The West's willful blindness to the threat of Islamist terrorism knows no bounds
[National Post](#) - Tuesday June 20th, 2017

In January 2016, a 24-year-old woman in Mannheim, Germany was reportedly raped by three migrants. At first, she identified them to police as German nationals, later explaining her lie as reluctance to "help fuel aggressive racism." Then, astonishingly, she wrote a letter of apology to her attackers in which she blamed her society for their crime, saying "I wanted an open Europe, a friendly one … You, you aren't safe here, because we live in a racist society. … You are not the problem. You are not a problem at all."

British political commentator Douglas Murray recounts this anecdote in his brilliant new book, The Strange Death of Europe: Immigration, Identity, Islam. The victim, seemingly beset by a reflexive, socially entrenched fear of appearing Islamophobic, was willing to sacrifice justice to virtue-signalling. Such conduct is a microcosmic example of the bottomless white guilt that is crippling Europe.

Canada hasn't experienced the same migrant-related stressors as Europe, but that victim's spasmodic recoil from perceived Islamophobia looks mighty familiar. Case in point: a fascinatingly logic-tortured June 9 Toronto Star column devoted to Islamism exculpation, entitled "Terrorists are misogynists first." In the piece, pundit Heather Mallick informs us that "religion isn't terribly relevant" in recent European attacks. No, the real problem is male misogyny. Mallick knows this because "It is my job to see patterns in events. And we women see different patterns than men do." (Sigh. Mallick never speaks for me. I wish she'd drop that "we women" shtick.)

In a recent column, Heather Mallick informs us that "religion isn't terribly relevant" in recent European attacks. No, the real problem is male misogyny

What is the "pattern in events" that Mallick sees? That all the killers are young males, with a narrow "world view" who suffer from "status anxiety." The wanton spilling of blood is simply the way they "display maleness." This is a simplistic theory cut from whole cloth. It completely ignores the role of ideology in terrorism, and the fact that millions of men have status anxiety but do not resort to terrorism to express it.

From the assertion that misogyny is universal, Mallick irrationally leaps to the conclusion that terrorism knows no particular race or culture. Look, she says, at "the hateful men we have come to know": here, she lists four Islamist terrorists and five North American, non-Muslim massacrists (only two of whom were motivated by misogyny), implying a general numerical equivalence. But her non-Muslim, North American massacrists were not associated with organized terror movements or with a specific ideology. And her non-Muslim, North American massacrists and their victims are statistically nugatory beside the vast human wreckage that has occurred as a result of individuals carrying out radical Islamists' apocalyptic vision.

In a further attempt at moral equivalence, Mallick writes, "It's of no interest to us whether we're attacked by a men's rights advocate, the 'alt-right,' a Muslim terrorist or an Irish one." But these are shamelessly misleading comparisons. IRA terrorism is not animated by gender bias, and was territorially and temporally constrained by political ends attainable through negotiation. Islamist terrorism is global and not open to negotiation. "Men's rights advocate?" A dreadful slur on a civilized movement. To my knowledge, no massacrist has ever cited encouragement to violence from any men's rights association.

What's Mallick's solution? First, she thinks we ought "to discard Muslim or Islamic as an adjective." (Obama and many other politicians have tried that, Heather. It didn't work.)

other politicians have tried that, Heather. It didn't work.) Because "why single out Islam," when "the misogyny of the Roman Catholic church is one of its pillars." Even if that were true (which I don't think it is), where is the organized terrorism — or any terror — perpetrated in Christ's name that Mallick's reckless equivalency implies?

The column is a sad read, but emblematic of the desperation progressives feel when objective evidence contradicts their beloved multicultural theories, and the intellectual corruption to which they fall victim in their stubborn refusal to acknowledge reality. Mallick's jejune finale only plunges deeper into polemic bathos: "Let's tackle misogyny at its source and find a way to raise boys to be more like the studious, gentle girls many of them have been told to despise." "Let's", as "let us"? As in Canada? Been there, done that, Heather. Any other brilliant suggestions for ending Islam— er, I mean, status anxiety driven terrorism?

All that's missing in Mallick's column is a sincere letter of apology to ISIL for the bad rap they are getting from people less enlightened than she. Regrettably, many Canadians think as Mallick does, or think they should. They need to read Murray's book and get woke.

National Post
kaybarb@gmail.com
Twitter.com/BarbaraRKay