

Chapter 1 : Unspeakable Acts (TV Movie) - IMDb

This shopping feature will continue to load items. In order to navigate out of this carousel please use your heading shortcut key to navigate to the next or previous heading.

Pinterest David Irving in Austria after being imprisoned for Holocaust denial in He is still writing and lecturing, albeit in a more covert fashion. He still makes similar claims and his defenders see him as a heroic figure who survived the attempts of the Jewish-led establishment to silence him. Holocaust denial is still around, and its proponents find new followers. There is a salutary lesson here: To continue to exist is a heroic act, a victory for the forces of truth. Of course, denialists might yearn for a more complete victory “ when theories of anthropogenic climate change will be marginalised in academia and politics, when the story of how the Jews hoaxed the world will be in every history book “ but, for now, every day that denialism persists is a good day. In fact, denialism can achieve more modest triumphs even without total victory. A better approach to denialism is one of self-criticism. The starting point is a frank question: Why have those of us who abhor denialism not succeeded in halting its onward march? And why have we as a species managed to turn our everyday capacity to deny into an organised attempt to undermine our collective ability to understand the world and change it for the better? These questions are beginning to be asked in some circles. They are often the result of a kind of despair. It appears that nothing works in the campaign to make humanity aware of the threat it faces. The obstinacy with which people can stick to disproved notions is attested to in the social sciences and in neuroscientific research. Humans are not only reasoning beings who disinterestedly weigh evidence and arguments. But there is a difference between the pre-conscious search for confirmation of existing views “ we all engage in that to some extent “ and the deliberate attempt to dress this search up as a quest for truth, as denialists do. Denialism adds extra layers of reinforcement and defence around widely shared psychological practices with the never articulated aim of preventing their exposure. This certainly makes changing the minds of denialists even more difficult than changing the minds of the rest of stubborn humanity. There are multiple kinds of denialists: What they all have in common, I would argue, is a particular type of desire. This desire “ for something not to be true “ is the driver of denialism. Empathy with denialists is not easy, but it is essential. Denialism is not stupidity, or ignorance, or mendacity, or psychological pathology. Nor is it the same as lying. Of course, denialists can be stupid, ignorant liars, but so can any of us. But denialists are people in a desperate predicament. It is a very modern predicament. The discovery of evolution, for example, is inconvenient to those committed to a literalist biblical account of creation. Denialism is also a reaction to the inconvenience of the moral consensus that emerged in the post-enlightenment world. In the ancient world, you could erect a monument proudly proclaiming the genocide you committed to the world. In the modern world, mass killing, mass starvation, mass environmental catastrophe can no longer be publicly legitimated. Yet many humans still want to do the same things humans always did. We are still desiring beings. We want to murder, to steal, to destroy and to despoil. We want to preserve our ignorance and unquestioned faith. So when our desires are rendered unspeakable in the modern world, we are forced to pretend that we do not yearn for things we desire. Denial is not enough here. As an attempt to draw awareness and attention away from something unpalatable, it is always vulnerable to challenge. Denial is a kind of high-wire act that can be unbalanced by forceful attempts to draw attention to what is being denied. Denialism is, in part, a response to the vulnerability of denial. To be in denial is to know at some level. To be a denialist is to never have to know at all. Denialism is a systematic attempt to prevent challenge and acknowledgment; to suggest that there is nothing to acknowledge. Whereas denial is at least subject to the possibility of confrontation with reality, denialism can rarely be undermined by appeals to face the truth. The tragedy for denialists is that they concede the argument in advance. Climate change denialism is predicated on a similarly hidden acknowledgment that, if anthropogenic climate change were actually occurring, we would have to do something about it. This is an understandable but profound misunderstanding. Certainly, denialism and other forms of pseudo-scholarship do not follow mainstream scientific methodologies. Denialism does indeed represent a perversion of the scholarly method, and the science it

