune with his people.

After a thousand years of constant training, there are good reasons to believe that the Anglo-Saxon cultural world has fully integrated the behavioural codes of a multipolar society.

This warning is all the more important because it only appears when the objectives of the partners concerned diverge. And when objectives diverge, the only certainty is that partners of Anglo-Saxon culture will not hesitate to trample all over the common heritage if they believe that their short-term interests justify it. The Europeans of continental culture have all the more difficulty in perceiving and understanding this attitude because when interests converge, partners of Anglo-Saxon culture prove to be absolutely reliable!

There is no schizophrenia here, there is only the observation that their group culture pushes them to these extreme attitudes without any 'middle ground'.

Rotten apples in the bosom

There are two clichés that explain well the difference in the functioning of monolithic and multipolar societies. The first cliché is that of the 'rotten apple' which is often used by the Americans to designate a person who has crossed the socially accepted limits.

Its French equivalent is that of the 'bosom of the Republic.' This symbol designates a place of refuge and security, describing a place where one feels protected and cherished.

When citizen Trump was confronted with law enforcement agents who had committed serious violations of their duties, he treated them as 'rotten apples that had to be thrown away to avoid the loss of the rest of the basket.'

This metaphor is very significant: it clearly demonstrates the fragmented functioning of a multipolar society. Each social group is defined by a behavioural niche that corresponds to the expectations and needs of society with regard to it. The element that contravenes the rules is declared unfit and is thrown out of its box without another social box being explicitly assigned to receive it. The element in question literally becomes a non-element that loses all social status and visibility. It no longer exists and no longer requires any attention. Such a vision is essentially excluding.

When any French president is faced with a similar situation – whatever the law enforcement forces of any country may be, there will always be one or other black sheep to cause fear following any misdemeanour -- he will get involved in the case and reassure the population by affirming that:

– Such behaviour is neither tolerable nor tolerated.

– That the guilty persons will be punished and THAT EVERYTHING WILL BE DONE TO BRING THEM BACK INTO THE REPUBLICAN BODY.

This immutable formula 'Republican bosom' shows that a monolithic society considers that no element can ever be lost, that any straying element must be recovered and reintegrated through a more or less long period of re-education in republican values.

These two clichés are not just figures of speech, they are true mirrors of the intellectual processes of each cultural community.

The cliché of the 'nurturing bosom' is certainly very French, but it exists in one form or another in all the cultures of continental Europe.

The cliché of the 'rotten apple' is more than a simple metaphor; it describes better than a long speech how the Anglo-Saxon communities have a fragmented view of their social life. These segregations are part of their DNA and no matter what veneer they may use to cover their words, their soul will always be planning the cut that will sever the established ties. It would be particularly inappropriate to pass any kind of value judgment on this behaviour, it is simply a defensive strategy. From the tenderest age, members of such a community spend their life creating ties and seeing them broken as life circumstances dictate. Planning the break as soon as a new relationship is established is a very intelligent tactic for preventing any overly violent emotional shock when the relationship comes to an end. 'We don't get attached so that we don't suffer when we move apart.'

One last emblematic example of the difference between monolithic and multipolar communities is provided by a question of etiquette that regularly comes up in forums dealing with worldviews and tourism: how to say '*Bon appétit!*' in English?

As strange as it may seem to the eyes of a monolithic continental European, this simple manifestation of (what we consider to be) elementary politeness has the power to send Anglo-Saxons into a maelstrom of tormented reflections.

Often, the answer is direct: 'You don't wish your table neighbours a good appetite.'

- Because 'it's not done.'
- Because it seems strange to wish '*Bon appétit!*' to a table of people who may be strangers to us.
- Because an 'Enjoy your dinner!' sounds too commercial.
- There is indeed an 'Amen' to close the pre-meal prayer, but it seems to be limited to very religious people and, in any case, it would be addressed more to God than to the diners...
- But in general, nothing is said because it gives the impression of being vulgar, according to an American author on a specialised forum on language issues.

In any case, we see here in a way that is both trivial and glaring the notions of the 'unique community' of monolithic cultures that address a wish encompassing all the people present, known or not to the one who makes the wish of good appetite and the notion of 'I have account to render only to members of my community!' of multipole communities.

These warnings were not written to stop all interaction between monoliths and multipoles, they are simply meant to alert and prevent the naivety of believing in promises that last as long as roses.

Now you've been warned.

Part Two: The London and Glasgow Attacks

Multicultural vs. monolithic culture

Now let's examine the influence of the compartmentalisation of English society on the London attacks.

- In 2005, the London terrorists were, in the eyes of the English community, young misguided fanatics whose naivety had been abused by a few individuals with criminal instincts who had indoctrinated them in a deadly religious philosophy.
- In doing so, the British nation never carried out its own examination of conscience, they have never asked themselves whether they had any responsibility, even indirect, in this problem.
- They had, in their opinion, shown themselves to be sympathetic by welcoming all these people to England. They had given them a roof over their heads, a job; they had allowed them to practise their religion, their traditions, their customs without seeking to hinder them in any way.
- From their point of view, the English people were right: they never interfered in the affairs of these foreigners, letting them agglomerate together in neighbourhoods that, by force of circumstance, gradually turned into ghettos.

