

# The Mainstream Media's Multifarious Mental Junk

I have been watching, listening to, and reading all the multifarious mental junk that has been on offer on NPR and on CNN and on Fox, and at The Times and The Post and tutti quanti, and witnessing all these sudden scholars of terrorism, ranging from tough-guy ex-FBI agents to left-wing Democrats alike, offering every conceivable variety of obfuscation, misdirection, incomprehension, sheer nonsense – such as placing blame for the San Bernardino jihad terror attack on the “gun lobby.” This is because in this case the Muslim murderers in question used guns, so let’s all concentrate on the instrument used for the mass murder, and pay no attention to the ideology that prompted that particular use of that instrument.

I have heard repeatedly how what the heavy-lidded couple did “was a political act and had nothing to do with religion”; heard how they were “radicalized” here or there or possibly over there – though what that word “radicalized” would mean, i.e., following faithfully the dictates of Islam, no one seems interested in discussing. I have heard that the FBI has finally bravely concluded that “Yes, it was an act of terrorism,” but beyond that apparently daring declaration, nothing is said about what that “terrorism” was intended to do, or about how it was prompted by what texts of what religion.

Instead, we hold in our puzzled hands this mush-word “terrorism,” which has become a kind of free-floating Leibnizian monad unconnected to a particular faith Whose Name We Dare Not Speak. Our betters tell us they are still trying to puzzle out the whole mysterious business of that couple that was so mysteriously “radicalized.” They will still be puzzling it out during the next such attack, and the one after

that, and the one after that. In the midst of all this, just possibly something like a hemidemisemiquaver of the truth will be allowed in.

I hate to think, of how today's NPR and CNN and Fox and The Times and The Post would have covered the propagandists for Fascists and Nazis in the 1920s and 1930s. But this was happening even then. Why, no sooner had Mussolini made his March on Rome, and the *Ventennio* just started, than a certain Count Constantini was telling the society ladies of Boston about how wonderful that splendid fellow and his wonderful Blackshirts were: "Tells Mussolini's aims and progress; Count Constantini Speaks at the Chilton Club Italy's leader Has Won Whole Nation's Confidence, He Says." (Boston Daily Globe. Jan 16, 1923, p. 13)

In contrast to this disinformation to which we are daily subjected, no one should be embarrassed, much less apologetic, for daring to consider the evidence of his senses – that is, the Jihad news that mounts and mounts from all over the world, and especially that which demonstrates the cruel treatment of non-Muslims by Muslims wherever Muslims rule, save in a handful of cases where special circumstances have allowed for a taming or constraining – possibly temporary – of Islam, as in Kazakhstan or Kemalist Turkey. Nor should we be apologetic about becoming aware of the evidence provided in books, rather than from television reports or newspaper dispatches, by the historians of Islamic conquest: that is, the 1350-year history of the conquest of non-Muslim lands and the subsequent subjugation of the autochthonous non-Muslims. And we should be unapologetic about reading the scholars of Islam, such as C. Snouck Hurgronje, Joseph Schacht, Arthur Jeffery, and dozens of others, who wrote before Arab money and influence and other factors aided the Muslim takeover of many academic departments in the West having to do with Islam and related studies. And finally, we can read Ayaan Hirsi Ali, Wafa Sultan, Ibn Warraq, Magdi Allam, Nonie Darwish, and a growing list of other

Defectors from the Army of Islam, whose articulate works, whose morally and intellectually advanced testimonies, can be compared with the deceit practiced by Muslim spokesmen who are given such credulous treatment by the formulators of popular opinion.

The West is now imperiled in a way unique in its history, mostly from an ideological pressure brought from within, and not by military pressure from without. Not everyone thinks we should simply throw up our hands and wail "but what can we do?" and "there's nothing to be done." There are those who are not, sometimes out of a mere want of imagination and intellect, able to figure out the many things that they could legitimately and rationally do to preserve (and perhaps even extend) the civilisational legacy they inherited. But there are also those who wish to protect it from its present-day most dangerous enemies, those who have not lost their senses, those who refuse to make burnt offerings of themselves or their children on the Altars of the Idols of the Age, Tolerance and Diversity – a limitless and unintelligent and even suicidal "Tolerance," a diseased conception of "Diversity." The latter group must regard with alarm and disgust the irresponsibility of the media coverage that has followed the San Bernardino murders.

First published at