

Comments on Garcia's Sept. 12, 2007, article in *Counterpunch*

Francisco González

Manuel Garcia has written a new piece for *Counterpunch*, titled "Forgetting 911" <http://www.counterpunch.org/garcia09122007.html> where he expounds on the rational advantages of forgetting and the irrational dangers of not forgetting.

He says that:

"Those who have moved beyond 9/11 see it as blowback from decades of inhuman US foreign policy. Those who cannot accept the realization that "the natives" successfully struck back will instead find comfort in the hypothesis that 9/11 was an engineered catastrophe, and the ultimate puppeteers were those who pull the strings of the US government. I consider the first school of thought to be of rationalists and realists, and the second school to be of irrationalists and fantasists."

That's a nice start for him, as it establishes in one effortless stroke that those who have "moved on" are rational by definition, and those who haven't are irrational, also by definition. From this point on, Mr. Garcia can substitute at will the words "rational" and "irrational" for their defined representatives. I will do the same.

He goes on to explain that the irrationals (as defined above) are driven by fear, while the rationals can march on more serenely, wisely assimilating the lesson of this "blowback" from "decades of inhuman US foreign policy."

We wonder if Mr. Garcia thinks the assimilation of this lesson by all the rationals has produced the expected rational results, which one might suppose would consist in softening our "inhuman foreign policy" -- or whether it has had rather the exact opposite effect, to judge by the murderous rampages in which the rationals have engaged since the events, all the while claiming that these rampages are *precisely* the rational reaction of having assimilated the lesson. Mr. Garcia offers no opinion on this paradox.

He goes on to dwell at some length on the noxious effects of "the psychology of fear" that so clearly emanates from the irrationals. He finds himself growing impatient with this condition because:

"the presence of a large population of fearful people creates opportunities for alert charismatic opportunists to profit, by resonating with the archetypes of the shared mass-mindedness and stroking it to spasms of 'comfort' [...]"

Once again, we may allow ourselves to wonder if Mr. Garcia has ever noticed that all this "psychology of fear" seems to be coming, with clockwork regularity, from the government and the main stream media, which happen to be the two entities where the *rational* position finds its most vehement defense. We also wonder if Mr. Garcia has noticed that the "psychology of fear" has been used by the rationals to dismantle the US

Constitution. We also wonder if Mr. Garcia has noticed that one key element in the position of the *irrationals* is precisely their denunciation of this "psychology of fear" that emanates from the rationals.

Mr. Garcia is beginning to sound a bit irrational. He then goes on to point out that he gets a lot of mail from "conspiracists," and that their most common "mantra" as he puts it, is their request for a new investigation. Then he says (pay attention, this is extremely rich):

"For the record, I am in favor of further investigation. Seymour Hersh did it in 1969 to uncover the My Lai massacre by US troops in Vietnam (based on the original heroic investigation by a soldier, the late Ron Ridenhour) and he had no clearance for classified information, nor any subpoena power. Yet, he produced results that awakened the American public and prompted government hearings ("investigation"). This "independent" and public investigation of My Lai was a result of Hersh's reporting, not a precursor to it. So, I encourage all conspiracists to investigate to their heart's content (in fact, why don't they?). I am sure this investigatory frenzy will thrash out like that of the Kennedy assassination, and in 40 years we'll finally know for sure: it was airplanes crashing into the buildings (1), insulation knocked off steel, fire, metal creep, and a massive oil-fed fire in WTC 7".

Again, we may wonder why he is so in favor of further investigation, while simultaneously he dedicates his time to ridiculing such attempts, and has just called the very request for an investigation a "mantra" of the irrationals.

We also may wonder if Mr. Garcia (who writes as if independent studies on 911 were yet to begin) is not aware that a very substantial amount of investigation has already been conducted and documented by many scientists and scholars on many different aspects of 911. A cursory examination of its contents points to the (irrational?) conclusion that many fundamental aspects of the official story do not make any sense. Their work is widely available for Mr. Garcia's edification, should he care to look. He can find it at such places as:

Scholars for 911 Truth and Justice: <http://stj911.org/>

Journal of 911 studies: <http://www.journalof911studies.com/>

911 Research: <http://911research.wtc7.net/>

Architects and Engineers for 911 truth: <http://www.ae911truth.org/>

and many others.

As for the investigation prompted by the reports of Seymour Hersh on the My Lai massacre, which he presents as the model independent investigation by the lone researcher, we may wonder, in the first place, if Hersh's drive to inquire into the matter would have deserved to be described by Mr. Garcia, at that time, as the "mantra" of an "irrational" before it led to some Congressional hearings. If we believe in the persistence of the self, and in the consistency of convictions, we have to assume that Mr. Garcia would have dealt with Hersh's efforts exactly that way. But now he is extolling them.

