

November 14, 2015

Yesterday morning the president declared ISIS had been "contained." With that in mind, Mark Steyn posts on last night's attacks in Paris.

... With his usual killer comedy timing, the "leader of the free world" told George Stephanopoulos on "Good Morning, America" this very morning that he'd "contained" ISIS and that they're not "gaining strength". A few hours later, a cell whose members claim to have been recruited by ISIS slaughtered over 150 people in the heart of Paris and succeeded in getting two suicide bombers and a third bomb to within a few yards of the French president.

Visiting the Bataclan, M Hollande declared that "nous allons mener le combat, il sera impitoyable": We are going to wage a war that will be pitiless.

Does he mean it? Or is he just killing time until Obama and Cameron and Merkel and Justin Trudeau and Malcolm Turnbull fly in and they can all get back to talking about sea levels in the Maldives in the 22nd century? By which time France and Germany and Belgium and Austria and the Netherlands will have been long washed away.

Among his other coy evasions, President Obama described tonight's events as "an attack not just on Paris, it's an attack not just on the people of France, but this is an attack on all of humanity and the universal values we share".

But that's not true, is it? He's right that it's an attack not just on Paris or France. What it is is an attack on the west, on the civilization that built the modern world - an attack on one portion of "humanity" by those who claim to speak for another portion of "humanity". And these are not "universal values" but values that spring from a relatively narrow segment of humanity. They were kinda sorta "universal" when the great powers were willing to enforce them around the world and the colonial subjects of ramshackle backwaters such as Aden, Sudan and the North-West Frontier Province were at least obliged to pay lip service to them. But the European empires retreated from the world, and those "universal values" are utterly alien to large parts of the map today. ...

Roger Simon is a more direct than Steyn.

I am not going to blame Barack Obama entirely for what happened in Paris Friday — but mostly. And that's not just because he famously called ISIS the jayvee team, when they are now unequivocally the New York Yankees or the Manchester United of terror, repellent as that analogy may be (he started it).

But what is clear from the carnage at The Bataclan theatre and elsewhere in Paris that we will be studying for weeks or months to come is that the West has no leader in our evident civilizational war — no Churchill, no Roosevelt, no de Gaulle, not even a George W. Bush. It's certainly not Barack Obama, a ludicrous man who thinks the world's greatest problem is climate change in the face of Islamic terror. This is the same man who oversaw, indeed instigated, a large-scale American démarche for the first time since World War II.

And look what happened. ...

Same with John Podhoretz.

"We've gone through these episodes ourselves," President Obama said Friday afternoon in explaining how the "heartbreaking" events in Paris were resonating with Americans. Well, no, we haven't. We haven't been through an episode of this kind, ever. We haven't had a soccer stadium bombed and a concert venue occupied and three gathering places shot up simultaneously. We have not experienced urban warfare executed by a terrorist organization using a combination of suicide bombers and gunmen. We've had 9/11, and we had the Tsarnaev brothers, and we've had lone shooters. Combining these approaches is a horror we've yet to undergo. About these things, we are innocents.

The question is how much longer we will be. If one assumes this was an ISIS operation, that would mean the group may be engaged in a systematic effort against countries that have announced a common goal of extirpating it. And it may be doing so on an accelerated schedule. Two weeks ago, ISIS apparently took down a Russian airliner. Yesterday, it went wild in Paris. Where next? Germany? Australia? Turkey?

Or here in the U.S.? ...

And Andrew McCarthy.

There is always the chance that the next attack will knock the scales from our eyes. Always the chance that we will realize the enemy is at war with us, even as we foolishly believe we can end the war by not fighting it, by surrendering.

As this is written, the death count in Paris is 158. That number will grow higher, and very many more will be counted among the wounded and terrorized.

"Allahu Akbar!" cried the jihadists as they killed innocent after French innocent. The commentators told us it means "God is great." But it doesn't. It means "Allah is greater!" It is a comparative, a cry of combative aggression: "Our God is mightier than yours." It is central to a construction of Islam, mainstream in the Middle East, that sees itself at war with the West.