produces rests on profoundly erroneous assumptions, but denialism does all this in the name of science and scholarship. Denialism aims to replace one kind of science with another – it does not aim to replace science itself. In fact, denialism constitutes a tribute to the prestige of science and scholarship in the modern world. Denialists are desperate for the public validation that science affords. While denialism has sometimes been seen as part of a post-modern assault on truth, the denialist is just as invested in notions of scientific objectivity as the most unreconstructed positivist. Even those who are genuinely committed to alternatives to western rationality and science can wield denialist rhetoric that apes precisely the kind of scientism they despise. Anti-vaxxers, for example, sometimes seem to want to have their cake and eat it: The rhetoric of denialism and its critics can resemble each other in a kind of war to the death over who gets to wear the mantle of science. Mainstream science can also be dogmatic and blind to its own limitations. Human interests can rarely if ever be separated from the ways we observe the world. Indeed, sociologists of science have shown how modern ideas of disinterested scientific knowledge have disguised the inextricable links between knowledge and human interests. If denialists were to stop denying, we cannot assume that we would then have a shared moral foundation on which we could make progress as a species. Denialism is not a barrier to acknowledging a common moral foundation; it is a barrier to acknowledging moral differences. An end to denialism is therefore a disturbing prospect, as it would involve these moral differences revealing themselves directly. But we need to start preparing for that eventuality, because denialism is starting to break down – and not in a good way. On 6 November, when he was already preparing the ground for his presidential run, Donald Trump sent a tweet about climate change. After all, the second Bush administration had done as little as possible to combat climate change, and many leading Republicans are prominent crusaders against mainstream climate science. Yet something else was happening here, too; the tweet was a harbinger of a new kind of post-denialist discourse. It may have been a garbled version of the common argument on the US right that global climate treaties will unfairly weaken the US economy to the benefit of China. This is not how denialism usually works. Denialists usually labour for decades to produce, often against overwhelming odds, carefully crafted simulacra of scholarship that, to non-experts at least, are indistinguishable from the real thing. They have refined alternative scholarly techniques that can cast doubt on even the most solid of truths.

Chapter 2 : James Douglass, Confronting the Unspeakable

The Unspeakable People has 10 ratings and 3 reviews. Graham said: THE UNSPEAKABLE PEOPLE is one of a trilogy of themed horror anthologies by noted editor.

The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist. We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties or democratic processes. This is one reason there was such a universal outpouring of grief throughout much of the world when he was assassinated. His turning towards peace with increased vigor and resolve after staring into the abyss with the enemy Nikita Khrushchev, during the Cuban Missile Crisis was treasonous to the entrenched monied interests standing behind the institutions of government representing those interests. Douglass fine tunes this point in the Preface: That story, like the struggle it embodies, is as current today as it was in The theology of redemptive violence still reigns. The Cold War has been followed by its twin, the War on Terror. We are engaged in another apocalyptic struggle against an enemy seen as absolute evil. Terrorism has replaced Communism as the enemy. We are told we can be safe only through the threat of escalating violence. Once again, anything goes in a fight against evil: Yet the redemptive means John Kennedy turned to, in a similar struggle, was dialogue with the enemy. When the enemy is seen as human, everything changes. That reconciling method of dialogue—where mutual respect overcomes fear, and thus war—is again regarded as heretical in our dominant political theology. Consider how our failure to confront the Unspeakable caused this to manifest. How compassion is our source of nonviolent social transformation. And how understanding and sharing with others the transforming story of a President who turned towards peace and gave his life as witness to a new, more peaceful humanity, can help move our own collective story in the twenty-first century away from a spiral of violence that can only end in omnicidal oblivion and towards a way of peace. These ideas set the frame of the book at the end of its Introduction. The Unspeakable is not far away. It is not somewhere out there, identical with a government that became foreign to us. The emptiness of the void, the vacuum of responsibility and compassion, is in ourselves. The unspeakable is not far away. I love what Merton wrote about compassion in The Sign of Jonas: He was electrocuted by a fan at a conference center in Bangkok on December 10, , the conclusion of his journey into a deeper, more compassionate humanity. The human being must be rejected by the ruling powers, must be killed, and will rise again. What Jesus was all about, what we as human beings are all about in our deepest nature, is giving our lives for one another. By bearing that witness of martyrdom, he taught, we will come to know what humanity really is in its glory, on earth as it is in heaven. A martyr is therefore a living witness to our new humanity. Kennedy a martyr, one who in spite of contradictions gave his life as witness to a new, more peaceful humanity? That question never occurred to me when Kennedy died. Nor did it arise in my mind until more than three decades later. Did a president of the United States, while in command of total nuclear war, detach himself enough from its power to give his life for peace? From researching JFK's story, I know much more today than I did during his life about his struggle to find a more hopeful way than the Cold War policies that were about to incinerate the United States, the Soviet Union, and much of the world. I know now why he became so dangerous to those who believed in and profited from those policies. But how much of his future was John Kennedy willing to risk? He knew the forces he was up against. Let the reader decide. I will tell the story as truthfully as I can. I have come to see it as a transforming story, one that can help move our own collective story in the twenty-first century from a spiral of violence to a way of peace. My methodology is from Gandhi. This is an experiment in truth. Its particular truth is a journey into darkness. If we go as far as we can into the darkness, regardless of the consequences, I believe a midnight truth will free us from our bondage to violence and bring us to the light of peace. Whether or not JFK was a martyr, his story could never have been told without the testimony of risk-taking witnesses to the truth. Even if their lives were not taken—and some were—they were all martyrs in the root meaning of the word, witnesses to the truth. Its other side is compassion, our response to suffering. The story of JFK and the Unspeakable is drawn from the suffering and compassion of many witnesses who saw the truth and spoke it. In living out the truth, we are liberated from the Unspeakable. As biblical scholars John L. The Aramaic idiom Jesus uses eighty-two times