From a purely legalistic point of view, the English nation did not create ghettos as was the case in South Africa. But if they did not create them, they allowed them to be created by not integrating foreigners among them.

From a pragmatic point of view, it is equivalent: whether they voluntarily created the ghettos or allowed them to develop out of indifference to these immigrants, their responsibility is undeniable.

The historical reasons mentioned above show that the English people were 'trained' to accept foreigners among them without ever integrating them, since the notion of integration, distinctive of a monolithic culture, is foreign to their multipolar culture.

Strictly speaking, the more monolithic a culture is, the more integrative it is, because everything that is '*outside*' is perceived as '*abnormal*' and therefore needs to be '*brought inside*' to end this disruptive abnormality.

In a multipolar culture, on the other hand, a new element does not need to be integrated into its own group; it is intellectually much easier and more 'economical' (in the sense that it does not cost any energy) to create a new category in which all elements outside one's own group are 'stored'.

The world is thus reduced to a group – his own – within which one has rights and duties and for which one has social codes to express one's rights, duties and needs; and a multitude of other groups for which one has no sort of obligation since, by definition, one is not a member of them and therefore does not need to master their social codes.

When the Pakistanis, Jamaicans, Indians (from India), Sri Lankans and all the other migrants from the Commonwealth settled in England, the English people let them settle without any restrictions. For nearly a thousand years, history had 'taught' them to make room for newcomers while not seeking to mix with them. There was a social juxtaposition, like adding oil to water. There was never a mixture like pouring milk into tea. From the point of view of these foreigners from monolithic cultures, they have constantly encountered glass walls. As they were given a place, they could not complain about any apartheid. But as they were not integrated, they always considered themselves to be 'guests' who could stay as long as they did not cause any trouble.

It is important to note that both of these viewpoints are valid even if they are incompatible with each other.

- The English people acted 'as usual' by making room for the newcomers but not integrating them, because these foreigners were just another pole in a multipolar society.
- The newcomers, coming from monolithic cultures where integration and fusion into the social melting pot were very important, wanted to live 'as usual' in a unipolar society. They felt rejected by the distance of the English and felt a strong resentment towards them. But as they were '*not at home*,' they kept quiet...

The 2005 attacks

In 2005, some of these foreigners, recruited by an Islamist organisation, let their anger at a culture they did not understand boil over, because no one had taken the trouble to explain to them how English civilisation had been formed, because no one had explained to them that English culture was made up of placid juxtaposition and not immersive integration.

But as the English society was able to explain these attacks by the morbid influence of a vengeful Islam on 'a *few stray sheep too young and too uneducated*' to understand the situation, the English society did not question its cultural pattern based on a supposed tolerance towards immigrants.

In fact, this 'tolerance' that the English community claim is simply polite indifference...

It's not 'I let you do what you want because I respect your customs.'

It's more like 'I don't give a damn about you, you're not in my social group, so you can do whatever you want, I don't care.'

In our (continental) eyes, that's much closer to contempt than to open-mindedness!

This explanation, which absolves English society of any responsibility for these attacks by means of this 'spirit of infinite tolerance' (which is a myth at least as important for the English people as the melting pot is for the Americans ones), has meant that life has continued without any change or break with the past.

The 2007 attacks

The same causes produce the same effects, and the attacks of 2005 were 'naturally,' logically, followed by those of June 2007...

But, how shocking!!

The English people discover that this time, it starts again with 'well-educated' people, who are, what's more, doctors! The incomprehension is matched by horror!

Men and women who are supposedly respected, who are supposed to care for the sick and restore their health, are found to be responsible for organising a massacre that could have cost the lives of very many people!

In fact, a little bit of basic psychology allows us to guess the origin of the problem and the 'responsibility' of English society in its occurrence!

It is easy to imagine that these doctors, who come from countries outside Europe, have all completed long courses of study to obtain their qualifications and that they are regarded almost as gods in their countries of origin because, since the standard of living in those countries is not as high as ours, doctors are often called in at critical moments in the lives of the people who seek their help.

As a consequence, these doctors are deeply respected because they have, so to speak, life and death responsibility for their patients!

- If we know that they were recruited with insistence because the shortage of doctors in Great Britain is significant.
- If we also know that the reputation of England means that their stay is often fantasised about by both immigrants and their families who remain in the country, seeing in this trip the recognition of their very high social status.
- One can easily imagine the phenomenal implicit expectations that these people place in their stay in England!!

Therefore, the brutal confrontation between their very high expectations, their fantasies of personal and social glory and the reality of English society, which seemed to offer them little more than a footstool instead of the expected podium, could only lead to a phenomenal misunderstanding and an equally enormous resentment!