It is what animates our enemies.

Barack Obama tells us — harangues us — that he is the president who came to end wars. Is that noble? Reflective of an America that honors "our values"? No, it is juvenile. ...

No cartoons today. Nothing humorous about living in an obviously leaderless country.

Steyn on Line

[The Barbarians Are Inside, And There Are No Gates](#)

by Mark Steyn

As I write, Paris is under curfew for the first time since the German occupation, and the death toll from the multiple attacks stands at 158, the vast majority of them slaughtered during a concert at the Bataclan theatre, a delightful bit of 19th century Chinoiserie on the boulevard Voltaire. The last time I was there, if memory serves, was to see Julie Pietri. I'm so bloody sick of these savages shooting and bombing and killing and blowing up everything I like - whether it's the town where my little girl's favorite fondue restaurant is or my favorite hotel in Amman or the brave freespeecher who hosted me in Copenhagen ...or a music hall where I liked to go to hear a little jazz and pop and get away from the cares of the world for a couple of hours. But look at the photographs from Paris: there's nowhere to get away from it; the barbarians who yell "Allahu Akbar!" are there waiting for you ...when you go to a soccer match, you go to a concert, you go for a drink on a Friday night. They're there on the train... at the magazine office... in the Kosher supermarket... at the museum in Brussels... outside the barracks in Woolwich...

Twenty-four hours ago, I said on the radio [apropos the latest campus "safe space" nonsense](#):

This is what we're going to be talking about when the mullahs nuke us.

Almost. When the Allahu Akbar boys opened fire, Paris was talking about the climate-change conference due to start later this month, when the world's leaders will fly in to "solve" a "problem" that doesn't exist rather than to address the one that does. But don't worry: we already have a hashtag (#PrayForParis) and doubtless there'll be another candlelight vigil of weepy tilty-headed wankers. Because as long as we all advertise how sad and sorrowful we are, who needs to do anything?

With his usual killer comedy timing, the "leader of the free world" told George Stephanopoulos [on "Good Morning, America" this very morning](#) that he'd "contained" ISIS and that they're not "gaining strength". A few hours later, a cell whose members claim to have been recruited by ISIS slaughtered over 150 people in the heart of Paris and succeeded in getting two suicide bombers and a third bomb to within a few yards of the French president.

Visiting the Bataclan, M Hollande declared that "*nous allons mener le combat, il sera impitoyable*": We are going to wage a war that will be pitiless.

Does he mean it? Or is he just killing time until Obama and Cameron and Merkel and Justin Trudeau and Malcolm Turnbull fly in and they can all get back to talking about sea levels in the Maldives in the 22nd century? By which time France and Germany and Belgium and Austria and the Netherlands will have been long washed away.

Among his other coy evasions, President Obama described tonight's events as "an attack not just on Paris, it's an attack not just on the people of France, but this is an attack on all of humanity and the universal values we share".

But that's not true, is it? He's right that it's an attack not just on Paris or France. What it is is an attack on the west, on the civilization that built the modern world - an attack on one portion of "humanity" by those who claim to speak for another portion of "humanity". And these are not "universal values" but values that spring from a relatively narrow segment of humanity. They

were kinda sorta "universal" when the great powers were willing to enforce them around the world and the colonial subjects of ramshackle backwaters such as Aden, Sudan and the North-West Frontier Province were at least obliged to pay lip service to them. But the European empires retreated from the world, and those "universal values" are utterly alien to large parts of the map today.

And then Europe decided to invite millions of Muslims to settle in their countries. Most of those people don't want to participate actively in bringing about the death of diners and concertgoers and soccer fans, but at a certain level most of them either wish or are indifferent to the death of the societies in which they live - modern, pluralist, western societies and those "universal values" of which Barack Obama bleats. So, if you are either an active ISIS recruit or just a guy who's been fired up by social media, you have a very large comfort zone in which to swim, and which the authorities find almost impossible to penetrate.

