

# Dining Out With the Terrorists

On the days when my wife teaches late classes at the university, we usually go for supper at a nearby mall, which boasts a massive “dining hall” (once a “food court”) and which features a wide range of exotic menus to choose from. It is immensely popular, seating hundreds of diners at any one time, some in company, others peering into their smart phones, a few reading books, some attending to baby carriages, most clearly enjoying themselves under ample lighting in a mainly festive atmosphere.

Janice and I were there for a 7 o'clock post-class supper on Wednesday, December 2, tucking into our Bento Box and chatting about university politics and related issues, when for no apparent reason I was suddenly struck by a kind of vision, a troubling sense of premonition. I imagined a team of terrorists emerging from the corridor into the dining area, armed with AK-47s and spraying the crowd—they could take as many lives as they had bullets to take them with. What would I do? My first impulse was to shield my wife, but by then it might already be too late. The image does not bear describing. The security guards would have been utterly useless since they are unarmed, and, given our strict gun laws, no one among the diners would have carried a weapon. It was Bataclan revisited. I shook off the visitation and returned to a semblance of normality, but the meal had lost its savor.

Later that evening, after a two hour drive to our country home, I consulted my computer to catch up on the day's events and read about the mass shooting in San Bernardino. And I knew beyond the shadow of a doubt that the horror could just as easily have happened in that spacious, well-lighted dining hall, or in one like it, and that, thanks to our lax immigration procedures and the welcome we have extended to the

droves of “Syrian” refugees and other poorly screened migrants, one day it surely would. And I knew, too, that in the aftermath, we could expect the same evasions and platitudes from our newly elected prime minister, the feckless Justin Trudeau, that Americans were treated to by Obama, who [lied](#): “At this stage we do not yet know why this terrible event occurred...we don’t know why they did it, we do not know the extent of their plans, we do not know their motivations.”

One wonders how the jihadists get away with their atrocities and from where they derive their power. Of course, they enjoy material help from the constitutive practices and ideology of the very nations they are attacking: the scourge of multiculturalism, which has received them into the body social and the body politic, and the reigning pathology of political correctness that refuses to name the enemy and suppresses or [scumbles](#) their true identity. The terrorists also profit from the sympathy of left-wing parties and the complicity of the liberal elites who pride themselves on the destructive canard of “tolerance,” that is, tolerance of both the intolerant and the intolerable. Influential leaders of Western nations have clearly sided with the children of Islam. One need look no further than Barack Hussein Obama, the first pro-Muslim American president; Justin Trudeau, the first pro-Muslim Canadian prime minister; Angela Merkel, the first post-war pro-Muslim German chancellor; and political weaklings like France’s president François Hollande and Britain’s prime minister David Cameron, among many others.

But the terrorists’ strength emanates from even more powerful sources. What we have not appeared to understand is that their spirit and practice differ categorically from the methods, traditions and policies of the armies of the West, in two crucial ways.

First, they are not bound by the Geneva conventions, they do not wear uniforms, they do not regard civilians as non-combatants, they do not care for the wounded, they do not

respect the sanctity of rescue and medical corps, and, what should be immediately obvious, they do not take prisoners; they take hostages. Which is to say, they are out-and-out barbarians with no redeeming traits and their only connection with what we call civilization is deceptive and parasitical. As PJ Media columnist David Goldman writes in the [Asia Times](#), "The trouble is that very large numbers of Muslims are willing to kill themselves in order to harm enemy noncombatants, and the number appears to be increasing. To my knowledge that is something new under the sun. Japanese kamikazes and Nizari assassins in the Middle Ages, like the pre-1917 Bolsheviks, were willing to die to kill public officials or soldiers. But the murder of noncombatants through suicide attacks (or attacks likely to prove suicidal) is something we have never before witnessed."

Second, they are subjectively invincible. *They do not take casualties*. Their bodies are like weapons; when these are spent, they can be discarded. In other words, they do not die, but are immediately translated into *Jannah*, the Muslim heaven, where they will revel eternally in sparkling brooks, fruited orchards, and harems of doe-eyed virgins. In a sense, they are the zombies of the modern world, the armies of the living dead who, as they are fond of saying, love death more than we love life. They cannot be defeated, they can only be quarantined, kept at bay, left to rave and rampage in the killing grounds of their own countries.

I don't wish to join the [controversy](#) around Donald Trump's proposal to ban Muslim immigration or Ted Cruz's more modest plan to restrict it. But it's clear that we have an enormous problem on our hands. "[T]o deny we have a gigantic Muslim problem in this country and in the world," [writes](#) Roger Simon, "is to be a troglodyte of epic proportions. Something has to be done." Simon advocates the outlawing of Sharia law, which is a start. But since Sharia is a bedrock principle of the Islamic faith, proscribing the one looks equivalent to

prohibiting the other—a thorny contradiction, to say the least. Additionally, if a jihadist wants to kill Americans or Canadians, a public renunciation will have no braking effect on his intentions.

