

## **ANOTHER OUTRAGE, ANOTHER VOID**

***Tassos Symeonides (PhD)***

**(RIEAS Academic Advisor)**

***As a rule, men worry more about what they can't see than about what they can***

***Gaius Julius Caesar***

**Copyright: Research Institute for European and American Studies ([www.rieas.gr](http://www.rieas.gr))**

**Publication date: 13 December 2015**

The Paris outrage has stunned the West. Disbelief is mixed with anger. Anger is justified. Disbelief is not.

Ever since 9/11, the West has waged a two-pronged war: one against Islamic terrorism, the other against itself.

Fighting the Islamist fanatics bent on death and destruction is far easier, it turns out, than competing with those *inside the gates*, who find any form of aggressive defense “a breach of human rights.”

In Britain, for example, this attitude has already taken the most official guise possible under the circumstances: the Home Secretary, Theresa May, [hastened to tell](#) the world that the Paris attacks “have nothing to do with Islam”—while the main opposition Labour leader, Jeremy Corbyn, [was “not happy”](#) with the thought of British police opening fire on terrorists during a terrorist attack.

According to Mr. Corbyn, shooting terrorists who are attacking innocents could “often be counterproductive.” (Mr. Corbyn is right, with the only minor difference that the ‘counter-productive’ part would apply upon those being on the receiving end of terrorist violence).

Not even France is exempted from this constipation about the truth. Within hours of the outrage, the French foreign minister, Laurent Fabius, [discovered](#) that climate change is a greater threat than terrorism.

By placing global warming ahead of all threats with 130 killed not yet in the morgue, and over 300, most of them critical, lying in hospital beds, Mr. Fabius, a former prime minister to boot, displayed a level of political sensitivity remarkable by its missing the point.

This attitude is not strictly European. Across the pond, US presidential candidates have been [called out](#) by *progressive* media for their reluctance (actually, refusal) to use the term “radical Islam” in public debates.

Even the FBI director announced that the report on what motivated a jihadi attack by a home grown Muslim assassin that cost the lives of four US Marines and a US Navy sailor in July 2015 [will not be released to the public](#).

The reason why the report will remain secret, the Director said, was that “We don't want to smear people.”

Smear who? We shall not ask. The Lord works in mysterious ways, although, in this case, anyone who cannot interpret the subtext of this FBI announcement is either asleep or beginning to doze off.

With the blood of the Paris victims not yet dry, the progressives are concerned not about the carnage but about the Paris massacre providing opportunities for “hate speech” and the mistreatment of minorities

What is “hate speech” exactly?

According to those who claim the sole prerogative of defending democracy and human rights, **anything that mentions the truth by its real name qualifies as “hate speech.”** Woe onto anyone who might *think* to associate Paris, and other such outrages in the past, to Islamic radicalism born and bred in Europe and now feeding the carnage in the Middle East.

This attitude is paralyzing European democracy or, rather, what is left of it amid conceptual confusion, the preoccupations of the politically correct generation, and the German-made austerity trap and a failing pan-European economy.

Emboldened by the conviction that large segments of Western society will never stop supporting conceptual confusion and confounding the truth, ISIS is now boldly [announcing](#) its next target is Washington DC.

As Prof. Daniel Pipes [observed](#) shortly after the Paris carnage, “[to] politicians, the police, the press, and the professors, the unrelenting [Islamic] violence has a contrary effect [to that influencing public opinion]. Those charged with interpreting the attacks live in a bubble of public denial (what they say privately is another matter) in which they feel compelled to pretend

that Islam has no role in the violence, in part out of concern that to recognize it would cause even more problems.”

Denial and obfuscation are time-tested methods politicians use to deflect the need for acting according to what is good for their countries instead of what is good for their careers.

In recent decades, the methods have worked wonders bringing inept, blinkered, untalented, and fundamentally uneducated individuals to positions of power. And so far, there is no end of this trend in sight.

The dead and the wounded pile up and become statistics and “tolerance,” “diversity,” and dismantling one’s home wins, hands down.