And all Chancellor Merkel and the EU want to do is make that large comfort zone even larger by letting millions more "Syrian" "refugees" walk into the Continent and settle wherever they want. As I wrote [after the Copenhagen attacks in February](#):

I would like to ask Mr Cameron and Miss Thorning-Schmidt what's their happy ending here? What's their roadmap for fewer "acts of violence" in the years ahead? Or are they riding on a wing and a prayer that they can manage the situation and hold it down to what cynical British civil servants used to call during the Irish "Troubles" "an acceptable level of violence"? In Pakistan and Nigeria, the citizenry are expected to live with the reality that every so often Boko Haram will kick open the door of the schoolhouse and kidnap your daughters for sex-slavery or the Taliban will gun down your kids and behead their teacher in front of the class. And it's all entirely "random", as President Obama would say, so you just have to put up with it once in a while, and it's tough if it's your kid, but that's just the way it is. If we're being honest here, isn't that all Mr Cameron and Miss Thorning-Schmidt are offering their citizens? Spasms of violence as a routine feature of life, but don't worry, we'll do our best to contain it - and you can help mitigate it by not going to "controversial" art events, or synagogues, or gay bars, or...

...or soccer matches, or concerts, or restaurants...

To repeat what I said a few days ago, I'm Islamed out. I'm tired of Islam 24/7, at Colorado colleges, Marseilles synagogues, Sydney coffee shops, day after day after day. The west cannot win this thing with a schizophrenic strategy of targeting things and people but not targeting the ideology, of intervening ineffectually overseas and not intervening at all when it comes to the remorseless Islamization and self-segregation of large segments of their own countries.

So I say again: What's the happy ending here? Because if M Hollande isn't prepared to end mass Muslim immigration to France and Europe, then his "pitiless war" isn't serious. And, if they're still willing to tolerate Mutti Merkel's mad plan to reverse Germany's demographic death spiral through fast-track Islamization, then Europeans aren't serious. In the end, the decadence of Merkel, Hollande, Cameron and the rest of the *fin de civilisation* western leadership will cost you your world and everything you love.

So screw the candlelight vigil.

Roger L. Simon
Why Paris Happened

I am not going to blame Barack Obama entirely for what happened in Paris Friday — but mostly. And that's not just because he famously called ISIS the jayvee team, when they are now unequivocally the New York Yankees or the Manchester United of terror, repellent as that analogy may be (he started it).

But what is clear from the carnage at The Bataclan theatre and elsewhere in Paris that we will be studying for weeks or months to come is that the West has no leader in our evident civilizational war — no Churchill, no Roosevelt, no de Gaulle, not even a George W. Bush. It's certainly not Barack Obama, a ludicrous man who thinks the world's greatest problem is climate change in the face of Islamic terror. This is the same man who oversaw, indeed instigated, a large-scale American *démarche* for the first time since World War II.

And look what happened. Well, we all know. We are living at a time when the Islamic world is having a nervous breakdown, actually more like a violent psychotic break, in its encounter with modernity and is determined to bring us all down with it.

Something must be done, but by whom? (As I write this, Paris is under mandatory curfew, the nation's borders sealed. Are we next?) America, once the country everyone turned to, needs someone serious at its helm never more than now. The world needs it. But who is it?

Hillary Clinton, the sleazy liar and confidant of the even sleazier Sidney Blumenthal, the woman Donald Trump was correct in alleging is running for president at least in part to stay out of jail? Doesn't that sound reassuring?

What about Trump himself? On the surface, and maybe below it too, he seems the man most likely to profit from this horror. If that's true, I only hope he's up to it. I admit to being seriously disturbed by his recent comments about Ben Carson, accusing the doctor of psychopathy. It's not that he has to walk that back (although he certainly should). It's obvious that many of Donald's outrageous comments come from a position of insecurity. But now more than ever he should realize we're in serious times. If he wants the most important job in the world, he better act like he deserves it.

But here's one statement he really should walk back at this point. In fact it's mandatory if he wishes to take office. I'm referring to his casual remark that he'd let Putin handle ISIS if he wishes. He'd be doing us a favor.

