

February 3, 2024

The Crazy Story Behind the Disturbing News

By: Victor Davis Hanson

Part One - January 24, 2024

The Unspeakable Precivilizational Barbarity of Hamas

A recent report from Israel chronicles the tragic, more than two-months-long hunt of a bereaved father, David Tahar, for the head of his slain son, Adir—a young Israeli soldier murdered by terrorists on October 7.

Tahar had been warned by Israeli authorities not to view the remains of his son. But he insisted, and thus discovered the mutilation perpetrated by Hamas killers and then sought to find the missing remains of his son.

Israelis, however, recently captured two terrorists who knew firsthand of the incident—given one was the perpetrator. And then the story descended further into barbarism.

In the words of the news report from The Times of Israel:

“Two terrorists who were captured by Israeli forces and interrogated by the Shin Bet security service revealed that one of them had tried to sell an IDF soldier’s head for \$10,000 and gave details on where it could be found.”

Further macabre questions arise: is there a market for severed Israeli heads? Does the \$10,000 dovetail with the earlier reports that Hamas was offering \$10,000 bounties to Gaza “*civilians*” who tagged along opportunistically as soon as word spread that the wall was breached, Israeli civilians were being robbed, raped, and murdered—and bounties offered for ad hoc killing and hostage-taking?

Acting on such details from the captured terrorist, an Israeli patrol went out and recently found the head of Adir Tahar.

The details of the gruesomeness only mounted:

“Orders were given for an elite unit, backed up by tanks, to enter a central Gaza location where they found the head in a bag inside a freezer in an ice cream store... The severed head had also apparently been further abused... It was returned to Israel. DNA and dental records showed that it was Adir’s head and it was later buried.”

So decapitation was not savage enough for the Hamas ethos, and the bartered head of the slain soldier was then further mutilated? Was the civilian proprietor of the ice cream store at all bothered that his refrigeration appliances were used to store a human head? Was he the purchaser of the human head from the terrorist decapitator? Or was he the seller? Or was he simply the transactional middleman?

The Times of Israel also referenced a CNN-released video from October 7 of Hamas terrorist gunmen filmed while sawing off the heads of dead IDF soldiers, and an account of the decapitation by a shovel of an Israeli woman in the act of being raped—yet another sick crime to be added to the others of the simultaneous raping and lethally stabbing of Israeli women.

At some point can the diseased mind of the Western world do the simple enough moral calculus between these two sides of this war? It is not that hard.

Or to put it another way: one side decapitates and then sells severed heads, and one does not, and millions cannot see a difference.

Part Two - January 26, 2024

The Unspeakable Precivilizational Barbarity of Hamas (Continued)

Israel had vacated Gaza since 2005. A democracy of sorts was promised. Philanthropists sent hundreds of millions of dollars in aid to facilitate the profitable transitional use of abandoned Israeli infrastructure. Literally, billions of dollars of international money poured into Gaza, much of it Western, on the exciting news that it was autonomous and holding free elections—but of course one time only.

The rest is history. Hamas took power, eliminated its rivals (throwing some off high buildings), and then began diverting its aid into the world's largest labyrinth of military-use tunnels—by intent with nexuses dug under mosques, hospitals, and schools.

Note that Hamas, which has now sent without warning well over 7,000 rockets into civilian centers inside Israel, assumes two central truths:

- 1) it believed that Israel would be unlikely to strike its command-and-control centers if they were shielded by humanitarian or religious institutions, and thus would become more effective; and
- 2) de facto, Israel cares more about not killing Gazan civilians than does Hamas, which uses them as human shields.

Hamas has never dropped leaflets, texted civilians near intended targets, or sought to avoid civilians. To the contrary, Hamas is a civilian-killing machine: it seeks to kill unarmed Jews, often by exposing its civilians to possible retaliatory attacks.

So there is a great moral asymmetry that is taken for granted so much so that it needs not even to be articulated.

Abroad?

One side decapitates, rapes, mutilates, murders, and tortures. One side targets civilians by intent (even at this late date Hamas still manages to launch rockets into Israeli neighborhoods). One side takes hostages (the war would end tomorrow if Hamas would surrender its murdering hierarchy and the remaining killers of October 7, return the hostages, ignore the Israelis, and concentrate on turning Gaza into a Dubai). One side's press releases are fraudulent and do not consider serial lying anything other than necessary propaganda. And one side is nihilist: it cannot create or build, only envy others and try to destroy them.

And here at home?

On one side, the protester occupies bridges at commute time, indifferent to the damage it does to the first responder, the parent racing to get home to his home-

alone child, and the desperate commuter trying not to be punished by arriving late to work

One side defaces the hallowed icons of its generous host, whether the Lincoln Memorial, the White House gate, or a Los Angeles veterans' cemetery. One side claims religious victimhood but boldly tries to disrupt the religious observances and ceremonies of others on the assumption they would never do the same to the disrupters.

One side swarms a cancer hospital entrance to scream at the patients and block families and friends from entering to visit the ill. One side fights with the police. One side violates the law. One side shouts obscenities and threats. One side screams for genocide and the destruction of an entire race. One side physically assaults others based on their race and religion.

So what then are Israel's crimes in Gaza? It is successful, Western, and disproportionate when attacked. And in our sick world, all that is a mortal sin.

In the end, the Western pro-Hamas demonstrators lack the morality to make simple distinctions between good and evil, whether they are Ivy League University presidents, the retinue around Joe Biden and the Obamas, or the Middle Eastern visitor, eager to leave the madness of the Middle East for the security, prosperity, and freedom of the West—only to manipulate the guilt-ridden Westerner by playing the victim, and to cheer on the cruelty and autocracy of autocrats, but only on the provisos that he is safely distant from them while there are never any consequences for his ingratitude, his hypocrisy, and his moral shallowness.