Dr Mohammed Asha

This was particularly clear from the testimonies collected by the *NY Times* in England describing the 'metamorphosis' of Dr Asha, the de facto leader of this group of terrorists, ref. '*A Surgeon's Trajectory Takes an Unlikely Swerve*,' NYT 03.07.2007.

On his arrival, Dr Asha had given the impression of a condescending young man, very proud of his title of Doctor of Surgery and eager to show the English patients the extent of his talent. He presented himself as a well-educated, courteous, brilliant and very European man in his manners. But also a man who was isolated, distant and speaking little.

In Jordan, he left the image of a very intelligent but rigid young man, a go-getter profile focused on competition and determined to become the best, with little interest in leisure activities.

In a few months, his reputation became that of a young man who was bitter and agitated by the lack of respect of English society for himself and for all Arabs and Muslims living in England. Obviously, he could not stand the segregation he was subjected to.

His neighbours and friends described him as a man '*who felt very concerned about the racism shown against his community [and that] this racism weighed heavily on him,*' but they also said that they had often told him that '*this issue was not a problem in the community.*'

One can react in two ways to the assertion that this social segregation was not a problem.

One can take the statement at face value and believe that these immigrants were satisfied with their lot. It's plausible but a bit superficial...

One can also listen between the words and notice that it rather resembles an implicit request not to turn and twist the knife in the wound!

And past events indicate that this last observation fits well with the facts.

People arriving in England from monolithic cultures have had to endure this polite indifference, which has hurt them because it has left them unaware of the status that English society accords them; which they have been entitled to interpret as rejection, a denial of their human value.

Unfortunately, the *NY Times* fails to report a very important sociological fact: it does not mention the social status of the people interviewed. If these people are in subordinate positions, they are more likely to say they are satisfied with the indifference of their environment than a proud doctor who is more concerned with his own integration and who will demand more social recognition than, for example, a McDonald's cook.

In the face of these facts, the actions of these terrorist doctors are easy to understand, since they are people who have not obtained the social status they felt they were entitled to, given their skills.

Cut off from their roots, they were unable and unwilling to channel their frustration in a non-violent way, but instead developed an increasing fixation on the subject. When the point of no return was passed, terrorist acts 'naturally' followed.

Of course, all this does not excuse these criminal acts.

++++

Part Three: The responses to the attacks

The English response to terrorist acts (Editor's note: Situation in 2007)

Let's now examine the responses of the English officials to this situation:

- Gordon Brown, the new Prime Minister, has asked that the media and officials no longer link 'Islam' and 'terrorism' in their speeches.
- He welcomed the leaders of Islamic communities for working sessions.

Of course, these seem to be common-sense solutions, albeit somewhat hypocritical in the case of the request on the possible link between Islam and terrorism.

However, if we examine the situation from a systemic perspective (considering that English society is a highly interdependent system), we can only conclude one thing: these decisions are clearly inappropriate!

These decisions are terrifyingly stupid because the London terrorism is not linked to Islam. Religion is a pretext in this case; it is a simple way of crystallising a revolt but it is not the reason for the revolt, it is the most visible common denominator between the individuals involved but if the terrorists have acted in the name of Islam, Islam is not the source of the problem.

In this case, any solution that acts only on the 'Islam' criterion is bad because it does not address the problem, which can therefore resurface at any time.

Origin of the crisis

The crisis originates in the confrontation between two incompatible cultures, a monolithic culture that considers everyone as members of the same whole and a multipolar culture that divides individuals into separate groups with low permeability (it is difficult to move from one group to another and only according to an implicit protocol that testifies to the rupture with the old group) within which the way of recognising the belonging and the social rank of an individual differs greatly.

This issue of respecting the social rank of individuals in the presence of others is of paramount importance in all cultures. It determines socialisation and acceptance in a given group:

- In a monolithic culture (it doesn't matter which one, whether we take the culture of immigrants of Pakistani, Jordanian or other origin, the analysis is the same) respect for social rank is due by each person to each other. The beggar will respect the prominent and the prominent will respect the beggar.

Of course, the respect of one for the other will not manifest itself in the same way but each will convey to the other an implicit social message that corresponds to 'I recognise you as a member of the same society [cultural community] as myself and I treat you according to the social norms in force in our society, in accordance with our respective ranks.'

- In the multipolar culture, the behaviour is completely different: within a given group, it is in all respects similar to that of the monolithic culture.

But between members of different groups, it is reduced to total indifference, the rules of each group requiring that the member of a group seek his signs of social recognition within his own group.

Between members of different groups, by definition, there is nothing because if there was something, it would mean that they implicitly recognised that they were part of a group or a supergroup that could define them in relation to each other.

Review of a social communication

Now let's observe with precision the clash of these two mentalities in the case of a meeting in the corridor when two people cross paths without speaking to each other.