How does that look now, Donald? Not so hot, I know. ISIS — and related groups — are, sad to say, the number one responsibility of the president of the United States. No one else is going to do it ultimately. If you're not willing to take that on, pass the baton to someone who is. Marco Rubio is one idea. He's young and green, but seems to be about as clear-eyed as anybody about the enemy.

But if you want to prove you are the right commander-in-chief, here's an idea for you, Donald. Get on one of your private jets and fly to Paris. Act presidential, even if the actual president doesn't. Try to figure out what to do about this growing terror threat that is going to be the major problem of the next administration. Educate yourself and show real interest. Gain all the knowledge you can. And if you want to have some fun in the midst of this dreadful situation,

make fun of Obama for concentrating on climate change while the world burns. You might even ask him for his science grades.

But keep this in mind most of all, if you want that job. Tonight, from a jihadi on Twitter: "The American blood is the best blood and we will taste it soon." Trust me — they mean it.

Contentions

The Paris Horror Was Not 'Contained'

by John Podhoretz

"We've gone through these episodes ourselves," President Obama said Friday afternoon in explaining how the "heartbreaking" events in Paris were resonating with Americans. Well, no, we haven't. We haven't been through an episode of this kind, ever. We haven't had a soccer stadium bombed and a concert venue occupied and three gathering places shot up simultaneously. We have not experienced urban warfare executed by a terrorist organization using a combination of suicide bombers and gunmen. We've had 9/11, and we had the Tsarnaev brothers, and we've had lone shooters. Combining these approaches is a horror we've yet to undergo. About these things, we are innocents.

The question is how much longer we will be. If one assumes this was an ISIS operation, that would mean the group may be engaged in a systematic effort against countries that have announced a common goal of extirpating it. And it may be doing so on an accelerated schedule. Two weeks ago, ISIS apparently took down a Russian airliner. Yesterday, it went wild in Paris. Where next? Germany? Australia? Turkey?

Or here in the U.S.? The evidence is strong that the costly and controversial efforts by the United States over the past 14 years to make it extremely difficult to stage such an assault have done the trick so far. Plots have been broken up; drone strikes have killed plotters and designers of such plots; and all the annoying things we have to put up with, from shoe removal at airports to having to show ID to get into a suburban office building have raised the difficulty level to a point at which groups may figure the risk of attempting a mass atrocity is not worth the reward.

Still, there is no security without vigilance. Here in New York City, even under Bill De Blasio, vigilance is the order of the day when it comes to terrorism. But it cannot be a good sign for the nation's vigilance that our president, a mere 10 hours before the attack, went on ABC and said we "have contained" ISIS. As a matter of pure fact, it wasn't true. As a matter of strategy, it was a disastrous thing to say for a man who had promised only a year ago to destroy the group — a signal that once again he was circumscribing a goal he himself had set. And it suggests what the president wants most of all is for Americans to believe they are not at risk. This was his shameful goal in 2012 when he denied the truth about the Benghazi attacks in order to preserve his campaign slogan about ending wars rather than beginning them. And it was his shameful goal as well in that ABC interview.

Those are words he will not speak again — unless he continues to speak them to himself, denying the threat that is right in front of him, jamming its nose into his face, as he turns his neck so he can pretend it isn't there.

National Review

The War That Hasn't Ended

by Andrew C. McCarthy

There is always the chance that the next attack will knock the scales from our eyes. Always the chance that we will realize the enemy is at war with us, even as we foolishly believe we can end the war by not fighting it, by surrendering.

As this is written, the death count in Paris is 158. That number will grow higher, and very many more will be counted among the wounded and terrorized.

“Allahu Akbar!” cried the jihadists as they killed innocent after French innocent. The commentators told us it means “God is great.” But it doesn’t. It means “Allah is greater!” It is a comparative, a cry of combative aggression: “Our God is mightier than yours.” It is central to a construction of Islam, mainstream in the Middle East, that sees itself at war with the West.

It is what animates our enemies.

