

## AFTER CHRISTCHURCH

### Q&A

**Tassos Symeonides**  
(RIEAS Academic Advisor)

**Copyright:** Research Institute for European and American Studies ([www.rieas.gr](http://www.rieas.gr))  
Publication date: 31 March 2019

**Note:** The article reflects the opinion of the author and not necessarily the views of the Research Institute for European and American Studies (RIEAS).

*The horrific New Zealand mosque attack was yet another terrible escalation of international terrorism. What are we to expect in the wake of Christchurch?*

The overwhelming revulsion at the death of so many innocent victims inevitably overshadowed a significant fact associated with this latest outrage: in view of the steady escalation of Islamist terrorist violence in recent years, it is not so much a surprise that Christchurch *did happen* but, rather, why such a barbarity took *so long to occur* in a global system where tit-for-tat and unbridled religious-induced violence have become the daily norms. Only those who ignore reality were unprepared for an attack like Christchurch. We can only speculate about the reasons behind this terrorist “time lapse” but the worrisome fact now is *what to expect next*. Islamist terrorism knows no bounds in its barbarity, brutality and appalling rejection of the sanctity of human life. It is only “rational” that as we speak Islamic “avengers” are planning an equally, or even worse, counterstroke against the infidels in the Christian world.

*The NZ prime minister, Jacinda Ardern, has been showered with effusive praise from across the globe for her “compassion” and “solidarity” to Islam in the wake of the mosque massacre. Is this overwhelming response justified?*

It is justified according to a certain world view promoted by spreading “progressivist” leftism and its offshoots. An old idea, today's “progressivism” has adapted to the demands of left liberalism and its various offshoots; it adopts an approach putting the emphasis on feelings rather than reason and on absence of debate if there is an attempt to refute its claims of “global harmony” and “peaceful coexistence.” It is allergic to any mention of questions

about Islam's worldwide spread and the violence perpetrated by Moslem fanatics. In its ideological shift, today's "progressivism" leaves even the traditional extreme left liberal creed by the wayside: it has adopted a new code of "ethics" praising open borders and nodding positively toward Third World mass illegal immigration. European political elites adopting progressivist policies are especially eager to promote and legitimize the full integration of Moslem minority populations into their societies by accepting practices and beliefs that are often directly opposed to the ideas of Western democracy. Few, if any, of these politicians pushing for such "adjustments" have ever paused to reflect on the cultural, political, and social implications of such rather abrupt policies. The result has been politically divisive and unacceptable in the eyes of native European populations (see, for example, [this](#), [this](#), and [this](#)).

The NZ PM, termed a "[global feminist icon](#)," belongs to this "progressivist" wing. She responded in perfect harmony with the principles of "openness," "diversity," and "togetherness" irrespective of creed, history, and NZ social and ethnic origins and traditions. She went out of her way to stress how Islam has allegedly become an integral part of NZ culture and how the mosque outrage was "an attack on all of us." She took the additional, rather unprecedented, step for a Western head of government to have a hijab day of mourning during which she and many other Christian women wore Islam's traditional feminine headscarf and participated in prayers offered by an imam. Ms Ardern's initiative, however, did not meet universal approval. Critics suggested that wearing the hijab [legitimizes](#) "... a [Moslem] symbol of oppression and control, a way of policing women's bodies by enforcing standards of modesty." Women activists in Moslem countries [found the wearing of the headscarf an "ironic" gesture](#) in in the face of the struggle for the emancipation of women in conservative Moslem societies.

The international outpouring of admiration and effusive commentary over Ms. Ardern's "steel" in coming out so forcefully in defending, praising, and honoring Islam as a universal value, not to mention as a "core" value of her own country, is being celebrated as the latest golden standard of how to battle "prejudice and Islamophobia." Overall, however, the terms of this debate (democratic 'values' vs. Islam vs. terrorism) is vastly more complicated and divisive than the rather simplistic, but PR-powerful, approach adopted by this "steely" global feminist icon that triggered the worldwide explosion of ill-thought, but "politically correct," congratulatory adulation directed at Ms. Ardern.