in the Gospels to identify himself, bar nasha, means humanity, personally and collectively. His story is meant to be our story. Thomas More Press, , pp. Orbis Books, , pp. Jesus and the Enigma of the Son of the Man Minneapolis: John Kennedy is in some ways the most amazing story to me. Because Malcolm and Martin were prophets. And Robert Kennedy was of course changed profoundly by the death of his brother and moved in a new direction. It is that he had the courage, in a position that became more and more and more isolated during his presidency, he had the courage to stand against the most powerful state in history and particularly at its most critical moment. A democratic national security state is a contradiction in terms. To protect the security of that illusory means of security, which was absolute destructive power, we now needed a ruling elite of national security managers with an authority above that of our elected representatives.

Chapter 3 : Denialism: what drives people to reject the truth | News | The Guardian

The Unspeakable People Unknown Binding - Be the first to review this item. See all formats and editions Hide other formats and editions. Price.

One month later, young people organized a nationwide school walkout, lasting seventeen minutes to honor each of the dead. If more students befriended the loners and the bullied, then there would be less school violence. Or so the WalkUpNotOut organizers suggested. American cultural debate today quickly breaks down along partisan lines. But the debate about gun control is only part of the picture. The bigger question, which simmers beneath the surface warfare over gun control, is Why? Why do a growing number of young people feel that they have, as R. Others blame the high rate of gun ownership in the United States, or violent video games, or social media. Commentators on both left and right seem reluctant to blame the perpetrator. All parties appear to assume that humans, left to themselves, are good, and that acts of violence stem from conditions external to the self. I am a family doctor and a psychologist. I have seen how trauma in childhood can create scars that never heal. But during more than a quarter-century of medical practice, I have been led by my clinical experience to reject the deterministic assumptions underlying the therapeutic worldview that now pervades American culture. I have seen survivors of child abuse and neglect grow up to be kind and gentle adults. I have seen children who had every possible advantage—two loving parents, a stable home, and a close-knit community—grow up to be cruel and violent. The Jewish and Christian traditions understand the problem of violence differently than does our therapeutic culture. In the Jewish and Christian traditions, sin is a temptation. Cain chose to yield to the temptation, to indulge the sin: But he had the ability to choose. Humans are not the helpless products of their previous experience. By the grace of God, we can choose to do right and shun evil. Contemporary American psychology largely ignores the possibility of moral choice rooted in a framework of transcendent values. The assumptions underlying contemporary American psychology are now relentlessly materialistic and goal-oriented. Teach children that they will get in trouble if they hurt others, and they will behave better because they fear the bad outcomes of misbehavior. Work hard, always obtain affirmative consent before you engage in intimacy, and you will have a good life. More than half of the mass shooters in the past fifty years committed suicide at the conclusion of their crimes. They wanted the unspeakable pleasure of taking human life; they were willing to sacrifice their own lives for it. No approach to such individuals, or to such acts of violence, can be empirically valid if it denies the reality of moral choice and of the temptation to do evil. Part of the answer to the question Why? The culture has changed. That is less true today. The temptation to kill is as old as Cain. Photo by Rosa Pineda via Creative Commons.