When a Jordanian such as Dr Asha crosses paths with an Englishman, the Jordanian will send social signals, such as a glance in the direction of the person they have crossed paths with or a nod, to indicate that they are aware of the Englishman's presence.

He responds to this presence according to the social norms of his monolithic group. He responds to the stimulus by the emission of an act of social recognition appropriate to the situation.

The Englishman, for his part, will also have perceived the presence of the Jordanian, but since the latter is not part of his social group, the Englishman will bypass any reaction: the Jordanian is not part of his group, he does not react because his social norms dictate that he must only emit a social signal in the presence of a member of his own social group.

- Social communication has the particularity that any transmission necessarily calls for a response attesting to the correct progress of the interaction.
The absence of a response to a given broadcast is perceived as an abnormal phenomenon that strongly destabilises the broadcaster.
- The social transaction is initiated at the moment when the two people can no longer ignore each other's presence.
- The Jordanian perceived the Englishman and correctly responded to this presence by sending the corresponding social signal, a correct reaction according to his social norms. He expects in return a response attesting that the 'mutual social recognition transaction' has proceeded properly.
- The Englishman perceived the Jordanian but did not react to this presence. In accordance with the norms of his social group, he blocked any emission of social signals. His reaction is correct according to his norms.
- The transaction is complete.

- The Jordanian has issued a social message and is waiting for a response that is not coming. For him, the situation is frustrating because *'it's not happening the way it should.'* The situation is not correct according to his cultural and social upbringing.
- The Englishman, on the other hand, feels no frustration. He has acted in complete accordance with his cultural and social upbringing.
- Multiply this frustrating situation by the number of people a Jordanian doctor is likely to meet throughout his professional day and you will come to the conclusion that this surgeon will return home in the evening with an impressive stock of frustration!
- Multiply this frustration by all 365 days in a year and you realise that – since this doctor attaches great importance to his social integration – the frustration will be exacerbated by the psychological fixation he feels.
And the conclusion is that a bomb can indeed be part of the plausible manifestations of this accumulation of frustration...

The misguided involvement of religion as a determining factor

Mix this frustrating situation with the fact that the Jordanian is Muslim while the Englishman is Christian and the reaction to condemn Islam is also plausible but, alas, wrong because the problem is a matter of how to show mutual respect, which has no religious basis.

This way of perceiving the situation in terms of mutual respect has the advantage of simply explaining why a doctor who is very proud of himself and whose job is to care for people comes to [try to] kill people: 'Since the English people refuse to consider him one of their own by not responding to his social signals, he will do as they do, he will stop considering them as members of his socio-cultural group'.

After this step, the next step of eliminating them with a bomb is taken without any problem according to the following sophism:

- He is human and he treats humans.
- The English people do not consider him a member of their group, he does not consider them as members of his group formed of all the humans who respond to his social messages --> the English are not human.
- If they are not human, he can eliminate them without conflict of conscience, with all the less moral conflict that he can affirm *'...that it is their fault, that they started it by not respecting his social code, by not responding to his social signals.'*

The reaction of the English political world

A monolithic culture like that of the Jordanians requires that everyone be treated the same as everyone else. Therefore, G. Brown's decision to surround himself only with Muslim leaders is an absolute nonsense since it implicitly means that *'Muslims are not like everyone else and need special treatment.'*

In fact, by acting in this way, G. Brown is sending a signal that further reinforces the problem!!

The only good solution would have been to call on leaders from ALL of British society so that the implicit message would be *'We are all in THE SAME boat, the solution will come from each of us,'* which is an open

response to the monolithic culture of immigrants, whereas the call to Muslim leaders only serves to reinforce their feeling of exclusion, which is the source of the frustration that has led some to take the path of terrorism...

Indeed, since the problem is the monolithic nature of the immigrants' culture, the only 'good' answer is to tell them *'You are one of us, you are a member of our society; you and we are members of the same community!'*

Because what immigrants want deep down is to be treated like everyone else!

The problem is that *'like the others'* means *'We are all members of the same community and we respond to all social signals'* according to their culture, whereas in the English culture, the same *'like the others'* means *'We are not necessarily members of the same community and therefore, we only respond to signals from members of our group.'*

The Origin of Gordon Brown's Error

Further analysis of the situation shows that Prime Minister Brown gave a very poor response to the terrorist acts of June 2007. The interesting question is *'Why?'*

The answer is that G. Brown, as a member of a subgroup of the British multipolar culture, responded according to the norms of his subgroup.

His *'deciphered'* attitude according to a multipolar standard is equivalent to reassuring all the *'victim'* subgroups by pointing the finger at the *'responsible'* subgroup. This is implicitly equivalent to ordering this subgroup to bear alone the consequences of the deviant behaviour of a few members of this subgroup.

It is a manoeuvre of isolation, a social quarantine that transforms an entire social group into a scapegoat that must atone for the fault of some of its members.

And since it is precisely this social quarantine that was the trigger for the June 2007 explosions, it is equally easy to see that G. Brown's solution is not a solution. And what is worse is that this solution not only did not solve the problem, but actually made it worse.