Barack Obama tells us — harangues us — that he is the president who came to end wars. Is that noble? Reflective of an America that honors “our values”? No, it is juvenile.

In the real world, the world of aggression — not “micro-aggression” — you don’t get to end wars by pronouncing them over, or mistaken, or contrary to “our values.”

You end them by winning them . . . or losing them.

If you demonstrate that you are willing to lose, then you lose. If you sympathize with the enemy’s critique of the West on the lunatic theory that this will appease the enemy, you invite more attacks, more mass murder.

France is hoping the night’s bloodshed is done as it counts its dead. And perhaps it is for now. But the atrocities are not over, not even close.

In Paris, it has been but the blink of an eye since the *Charlie Hebdo* massacre, after which Western nations joined together in supposed solidarity, supporting the fundamental right to free expression.

That lasted about five minutes.

Intelligentsia on both sides of the Atlantic rationalized that, while we of course (*ahem*) champion free expression — “*Je suis Charlie!*” and all that — columnists and cartoonists who dare lampoon a totalitarian ideology are bringing the jihad on themselves.

It was a familiar story. In 2012, jihadists attacked an American compound in Benghazi, killing our ambassador and three other officials. The president responded by . . . condemning an anti-Muslim video that had nothing to do with the attack, and by proclaiming that “the future must not belong to those who slander the prophet of Islam.”

Islamic supremacism killed Americans, and America's president validated Islamic supremacism.

How did the French and the rest of the West react when jihadists attacked *Charlie Hebdo* in Paris?

After a fleeting pro-Western pose, they condemned . . . themselves.

What happened when American commentators who had spent years studying Islamic-supremacist ideology warned that mainstream Muslim doctrine was fueling jihad against the West?

The Obama administration — the president and his secretary of state, Hillary Clinton — reacted by targeting the messengers, not the aggressors.

Jihadist terror would be obfuscated by euphemisms like “violent extremism” and “workplace violence.” The critics of jihadist terror would be smeared as racist “Islamophobes.” Mrs. Clinton led the administration's effort to portray examination of Islamic doctrine as hate speech, to brand commentary about radical Islam as illegal incitement.

Wouldn't that be a betrayal of First Amendment free expression? If so, Mrs. Clinton declared, the government had other ways to suppress it. The administration, she said, would resort to extra-legal extortion: “old fashioned techniques of peer pressure and shaming.”

American government intimidation, not against the jihad but against opponents of the jihad. Could we tell the enemy any more clearly that we don't think we are worth defending? Could we tell the enemy any more clearly that we are ripe for the taking?

Hard experience has taught us that when jihadists have safe haven, they attack the United States and our Western allies. But as ISIS and al Qaeda expand their safe haven in Syria and Iraq, we tell the world it is everyone else's problem — the Kurds have to do the fighting, or the Yazidis, the Iraqis, the “rebels,” anyone but us.

As hundreds of thousands of refugees flee the region — many of them young, fighting-fit men whose potential terrorist ties cannot possibly be vetted — we encourage Europe to open its arms and borders to them, promising to open our own as well.

After all, to do otherwise would be to concede that the war is against us — and Obama is the president who “ends” war.

The enemy is not impressed. What Obama calls “ending” war the enemy sees as surrender, as the lack of a will to fight, much less to prevail.

So, as night follows day, the enemy attacked Paris tonight, yet again. Jihadists brazenly proclaimed that they were from Syria, spreading their jihad to France.

Obama responded by soft-peddling the atrocity as a “tragedy,” the acts of war as a “crime.”

A “crime” that tonight killed 158 people (and counting). A “crime” by “criminals” who vow more jihadist acts of war against Paris, Rome, London, Tel Aviv, and New York.

We did not ask for a war with jihadists. Years ago, they commenced a war of aggression against us. *Pace* Obama, you can't end such a war by withdrawing, or by pretending it is just a crime. You end it by winning it or losing it.

The enemy senses that we are willing to lose it. Tonight, they pressed their advantage. It won't be the last time.