Simon and I agree that border security has become an unmitigated farce and that Muslim immigration should be rigorously monitored and scrupulously vetted. Indeed, it needs to be radically curtailed. Plainly, only a small percentage of the Muslim community living in the West are jihadists, but the zombies enter our countries under cover of a non-belligerent majority, whether as legal immigrants, as students, or as refugees. As former FBI counterterrorism agent John Guandolo [points out](#), since 9/11, “we collectively have received nearly zero help from the Muslim community” and a “[vast majority](#)” of U.S. mosques and Islamic centers are a part of a much larger “jihadi network.”

This suggests that we need to take resolute action against the so-called “terror mosques”—which [proliferate](#) throughout the land—and the host of problematic Islamic organizations, many affiliated with the Muslim Brotherhood, by revoking their licenses and privileges. We must also revise our immigration protocols drastically downward and refuse to accept the multitudes of refugees and migrants who will deplete our budgets, displace native citizens and furnish the camouflage the killers among them require to carry out their purposes. Regrettably, they are already here, with many more on the way, bound by the precepts of an archaic religion and culture at odds with liberal values and wholly incompatible with the constitutions and charters of Western secular nations.

Blogger Tim Murray is worth heeding when he [reminds us](#) that “we don’t have a moral obligation to act as a dumping ground for hundreds of millions of migrants from failed states...who can’t be expected to check their third world mentality at the door.” Nonetheless, we now find them in the free shelters, military barracks, subsidized apartments, affordable housing

projects, and eventually residing next door, like the [Khadr family](#) in Canada and the [Farook family](#) in the U.S., where they are at liberty to feed their hatred and hatch their plots.

How many innocent people will have to be butchered before we awake to the reality that the enemy is embedded in our midst? How many apologists for Islam will have to take a bullet or a knife blade before they change their tune? Hundreds? Thousands? Or—if a recent [EU Parliament](#) report is correct in claiming that ISIS is acquiring the expertise and the raw materials to build and employ weapons of mass destruction—millions? According to the London [Daily Mail](#), “Wolfgang Rudischhauser, Director of the Weapons of Mass Destruction Non-Proliferation Centre at NATO said: ‘ISIS actually has already acquired the knowledge, and in some cases the human expertise, that would allow it to use CBRN (chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear) materials as weapons of terror.’”

Such devastation is a genuine future threat, as Europol has acknowledged. But on the less cataclysmic scale of our present circumstances, we remain under the gun. We are hectored daily by the political elite not to turn against our (presumably) innocuous Muslim neighbors—yet as Rudyard Kipling wrote in a poem called “[The Stranger](#):

*The Stranger within my gates,*

*He may be evil or good,*

*But I cannot tell what powers control—*

*What reasons sway his mood;*

*Nor when the Gods of his far-off land*

*Shall repossess his blood.*

In this connection, I think also of W.B. Yeats’ immortal lines from “[The Second Coming](#),” “The best lack all conviction, while

the worst/Are full of passionate intensity.” As for the “worst,” the jihadists who have infiltrated our societies, they are not only full of passionate intensity, which gives them a distinct advantage, they are also full of death, which to them is life everlasting, and which is the greatest advantage of all.

Meanwhile, the “best” among us are the mediocre, the fearful, the sanctimonious, the decadent and the corrupt, those whom [C.S. Lewis in \*The Abolition of Man\*](#) called “men without chests,” men without “virtue and enterprise...traitors in our midst.” Political divisions and allegiances are not entirely applicable in this regard. Lewis’ apt formulation is reminiscent of a distinction put forward by Dwight Morrow in a [letter](#) praising his good friend, America’s thirtieth president Calvin Coolidge: *“I have about come to the conclusion that the division of the people of the world is not really between conservative and radical, but between people that are real people and people that are not.”* Our leaders, opinion makers and the plurality of our intellectuals are in this respect not “real people.”

In such amenable circumstances, coddled by the human wraiths that constitute our authority structures, the terrorists are free to wreak carnage among us, and they will continue doing so until or unless we come to our senses. Prayers, “*je suis*” slogans, sidewalk bouquets and candlelight vigils are a non-deterrent joke, a sentimental indulgence that only shames us. There is no alternative, if we wish to live more or less normally—or even simply to live—but to implement the stringent measures mentioned above. Every day that passes raises the probability of further attacks targeting ordinary citizens who will suffer the consequences of their complacency, timorousness and self-righteous clemency for those who wish to kill them. For the fact is, we are engaged in a war unlike any that has been fought before.

Yet in a significant way, the jihadists, their supporters and

their devout co-religionists have already won. They have made air travel an ordeal and a danger. They have infested our universities with their demands and activities. They have sponsored hate-speech legislation that has curtailed freedom of expression and led to damaging law suits ("lawfare"). They have exploited the workplace with their assumptions of and claims to special exemptions. They have stoked the fires of anti-Semitism. They have rendered neighborhoods inhospitable. They have established ghettos and no-go zones. They have made [shopping](#) a wager and [strolling](#) a hazard. They have turned Christmas parties into charnel houses and public events into abattoirs.

And they have made dining out a risky proposition.

First published in