An essential principle of systems is to always work according to the standards of the most restrictive element. In this case, it is the monolithic subgroup that is the most restrictive element because it imposes respect among all members of society, regardless of any possible membership in a subgroup, since this type of society does not know the concept of an exclusive subgroup.

From this perspective, G. Brown was obligated to think his response in terms of monolithic groups.

He has been elected to represent and govern the destiny of the whole population of the United Kingdom, he must act according to the standards of the most restrictive element of this population for the simple reason of *'Who can do the most, can do the least,'* that is to say that if the solution satisfies the members of the most socio-sensitive sub-group, it will also satisfy the members of the less sensitive sub-groups to social relations, the opposite not being true.

What if new attacks were to be committed?

If another attack were to occur, the situation would become very difficult to manage because the political power would very likely lose the trust of the English people and consequently, their collaboration in correcting the problem.

As for the Islamists, if they were able to organise a third cycle of attacks on English soil (even if luck prevented the second cycle from succeeding), this would give them *'legitimacy'* as a representative actor of the Muslim community.

For sure a very large majority of Muslims reject these barbaric acts, but the next cycle of Islamist violence could give them the illusion that this approach is the only one that gives them some media visibility and, by extension, some social respectability, in other words, *'they would feel they exist.'*

The fact that this Muslim community is seeking its place in English society means that it is in search of strong media visibility, as this is the only way to answer their questions about their social integration.

They ask to be recognised and this recognition could be based on the useful work that this community does: it would be a positive recognition.

But for the moment, English society does not offer them this recognition, at least not in terms that are understandable to the members of these communities.

This social recognition can also very well be based on terror and ostracism. This would certainly be recognition for very bad reasons, but Muslims are currently faced with the dilemma of choosing between *'no recognition'*

(which is a source of anguish because of the lack of answers to their existential questions) or '*negative recognition*'.

This demonstrates another important principle of systemic thinking, which is that the value of the communication as defined by the sender is irrelevant, what matters is how the receiver perceives that communication.

In the case of Gordon Brown's response to the attacks, what he thinks of his response to the attacks is irrelevant, what matters is how that response is perceived by Muslim immigrants.

Paradoxically, this situation, which should normally offer no satisfaction since it is based on a devaluing perception, offers the group in question the advantage of allowing them to recognise themselves and be recognised by others under the same definition.

The same applies to the English Muslim community: in the absence of positive recognition, there is a great risk that it will be content with negative recognition, to the detriment of all, Muslims and others...

This situation may seem absurd, yet it is common to see people preferring to stand out from others by adopting obviously self-destructive behaviours. We see here the same situation, except that it is no longer one person who is acting in a self-destructive manner, but a group of people or a subset of a group of people.

This situation shows how deeply ingrained the need for social recognition is in the psyche. It is so important that an individual would prefer to be recognised for negative reasons rather than suffer the anguish of not being recognised.

Following the controversy over the inhumane treatment of prisoners in Guantanamo, a group of former military personnel who guarded and debriefed Nazi prisoners of war suspected of possessing strategic information have chosen to come out of the shadows to testify about the methods they used on prisoners as important as Rudolf Hess, the Führer's deputy.

One of them said that it was by playing chess with R. Hess that he obtained the most important information. Despite the fact that both guards and prisoners knew perfectly well what crimes the prisoners had committed in the name of the Nazi doctrine, crimes that normally entail a strongly negative social stigma, the fact that the guards treated the prisoners humanely restored to the prisoners a socially acceptable image of themselves. As a result, they were eager to respond to this positive social recognition with other positive social behaviours, such as collaborating with what are aptly called 'enemies'...

This testimony alone proves how important positive social recognition is in preventing violence and improving safety.

Fort Hunt's Quiet Men Break Silence on WWII

Interrogators Fought 'Battle of Wits'

By Petula Dvorak

Washington Post Staff Writer

Saturday, October 6, 2007

The hybrid solution

A correct response to this problem must therefore take into account both the a priori incompatible interests of monolithic communities and those of multipolar communities.

This hybrid solution consists of making each member of each community aware that the members of each other community act differently according to their customs and their historical and socio-cultural background. And for that, it should be enough to clearly highlight the differences between communities so that everyone can understand and explain the behaviour of the others.

Basically, everyone desires one thing above all else: to be treated '*normally*' because receiving '*standard treatment*' means culturally speaking '*being a full member of the X or Y community*' and that is the deepest desire of every individual.

In this case, the solution is for members of monolithic cultures to know that the '*standard treatment*' they will receive from members of multipolar cultures is a more or less polite indifference. Whether they like this treatment or not is a matter of individual perception. What is important is to know that this indifference is, whatever the person concerned may think, a sign of normality like any other.

Members of multipolar cultures will understand that their lack of response can sometimes be interpreted as a denial of the humanity of others and that this perception can generate conflict.

