

WHAT HAPPENS WHEN LIBERAL MORAL RELATIVISM MEETS ISLAMIC EVIL?

I can't imagine how a father could [contemplate killing his ten year old daughter](#) because a mullah had raped her in a mosque, but I know it is evil.

It is evil, too, to behead or bury alive helpless people because they are of a different faith; to blow up little girls because they went to school. But many prominent liberals have criticized Islamists only when making false and invidious comparisons between them and [Christians](#), or [Republicans](#).

Liberals tend to conflate Islamists with Moslems generally, which is like conflating Germans with Nazis, Italians with the Mafia.

The term was coined to distinguish between those who seek to impose a worldwide "caliphate" ruled by Islamic law, and most Moslems.

The Islam Islamists seek to impose is essentially unchanged from what Mohammed preached 1,400 years ago. Men required to wear beards. Women denied education, forced to have clitorectomies. Homosexuals put to death.

All must worship Allah in the manner they do, Islamists demand. "Infidels" who don't convert are to be enslaved (dhimmitude), expelled, or exterminated. But for every Jew, Christian, Hindu or Yazidi they've killed, Islamists have murdered a thousand Moslems they consider heretics.

There's a schism in Islam which dates from 661, when Ali, cousin and son in law of the Prophet, was murdered in Najaf in what is now Iraq. The Shia (about 15 percent of all Moslems) believe the true succession of Islam's caliphs runs through Ali.

Most Moslems have come to terms with modernity, and with each other. In Iraq, where intermingling of Sunni and Shia is greatest, intermarriages have been common. But Sunni and Shia Islamists hate each other every bit as much as they hate infidels and moderate Moslems.

It's as puzzling as it is appalling so many liberals - who trumpet their support for women's rights and gay rights - are unable or unwilling to distinguish between the majority and the Islamists.

"Islamist" is a racist term, according to "media critic" Kay Sokolowski. Which is preposterous, because Islam is a religion with adherents in virtually every ethnic group.

Ignorance goes a long way toward explaining why liberals believe such nonsense. But ignorance alone can't explain the willful blindness of so many to the evil proudly displayed by ISIS, Boko Haram, Hamas and other Islamist groups.

Liberals tend to be moral relativists. Until ISIS rubbed it in their faces, many were unwilling to acknowledge such evil exists.

I suspect it's their touching faith in diplomacy - illustrated by the hopes they invest in each new Middle East cease fire, despite innumerable disappointments (We cease, they fire, noted [Bernard Lewis](#)) --that makes liberals reluctant to acknowledge the existence of such evil as we're witnessing in Iraq today.

Liberals desperately want to believe there's no problem in the world that can't be ameliorated by diplomacy. But even liberals understand that for negotiations to succeed, there must be some basis for compromise. With the likes of ISIS, there is none. Either we kill them, or they'll kill us.

Unwilling to acknowledge that in dealing with Islamists, only military force will do, many liberals shut their eyes to their true nature. Rather than give up their fond illusion, they embrace a deadlier one.

Cowardice may be a factor. Liberals can - and do - say vile things about Christianity, confident no Christian will respond to their blasphemy with violence. But if provoked, Islamists might murder them. (Many liberals have yet to figure out Islamists may murder them even if they're not provoked.)

In a [Pew poll](#) June 26, just 40 percent of "solid liberals" said they "often feel proud to be an American."

Perhaps some took a rosier view of Islamists because they consider Islamist criticisms of America to be justified.

I think the biggest reason why liberals are reluctant to acknowledge the true nature of Islamists is because to do so would be a tacit admission they've been really, really wrong - about reaching out to Islamists, about cuts in defense, about their entire philosophy of moral relativism. That would be a blow to the substantial egos most liberals have.

And for most liberals, nothing is more important than clinging to political power. To admit - even tacitly - their screwups have caused a humanitarian catastrophe and put America at risk might have adverse consequences at the polls.

Jack Kelly is a former Marine and Green Beret and a former deputy assistant secretary of the Air Force in the Reagan administration. He is national security writer for the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette.

[Discuss this item on the forums. Click Here!](#)