Why stay among those you despise and avoid those whom you praise—but only safely in the abstract?

Part Three - January 30, 2024

When Hatred Is Mainstreamed:

The Strange Case of Joy Reid

Joy Reid is the MSNBC host of her show, *The Reid Out*. She is the child of immigrants from the Congo and Guyana. Reid is known as the supposed “*heroine of the anti-Trump ‘resistance’*,” at least according to The New York Times.

Certainly, despising Trump is one of her two signature themes, the other being an obsession with race—or rather a fixation with accusing “*white people*” as a collective of being responsible for various stereotyped sins, ancient and modern.

Yet Reid herself has a long history of blatantly anti-Semitic, homophobic, and racist drivel directed at whites, immigrants, and conservative blacks (e.g., “*Uncle Tom*” Clarence Thomas).

She never willfully apologizes for her incendiary speech, except when caught and thus worried that the resulting mini furor might endanger her tenure at MSNBC (her show is at best-rated 6th of the anemic MSNBC news shows).

Only then do her defenses fall into three tired categories:

One, her earlier incendiary remarks were not hers, but invented by “*hackers*” who had gained access to her blog site (she finally dropped that outright abject lie when investigators found no such evidence). Note, which is worse for a journalist, flagrant venomous bias against particular groups, or knowingly promulgating an outright lie and proven fabrication on network news*?

** “In December I learned that an unknown, external party accessed and manipulated material from my now-defunct blog, The Reid Report, to include offensive and hateful references that are fabricated and run counter to my personal beliefs and ideology. I began working with a cyber-security expert who first identified the unauthorized activity, and we notified federal law enforcement officials of the breach. The manipulated material seems to be part of an effort to taint my character with false information by distorting a blog that ended a decade ago. Now that the site has been compromised I can state unequivocally that it does not represent the original entries. I hope that whoever corrupted the site recognizes the pain they have caused, not just to me, but to my family and communities that I care deeply about - LGBTQ, immigrants, people of color, and other marginalized groups.”*

OR, two, she is not the person now that she was earlier when she voiced such anti-gay and anti-Semitic remarks (yet they are not ancient history, but voiced or written between 2005 and 2020);

OR, three, she claimed victimhood due to racism.

But, in general, Reid is on record for lunacies such as claiming that al-Qaeda did not attack us on 9/11, that the 2020 violent riots were not the work of Antifa or BLM but more likely of white supremacists allied with Donald Trump, and most recently that there are too many white “*overrepresented*” Christians in Iowa, thus explaining why Donald Trump won the Iowa primary.

Three general oddities arise about her many prejudices, biases, and hatreds:

1) Does she ever stop and ponder why her parents left the poverty of the Congo in Africa or Guyana in South America to come to the United States— if America were truly, as she so often alleges, a systemically racist country?

Do racially obsessed people really leave countries in which they are part of a majority to emigrate to nations where they will be part of a persecuted minority? Or to it put another way, why would anyone leave the black or non-white solidarity of the Congo and Guyana to immigrate to a supposedly intrinsically racist America, where logically their children would have no chance, say, to become eligible for affirmative action or find advantages in journalism under DEI guidelines, but instead would be perpetually discriminated against?

2) If Joy Reid were white, would she have survived this long on cable news television, given her long history of racially incendiary and bigoted remarks? I say that in part because she came to MSNBC fore after the forced resignation of news veteran Chris Matthews. She inherited his 7 PM time slot. (Matthews was dismissed after decades in the cable news business for inappropriate sexual banter and remarks deemed inconsiderate or suggestive to female colleagues.)

In the complex intersectionality of DEI, Reid’s long history of racist, anti-Semitic, and anti-gay slurs and smears match or exceed Matthew’s juvenile and pathetic banter (e.g., “*Why haven’t I fallen in love with you yet?*”/“*Keep putting makeup on her, I’ll fall in love with her.*”).

Part Four - January 31, 2024

When Hatred Is Mainstreamed:

The Strange Case of Joy Reid (Continued)

3) Given Reid’s free pass to collectively stereotype groups, mostly all whites in general, why—in an era in which cultural appropriation is a common leftist charge in matters of dress and grooming (do we remember the dreadlocks scandal in which whites were blasted for emulating African-American hairstyles?)—would Reid die her hair white/blond?

Note that hair and race are irrelevant. They only become so, when one sees racial differences as essential to our personas rather than incidental, such as Joy Reid herself.

That is, Reid has a long history of claiming hairstyles represent revolutionary politics. In the past, she claimed she deliberately wears her hair in a way that exudes black authenticity and naturalness. For example, a 2020 Forbes article took note of her MSNBC appearance: “*It’s why Reid decided her history-making new show was an opportunity to be intentional with her choice of hairstyle. It was indeed a political statement. Actually, her choice was a revolutionary act.*”

Or as Reid put it of her “*revolutionary act,*”

“I think that Black women have come into our own in every aspect, including in insisting that we will be ourselves, including in the way we wear our hair. There’s no reason we shouldn’t be able to embrace our hair as it is, or how we reimagine it, and it’s an affirmation of our full arrival as citizens and cultural leaders. And yes, our natural hair is a political statement.”

If “*our natural hair is a political statement,*” what then is now Reid’s assessment of her latest style when she wears whitish blond dyed hair, even as she writes off the entire state of Iowa as overrepresented clueless white people who blindly vote for the evil Donald Trump?

*If you do not take an interest
in the affairs of your government,
then you are doomed to live under
the rule of fools.*

Plato