In the second place (and this is only an aside) Mr. Garcia may want to consult for example the work of Noam Chomsky, who has done extensive research on the Viet-Nam war, where he would learn that the My Lai massacre was in fact one of countless mass murder operations in that war, simply because they were a matter of official policy, not a matter of isolated madness by the dark recesses of the soul, as the media liked to sing it at the time: <http://www.zmag.org/Chomsky/year/year-c10-s11.html>

We may also wonder if Mr. Garcia is aware that the so called investigation prompted by Hersh's work was absorbed quite nicely as it sputtered out into a maudlin of endless media editorials wallowing in self-pity -- with stern orders, however, to look for explanations of such actions in "the complex light and dark of the individual human soul" (but no further, comments Chomsky), as the Washington Post put it. A few rotten apples soul-searching in the jungle. That's what it came to.

Then, shifting for good the terminology from "irrationals" to "conspiracists" (for the sake of lexical variety) Mr. Garcia asks:

"Why is it so imperative to the conspiracists to convert everybody else? No one prevents them from 'investigating,' no one prevents them from running engineering simulations of the Towers collapses to demonstrate their claims "scientifically" (commercial software is available to do this, and various universities, like Purdue, are touting their research software by applying it to the 9/11 events)."

We may wonder why it has always been so imperative for the rational Mr. Garcia to try to dissuade everybody from the dangers of conversion. Only a few days ago, when Robert Fisk expressed in The Independent some very timid doubts about the 911 official story, Garcia, alerted by a fan, rushed to the rescue with an article warning Fisk that he was about to enter a "black hole," and reassuring him that all the physics of the collapses had been worked out (presumably by Garcia's science fiction pieces in Counterpunch) and giving him the links to a few government propaganda sites of the crudest kind, where he could find all he needed to know.

The last section of his masterpiece has the following title:
"WTC7 Collapse, So What?" and reproduces a letter by a reader, who narrates how she saw a fire raging on one side of the building. Mr. Garcia needs no further proof than a letter from a reader to conclude that a fire on one side of a steel building can cause it to come down in perfect imitation of a perfectly symmetrical demolition at free fall speed. Happens all the time, apparently. Frivolous quibbles on the matter are left for the irrationals to investigate "to their hearts content." He also claims that the fires were fed by fuel tanks in the basements, apparently unaware that most of the fuel was recovered inside intact tanks, as described in the FEMA report. http://www.wtc7.net/articles/FEMA/WTC_ch5.htm

The science fiction pieces cobbled together by Mr. Garcia can be found at the Counterpunch website, titled: "The physics of 911". **He begins by dwelling on the idea that the official reports give all the information that may be needed to explain the**

collapses. On second thought, further down, he apparently feels this may not be quite so, so he offers his own hypothesis for the free-fall speed of the self-crushing structures, in terms of elastic waves and shock waves bouncing in self-sustaining resonance back and forth between the buildings and the ground, and producing the furious show we all have seen so many times. This marvel chanced itself upon Manhattan, not once, but twice the same morning. Mr. Garcia rests assured in the knowledge that no one will ever attempt to test his hypothesis empirically on a physical model. Putting aside the preposterous nature of this explanation, one useful piece of information transpires from it: Mr. Garcia is implicitly acknowledging that something very far removed from the ordinary, some portentous additional force, is absolutely required to produce what our eyes plainly see.

We could ask Mr. Garcia which of the following two tests might be easier to carry out:

1. Put together a team of structural engineers and demolition experts. Ask them to produce a successful complete collapse (as much in the "911-style" as possible) of a model of the towers, or a similar structure, using a projectile impact near the top, followed by hydrocarbon fires. Then they sit back and relax for an hour or so, and then the demolition experts detonate the pre-positioned explosives, and we watch what happens.

2. A test, same as above, except no team of demolition experts is necessary, because no explosives are allowed. After they throw in the projectile and ignite the fires, they sit back and wait for the "shock waves" to start kicking in furious resonance. The question now becomes: how long should they wait? Or: how many times should they repeat the experiment?

As a warm-up for the successful completion of test 2, Mr. Garcia may want to complete first the much simpler Progressive Collapse challenge as described here <http://911research.wtc7.net/wtc/analysis/challenge.html> where he is allowed to use any kind of material he likes for the structures.

Garcia ends with a lyrical note about the bewitching powers of the moon:

"The moon rises low over the night horizon this time of year, and probably calls out the zombies in greater numbers. Let them enjoy their dreams, their moaning and dancing releases their tension, and the tight coil of their consciousness will keep them captivated for the duration."

Finally, to put an end to this list of wonderings, we may wonder about the strangeness of the fact that a physicist who has spent most of his professional career working in nuclear weapons research for the US government, is writing for *Counterpunch* to blame the 911 collapses on "blowback" from "inhuman US foreign policy".