***What exactly are these “values” the NZ PM invoked? How do these “values” could help social peace and unity in today’s highly volatile socio-political climate?***

It is customary these days for politicians to invoke “values” that are almost never clearly identified, defined and explained. Ms. Ardern is no exception to this rule. There is no evidence, for example, she possesses scholarly understanding of Islam and its values and she would be, almost certainly, hard pressed to publicly explain how these values dovetail with the history of New Zealand as a country created and developed by British (Christian) settlers. It is also obvious that Ms. Ardern either ignores, or deliberately forgets, Islam is hardly a narrowly defined religion with a strong metaphysical core but, primarily, a system of social organization and behavior based on the Sharia and a long string of detailed behavioral instructions to the devout delivered by the [Hadith](#), the collection of sayings by the Prophet only second in importance to the Quran.

Under Moslem custom, for example, Ms. Ardern’s “value” as the mother of a child born out of wedlock (she is unmarried and currently in a ‘cohabitation arrangement’ with the father of her child) would be [severely treated](#) according to Moslem teachings (see, e.g., [here](#) and [here](#)). In fact, Ms. Ardern, the “global feminist icon,” would be in dire straits if called upon to publicly reconcile her liberal feminist “values” with those of Islam and explain to her audience how could she accept, without comment, the absence of separation between faith and state under Islam (a separation at the core of Western government).

Another problem with the NZ PM’s reaction to Christchurch is her obvious refusal to touch upon the complete absence of reciprocal expressions of grief over the slaughter of Christians by Moslem regimes. In fact, as Ms. Ardern and her acolytes mourned wearing the hijab and responded to the imam’s call for prayers, the mass murder of Christians in parts of the Moslem world continued (see, for example, [here](#) and [here](#) and [here](#)). It would take a strong imagination to believe that Moslem governments would mimic Ms. Ardern’s outpouring of innocent friendship and solidarity to Islam, which included police women ordered to wear the hijab, and TV announcers beginning their broadcasts with the Islamic greeting “Assalamualaikum,” by calling a mass event, complete with Christian symbols hoisted above the believers, to express grief over the slaughter of Christians that routinely occurs in parts of the Islamic world.

*Christchurch has inevitably rekindled the Islamophobia controversy and Moslem claims that the faithful face discrimination in Western societies. What is the impact of the tragedy on this particular topic?*

Islamophobia is a convenient portmanteau term foisted upon the “unbelievers” through patient cultivation by Islamic “activists” and “civil society organizations” which now has Western governments, universities, research institutions, local authorities, and school systems struggling to “defeat” this curse and eliminate alleged “criminal” Western behaviors toward the devout. Anyone who refuses to use the term, and criticizes its use, risks public vilification, character assassination, and career ruination. Islamophobia, therefore, has joined many other “-phobias” used by “progressivists” to discover “hate crimes” across an ever expanding penal spectrum.

Christchurch will inevitably fan the “Islamophobic” flames especially since the murderer who perpetrated the atrocity fits the profile of the “white Christian Islamophobe” perfectly. Christchurch has the potential to give a further decisive boost to “inclusion specialists,” “diversity experts,” and “community outreach partners” whose primary mission is to devise ways of avoiding *anything* within the public discourse that might sound, even remotely, “Quranically aggressive.” Translated in plain English, “Quranically aggressive” is the dynamic behind the *act of deliberate self-censorship when it comes to Islam that roundly defeats all Western claims of treating freedom of speech as one of the key foundations of democracy.*

In fact, the ground is already well cultivated to receive an additional infusion of how to defeat “Islamophobia” following Christchurch. For years, for example, the now tottering European Union has gone to great lengths to excise anything that has to do with Europe’s Christian foundations, and the fundamental role of Christianity in the evolution of European societies.

If anything, in the wake of Christchurch, and the almost universal adulation showered upon Ms. Ardern, the Western tendency (most pronounced in Europe) to diminish the key civilizational importance of the Christian heritage could increase. No politician worth his salt today dares defend Christian values for fear of the barrage of invective and condemnation from the “progressivist” left, which automatically ascribes any such talk to deliberate

hostility toward Islam but, also, other social groups deemed oppressed. Needless to say, these “progressivist” antics perfectly dovetail with the targets of Islamic organizations eager to deflect attention from established conservative Islam practices regarding, for example, the treatment of women and child marriage.

“Islamophobia” as an established weapon of political, social, and religious warfare isn’t going away anytime soon-- and it will continue to draw energy and potency not so much from Moslem advocacy as from Western “progressivist” fervor in combating opponents of “multiculturalism” and “diversity.”