In such a case, the members of this type of community do not necessarily have to change their behaviour, but they must be aware that in the event of a conflict with a member of a monolithic culture, they must explain their attitude more carefully than they would to a member of a multipolar culture.

No one abandons or questions their cultural achievements. On the contrary, each person increases their perception of their own culture in the light of another culture. In the long run, this can lead each culture to incorporate a little of the other culture.

As monolithics become more tolerant of indifference, multipole individuals become more aware of the existence of other individuals.

This solution presents a risk of rejection by the nationalist fraction of the population on the grounds that they are at home and do not have to adapt to others.

This reaction is stupid because the choice is not between the presence or absence of foreign elements within the population (these elements are already present, this reality is undeniable, it cannot be rejected) but between choosing a solution that satisfies the greatest number of people while minimising the inconvenience suffered by each individual and a solution that is economical for a certain number of people because it does not require them to make any effort to adapt, but which generates repercussions in a more or less large part of the other groups that can degenerate suddenly and very unpleasantly for everyone.

Implementation of the solution

In short, if G. Brown wants to do something useful, he must call representatives of all the communities that represent English society and ask them to live better together, explaining to them that cultural differences are sometimes difficult to understand, but that their historical roots mean that everyone must respect the culture of the other while making a minimum of effort to reduce friction. The solution cannot be at the level of cultural groups, because asking a group to adapt to another is tantamount to denying its value, which is why the solution can only exist in affirming the intrinsic value of each group and the obligation for each member of a culture to respect the culture of the other individuals of other cultures.

The solution can only be implemented at the level of individuals who must demonstrate understanding and flexibility in their interactions with others.

In practice, the ideal solution is for G. Brown to convene 200 to 400 people representing all socio-cultural groups.

A smaller number carries the risk of some people not feeling connected to the cultural reconciliation event because they do not identify with any of the chosen personalities.

A larger number will have the opposite effect in the sense that it will be the guests at the event who will feel lost in the crowd and who will not get involved in finding the best solution.

Having Her Majesty the Queen of England (situation in 2007, now it would be the King who would be involved) deliver the opening speech of this event and then receive the homage of each participant would be an excellent way to link each individual to the others by proving their belonging to the social corpus of the United Kingdom.

This will allow for social catharsis after the terrorist event, which will significantly reduce the risk of recurrence, either by exhausting the potential terrorist pool or by encouraging the environment to report potential troublemakers.

Situation in Switzerland

Switzerland is a monolithic society that is breaking up into a multipolar society. Problems similar to those in England could therefore occur in Switzerland, but at present in a very attenuated form. It would be useful to analyse the future changes in the Swiss social context to be able to prevent any dangerous developments.

++++

ADDENDUM: Review of the situation in 2015

Situation in the United Kingdom

The United Kingdom has experienced several individual terrorist episodes since 2007. Some have been committed in the name of support for Islam, others in the name of revenge against Islamist attacks.

The United Kingdom has also seen several departures of people for jihad in Syria.

Situation in Switzerland

Switzerland has not experienced any terrorist acts, but several people have also attempted to travel to Syria in the name of jihad.

An anti-terrorism specialist speaks

In an interview published on 27 June 2015 by *Le Télégramme* (www.letelegramme.fr, a daily newspaper in the French Brittany region), French judge Trévidic, who was a member of the anti-terrorism unit for 15 years, said that, to his knowledge, nearly 90% of the people involved in acts of Islamic terrorism are not motivated by religion. He cited belligerent attitudes, a desire for adventure, a desire for revenge, a feeling of not having a place in society, or simply the fashion for jihad as reasons for people to leave for the jihad.

8 years after our text, we are receiving a nice confirmation of our assertions. Indeed, the description given by Judge Trévidic of the jihadist motives corresponds well to what we grouped under the generic term of accumulation of frustrations in our original text of 2007.

Analysis of our 2007 findings

In 2007, we announced that a new cycle of attacks could bring these terrorists a certain legitimacy to represent Muslim society.

But we did not see the Arab revolutions or the war in Syria coming, nor did we see the European jihadist tourism coming, whether it was continental or British (ISIS-girls).

In any case, we maintain our analysis and affirm that the lack of positive social recognition plays an important role in jihadist recruitment. As we wrote in 2007, those who do not find happiness in positive social recognition will find it in negative recognition, because the important point is that recognition must be different from zero. Then, the higher its absolute value, the more the social reward associated with it will be perceived as 'pleasurable'.

For example, a person can engage in volunteering in the style of the French personality Abbé Pierre and derive a social impact of +8 on a scale of 0 to 10 (Editor's note: in 2015, Abbé Pierre was still one of the most admired French personalities.)

Another person can follow in the footsteps of Jacques Mesrine (French public enemy No. 1 of the past millennium) and manage to achieve a notoriety of -8.

Certainly, one of these people is active in good, the other in evil, but in the end, the absolute values of their notoriety being identical, both leave a lasting impression with the same force.

