

Appeasement Doublethink

A British prison officer **has been fired** for making a remark, in the aftermath of 9-11, which indirectly implied that he had something against Osama Bin Laden. Why is that grounds for dismissal? Because (the argument goes) if any Muslims had heard the remark, they might have been offended.

But why should they have been?

The officer is a former Coldstream Guardsman with a 21-year unblemished record in the Prison Service.

The Norwich hearing was told that on Nov 15, 2001, he threw some keys into a metal chute at the prison gatehouse. When someone said it sounded as if he had thrown them so hard that they were going through the tray at the bottom of the chute, Mr Rose said: "There's a photo of Osama bin Laden there."

Peter McKinnon, another prison officer, told him to be quiet because two Asian women wearing headscarves and an Asian man were at the window of the gatehouse.

The investigation never discovered whether the visitors heard the comment.

The very idea that hostility towards an enemy who has declared war on our civilization should be taboo, is the epitome of appeasement. It is the idea that threats can be avoided by systematically giving those who are making them the impression that we have no criticism of them, and that nothing that they might do would result in a violent response from us. This is not only false, it is the very thing that invites threats and, eventually, war.

The doublethink is located at the following question: *do Muslims, broadly speaking, sympathise with Osama Bin Laden or not?* And indeed, do they identify with him so profoundly that even overhearing a casual and indirect expression of opposition to him would cause them unacceptable offence? The authorities can answer neither yes nor no. If yes, they would be disparaging an 'ethnic' group – which is bigotry. If no, then their own assumption that the visitors, purely because they are Muslims, might be offended by an insult to a mass-murderer, would itself be a stunning piece of bigotry. And either way, their behaviour towards

officer Rose would be revealed as the outrageous injustice that it is.

This combination of doublethink and appeasement is shocking because it is not an aberration. It is a major factor in present-day Western political opinion. And it is dangerous. It concedes the enemy's fundamental ideological premise: that the war is caused by the West's lack of appeasement of anti-Western violence from the Arab world and other Islamic societies. So long as that remains so, we cannot win the war. The danger is not that we might lose it. It is that the longer the war takes, the greater is the chance that weapons of mass destruction will be successfully used against us. As soon as they are, the world will become a **nasty place** for a while.

The authorities should reinstate officer Rose. Sack those who sacked him. Locate the Muslims concerned and apologise to them, and to the Muslim community in Britain, for having tarred them with the Bin Laden brush.

Muslim organisations should demand that all of the above be done.

The government should make a declaration that expressions of opposition to the enemy in the current war will never again be grounds for disciplinary proceedings against civil servants.

The rest of us should be frightened and angry if any of that fails to happen.

Wed, 12/03/2003 - 20:27 | [digg](#) | [del.icio.us](#) | [permalink](#)

Not Appeasement, Just Insane "Political Correctness"

I have to disagree on this one. If this had happened at the UN or at a diplomatic meeting, then perhaps foreign policy would have been a consideration. I don't think it was here. I think this was just a case of insanely stupid political correctness.

I think you're right to suppose that they might have assumed "that the visitors, purely because they are Muslims, might be offended by an insult to a mass-murderer", but I don't think this is pure bigotry because the authorities are merely projecting their own ridiculous sorts of reactions.

In America, we have recently had **this incident**, in which someone got into big trouble for using the word "Niggers" in an *anti-racist* context. It's gotten to the point where some people are simply unable to hear certain words or expressions without taking offense, regardless of context.

Your points are good ones, but I think applying this incident as an example of the problems is a bit of a reach.

Gil

by **Gil** on Thu, 12/04/2003 - 17:39 | [reply](#)

Re: Not Appeasement, Just Insane "Political

Correctness"

Gil said

It's gotten to the point where some people are simply unable to hear certain words or expressions without taking offense, regardless of context

It got to that point quite some time ago: '**Stoning**' sketch from *The Life of Brian*.

by **Editor** on Thu, 12/04/2003 - 22:25 | [reply](#)

Python Reference

Yes. I think **David Bernstein** beat you to that reference.

Who's Gill?

Gil

by **Gil** on Fri, 12/05/2003 - 00:13 | [reply](#)

Re: Gill

Whoops. Corrected noww.

by **Editor** on Fri, 12/05/2003 - 06:52 | [reply](#)

the above

Sheer insanity! These people really don't want discussion anymore do they. The prof and spokesperson should be sacked. Why the hell should a person making what in my young day would have been considered a very "right on!!!" anti-racist statement be sent for racial awareness therapy. Have these clowns never heard of Stalinism? or maybe they still sneakingly believe it was a good idea.

Words have to be understood in context. It's no good getting a fit of the vapours just over the existence of them. Besides, why is it when I watch a Spike Lee film I hear the word nigger about every fifteen seconds, but being spoken by black people. This, apparently, is inoffensive because (let me do your homework for you you leftie clowns) it's post imperial slavery, neo-irony and a mark of black brotherhood and solidarity right? Well kiss my arse. I'm talking goose and ganders. What should be wrong for one should be wrong for all. What these PC assholes are saying is White always wrong, Black always right. It's way more complicated than that.

by a reader on Sun, 12/07/2003 - 17:04 | [reply](#)