Chapter 4 : Unspeakable | Define Unspeakable at calendrierdelascience.com

The unspeakable people by PETER HAINING EDT. and a great selection of similar Used, New and Collectible Books available now at calendrierdelascience.com

Law enforcement treating synagogue attack as hate crime Authorities believe alleged gunman Robert Bowers acted alone and was driven by his hatred of Jews; David Lee Miller reports from Pittsburg on what more is being learned about the suspect. The victims of the massacre at a synagogue in Pittsburgh included a grandfather, a husband and wife, and two brothers, officials and family members revealed as new details about the alleged gunman behind the deadly rampage were released Sunday. President Trump ordered flags at federal locations throughout the U. In a proclamation, Trump declared: What to know A gunman opened fire in a Pittsburgh synagogue, killing multiple people. Daniel Stein, 71, was among those killed in the massacre. Bernice and Sylvan Simon were married and were also among the dead in the rampage, he added. A friend of Melvin Wax told the Associated Press that the retired accountant was a "sweet, sweet guy," and a pillar of the New Light Congregation that rented space on the lower level of the synagogue. Most of the time they were clean jokes. Most of the time. But most of the time. He knew how to do everything at the synagogue. He was really a very learned person. Daniel Leger was scheduled to lead a service Saturday morning and sustained critical injuries to his chest, he said. Daniel Leger was seriously injured in the shooting. Bowers was being treated for his injuries when he said Jews were "committing genocide to his people," and that he wanted them all to die. It was the deadliest attack on Jews in U. Four police officers were among the wounded. Bowers faces 11 counts of criminal homicide, six counts of aggravated assault and 13 counts of ethnic intimidation in addition to federal counts that include weapons offenses and hate crime charges. Media tents and vehicles line an intersection near the Tree of Life Synagogue, upper left, where a shooter opened fire Saturday, Oct. Bowers has an initial appearance in federal court scheduled for 1: There is also nothing to indicate that Bowers had any accomplices, he added. The attack took place just before 10 a. Travis Fedschun is a reporter for FoxNews. Follow him on Twitter travfed Trending in US.

Chapter 5 : Unspeakable () - IMDb

Publication: The Unspeakable People You are not logged in. If you create a free account and sign in, you will be able to customize what is displayed.

Chapter 6 : The Unspeakable People: Being Twenty of the World's Best Horror Stories by Peter Haining

The murder trial is ongoing in the case against a man accused of torturing and murdering the 8-year-old son of his girlfriend, whom he believed was gay. Los Angeles County prosecutors argue.

Chapter 7 : The Unspeakable Pleasure | Leonard Sax | First Things

The Unspeakable has 4, ratings and reviews. Sarah said: There are 4, and even 5, star essays in this collection, and they were an absolute revelat.

Chapter 8 : Publication: The Unspeakable People

Other young people challenged the walkout, suggesting that students should "walk up" instead. If more students befriended the loners and the bullied, then there would be less school violence. Or so the #WalkUpNotOut organizers suggested.

Chapter 9 : WRAL Documentary: Speaking the Unspeakable :: calendrierdelascience.com

DOWNLOAD PDF THE UNSPEAKABLE PEOPLE

Welcome to UnspeakableGaming, a channel with Unspeakable content! Minecraft, Gaming, Challenges, Roleplays, Custom Maps, along with tons of other awesome vid.