
How to deal with the scourge of terrorism?: A world of paradoxes

Maximiliano E Korstanje

HOW TO DEAL WITH THE SCOURGE OF TERRORISM?: a world of paradoxes.

Maximiliano E Korstanje¹

15 July of 2016 and again, France woke up with news that terrorism took the lives of almost 84 persons. Now Nice was the epicenter of a new terrorist attack perpetrated a white truck in the middle of Festival celebrations for Bastille Day. This sad event not only reminds we are living in a world of paradoxes, but sometimes, these dilemmas prevent specialist to reach short-term solutions.

For the sake of clarity, the first of paradoxes consists in the fact while English speaking countries, post 9/11, monopolized the "war on terror" moving their military-forces to Middle East, French intelligentsia exerted a radical criticism the policies of the government of United States. Now things has changed a lot, and while France faces in its soil the cruelty of new attacks, American and British scholars criticizes the lack of programs to prevent terrorism homeland. Besides, most of these critiques center on "the doctrine of precautionary platform". No less true is that West draws geography delineating what are the safe places from what remains insecure, and this represents the touchstone of international terrorism. The meaning of security not only should be reconsidered after 9/11, Atocha, London, Paris, Brussels and now Nice, but the role of mass-media should be placed under the lens of scrutiny. The attention given by media to terrorist attack exceeds any logic of professionalism, because journalists do their best to broadcast the situation with further accuracy, even for audience to watch the moment where victims are massacred or exploding in the air. The culture of sensationalism oriented to enhance the quota of investors or even profits, which adjoins to the fact that terrorism sells, are two significant factors for what terrorism and media are inevitably entwined. Since media are attracted by terrorism, and terrorists employs media to make their acts public, this paves the pathways for a dialectics which is very difficult to break. The rise and expansion of news associated to terrorism desensitize public opinion (normalization) to the extent that each attack should be more innovative, creative, cruel and violent than others. On another hand, the question whether terrorists target tourists as new victims to install their terror-driven message is another point which merits to be discussed. In 70s decade, terrorists hosted and even killed important celebrities, politicians or chiefs of Police to cause political instability within society, but this has sets the pace to new tactics, where tourists are gun-fired, executed to upload the image in youtube. More associated to mobility, tourism and leisure-related spots, terrorists revealed not only that the liberality of leisure would be a fertile ground for bombings but understood how the "principle of randomness" causes panic in social imaginary. First and foremost, though spaces of consumption as beaches, tourist resorts or malls are

¹ Political Analyst- University of Palermo, Argentina. Fellow at CERS University of Leeds UK. International Society for Philosophers, UK.

daily monitored, it is very difficult for security forces to ensure a climate of zero-risk. Further, since the blow can happen anytime and anywhere, people are frightening not for present time, but for potential attacks, even in their vacations. As Professor Luke Howie puts it, terrorism does not want to kill a lot of people, they want a lot of people watching what they have done. Originally circumscribed to political instability, international terrorism appeal to lay-people not only for the lower costs, but because each attack is aleatory planned to kill lay-citizens who can remind all we are the prey. From 11-9 onwards, the attacks on recreation and entertainment centre multiplied. At some extent, people feel what happened in 9/11 can be repeated anywhere. This begs a more than interesting question, how can we prevent an attack perpetrated with means of transport or objects used for other purposes?.

One of the success of terrorism not only alluded to show that the hallmarks of Occident such as mobility, consumption, freedom, tourism and even transport can be used as weapons producing ontological vulnerabilities. Last but not least, in the society of spectacle not surpassingly, it is not accident that victims would be more interested in taking the correct picture; meanwhile the terrorist drove the truck, than impeding all these people to be hit. Witnessing has situated as the main priority in the society of consumers. This was exactly, we have dubbed as the rise of a new stage of capitalism where death of others placed as the main commodity to be exchanged. While people witness widely and daily news concerning others' death, it serves as a reminder one still is safe. Events only can be shared through the lens of camera in a way that transforms audiences in commodities of death. Though the future wakes up some uncertainty, what should be discussed is what Nation-state would do with Muslim community. It is unfortunate that West deals with others through the conception of lesser evil. From the conquest of Americas to terrorism, West has historically appealed to the otherness through the lesser-evil mandate. Within bio-politics, the medical gaze prioritizes to save the life, even when some organs can be sacrificed. This means that affected organ should be extirpated to save the body. This metaphor, doubtless, has ideologically legitimated not only the violation of human rights of ethnic minorities, but genocides. The states of emergencies are far from fixing the problem, even may exhibits a great risk for the security of Muslim in a not-so-distant future.