It is even possible, given the unfortunate tendency of the media to give more prominence to bad news, that in absolute terms, -8 will gain more media visibility than +8, thus reinforcing the appeal of negative social recognition.

The case of young people leaving to 'go and do jihad' is a 'hands-on' confirmation of the validity of our hypotheses. The remedies we suggested in 2007 are still valid in 2015.

If there is a problem to be addressed, it is the fact that the decisions taken to prevent the repetition of such events are either non-existent or illogical when compared to the recommendations of systems theory.

++++

Part Four: Analysis of the Analysis

Systemic analysis vs. monadic causal analysis

Analyses that attribute the reason for the attacks to a confrontation between Islam and the West are all based on a monadic causal analysis of the events.

Causal monadic (from the Greek *monas*, unit) analysis extracts the element to be analysed from its environment and analyses the element to establish a list of its characteristics, much like one would establish the technical specifications of a military aircraft by detailing its dimensions, performance or armament.

The consequence of such an approach is that the analyst will a priori seek a fault (cause) in the analysed element that can explain the problem observed.

Analysing the element designated as potentially disturbed without removing it from its environment opens up a broader and more complex field of research:

- Is the problem really related to the element in question or is it a 'scapegoat'?
- Is the problem caused by another element mistakenly considered healthy but which is actually the disruptor causing the malfunctions?
- Does the problem arise between a pair of perfectly functional elements that are unable to communicate due to the absence of a common protocol?
- Is the problem caused by an external factor such as weather conditions characteristic of the location where the analysed system operates?

To illustrate the point, in the case of monadic causal analysis, one acts like a mechanic faced with a car whose driver claims it is broken. A priori, the breakdown can only be in the car, and the mechanic will not waste time assuming that the cause of the breakdown may come from an external source other than the vehicle. He will focus on the car and neglect the environment.

In the case of system analysis, one acts like a computer techie who is trying to find out why a printer that prints correctly most of the time does not print from time to time.

This is typically a case of a transient fault that exasperates the specialist who operates according to a causal approach because his hypothesis '*the problem is in the machine*' is as often false as the printer prints correctly.

The systemic approach in this case is clearly superior as it will guide the intervention by leading the analyst to broaden the scope of the search to include all the elements that may interact with the printer, including the hypothesis that the problem may result from non-conformant use by an inexperienced user (the famous PEBKAC/PICNIC¹ 'Problem exist between keyboard and chair/Problem in chair not in computer').

The main defect of the causal monadic approach is that one who is accustomed to this method is likely to prefer to indulge in intellectual contortions and tautologies in order to remain within the limits of his method, whereas a systems analyst will always start by analysing the situation from the widest possible framework and then narrow it down as his work progresses.

This flaw is very visible in the analyses that followed the attacks of June 2007, since the explanation usually given was a tautology 'We know they are evil because they behaved evil.'

On the other hand, a systems analyst will always be able to reframe to a smaller system that he can again consider as a set of relevant elements. By definition, he will never be limited by a methodological framework that is too narrow, since his method follows a top-down approach from the largest to the smallest.

Analysis of the analysis of the June 2007 attacks

When examining the monadic causal analyses that dealt with the London and Glasgow attacks, the factor that was quickly identified to explain these attacks was that of Islamic religion.

¹ At least famous within the community of computer engineers working or having worked in the user support sector.

This was all the more easy to highlight because it was the most visible difference between the terrorists and the indigenous residents of the United Kingdom. The analyses in question followed this bias, encouraged by the fact that the global news agenda had paved the way by linking these attacks to the crisis in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Moreover, the perpetrators of the attacks clearly claimed their Islamicity.

For our part, we have always felt a certain unease about these analyses, because we have seen that they are based on a tautology: 'They are terrorists! We know that because they have committed terrorist acts'

In our eyes as analysts, this statement had absolutely no value because it is self-referential (it finds its own justification in itself)

Therefore, we conducted a counter-analysis using the documents we found on the internet. Our main source was the *New York Times*, which devoted many articles to this topic.

We used the systems analysis that we use in our work.

The first step was to determine the area to be analysed, we chose to focus our analysis on the cultural environment of the people present because the information collected seemed to us to imply a problem of intercultural confrontation. The next step was to determine which cultural characteristic was responsible for the crisis.

As explained above, we have assumed a priori that both the English society and the Jordanian terrorists were 'normal,' i.e. not suffering from any physical, psychological or social pathology.

We then examined the interactions between English society and the Jordanians.

The article from July 3, '*A Surgeon's Trajectory Takes an Unlikely Swerve*,' provided us with crucial information: initially, the leader tried to integrate into Anglo-Saxon society, adopting the dress and behavioural codes of the native population.

In a second stage, he was extremely critical of the same Anglo-Saxon society, proving that his attempt at integration had failed; more specifically, that the expectations he had placed in this approach had not received any responses that could satisfy him (no information is given on how this attempt at integration was perceived by English society).

The third stage was the accumulation of resentment and frustration until the final crisis.

At no point did we need to use the religious criterion characteristic of monadic causal analyses; a cultural misunderstanding linked to mutual social (absence of) recognition appeared sufficient to explain the crisis.

Our analysis is validated by the fact that the people interviewed in the aforementioned article indirectly testified to this problem of disrespect.

Analysis Assumptions

When we analysed the current situation in England, we found that the assumptions underlying the causal analyses all tended to focus on the Islamic religion. Having found that several hundred million Muslims live in good harmony with the rest of the world, we could only conclude that Islam is not the root cause of the problem, there must be something else.

This other thing is explicitly described in some media reports: there is a cultural misunderstanding between the involved parties. Having established this, it is a matter of finding the origin of this misunderstanding.

The clues that might lead us to this misunderstanding must certainly lie in differences in behaviour between the involved parties.

Around Systemic Analysis

Gregory Bateson, one of the main promoters of the systemic analysis school of thought, said: 'It is not a question of knowing 'why **did something** happen ?' but of knowing 'what constraints **prevented anything from happening?**' '

In the causal explanation, called 'positive' (where, for example, a billiard ball 'B' moves because it is hit by a ball 'A' at such an angle and at such a speed), the trajectory or behaviour of ball 'B' is considered to be entirely predictable from the initial conditions.

In the systemic, so-called 'negative' explanation, the examination of the system's restrictions or constraints shows that it is not 'anything' that can occur but only an 'appropriate response' to these constraints that can occur, develop and reproduce itself.

From the systemic explanation, the principles of equifinality and multifinality are developed, which are very far from the 'deterministic' or perhaps more accurately 'causalist' precept of René Descartes of the direct linear relationship (proportionality of the effect to the cause and antecedence: the cause precedes the effect).

- Equifinality refers to the same final state that can be reached from different initial states, through different paths and with different means. In other words, identical effects can have different causes. It is a kind of convergent sequence.
- Multifinality states that similar causes can produce different effects in a kind of divergent sequence.

The behaviour of an ant becomes intelligible in the light of the topographical constraints of the route and the logistical constraints of the supply in a stochastic process linking the randomness of encounters and the need to bring food back to the anthill.

The behaviour of a suspected terrorist becomes understandable in the light of the education he has received, the social constraints he has experienced, his expectations of the situation he is in, the responses he has received from his environment and the way these responses have met or failed to meet the implicit and explicit expectations he had previously formulated.

Causal analysis seeks to isolate an element that explains the phenomenon. Once this element is found, it is possible to build a representation of the event by linking the elements through a cascade of causes and effects.

Systemic analysis seeks to understand how the elements interact to determine which behaviour is most likely to occur. It requires the analyst to examine each hypothesis and assign it a probability, the set of hypotheses with the highest probability will give an indication of what is most likely to occur.

Whereas causal analysis provides a certain answer (the billiard ball will follow a certain trajectory), systemic analysis can only provide a probability index by following a weighting approach derived from thermodynamics: the less energy that is required to produce an event, the more likely it is to occur. Conversely, the more energy that is required, the less likely the event is to occur.

The fact that the causal analysis responds with certainty can be considered as evidence of better control of the situation.

In our opinion, this is an illusion: assuming that the causalist very quickly finds a suitable hypothesis, he will focus on this single hypothesis and will press it like a lemon to extract the maximum amount of information.

By doing so, the more he extracts elements from his hypothesis, the closer he will get to the margins of error, and he risks contaminating his work with erroneous or invalid information.

Moreover, by focusing on this single hypothesis, he will neglect the rest of the field of analysis and run the risk of not discovering a more satisfactory but more difficult-to-observe hypothesis.

The systemist is protected against these pitfalls by the fact that the systemic method forces him to examine all the hypotheses to determine their degree of probability. He cannot rule out any hypothesis until he has estimated its plausibility.

He is thus obliged to cover the entire field of research, which highlights the major defect of systemic analysis, which is that it requires a significantly longer analysis time than causal analysis. However, the gain in quality more than compensates for this longer time cost.

In this, our analysis faithfully obeys the systemic rules since it does not seek to understand why the attacks took place, the causal link '*They attempted to commit attacks because they are Muslims*' being incapable of providing any explanation since there are several hundred million Muslims in the world who have never attempted to commit such acts.

On the other hand, our analysis shows that these attacks fit into a pattern of possible responses to the original constellation of expectations and experiences of the suspects.

Our analysis shows that such acts are part of plausible responses to the cultural crisis experienced by people immersed in a social environment whose codes they do not master.

If our analysis is correct, two conclusions come to mind:

- In Switzerland, the best way to prevent the emergence of this type of threat is to promote the integration of people who do not belong to the majority culture by means of methods that allow them to understand Swiss cultural codes, and by creating a framework that can prevent violent excesses.
- More generally, if nothing is done to address these issues in a pragmatic, logical and coherent manner, then the risk of recurrence is high...