

- |  |
|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Annotate the article to show evidence of understanding and thinking.</li><li>2. Write a 1+ page response.</li></ol> |
|--|

### **Three Articles About *Charlie Hebdo***

*Article 1 provides background on the recent tragedy from which a debate resurfaced in the media.  
Read all three articles and respond to the debate.*

#### **#1: The World Mourns the Lives Lost in *Charlie Hebdo* Attack**

*By Stephen Talmadge, TheWeek.com, Jan. 7, 2015*

On Wednesday January 7, three masked gunmen stormed the Paris office of French magazine *Charlie Hebdo*. The gunmen killed at least 12 people, including two police officers, before escaping in cars. This wasn't the first time that *Charlie Hebdo* was attacked; it was fire-bombed in 2011 after printing caricatures of Prophet Muhammad, but there were no fatalities.

Later on Wednesday, the magazine's homepage reflected a completely black screen with the phrase "Je suis Charlie," or "I am Charlie," written in white. The phrase quickly became a show of support and solace for those who lost their lives.

#### **#2: Al-Jazeera Leak Reveals Staff Split Over Response to *Charlie Hebdo* Killings**

Emails show some journalists branded French satirical magazine racist while others defended Muhammad cartoons.

*By Lin Jenkins, theguardian.com, Jan 10. 2015*

Leaked emails from the Middle Eastern television channel al-Jazeera reveal that staff were divided on how to respond to the fatal attack on the staff of the French satirical magazine Charlie Hebdo.

Some journalists and editorial staff branded the publication as "racist" and "extremist" while others defended the right to publish cartoons depicting the prophet Muhammad.

The emails, published in full by the National Review, begin with one sent to staff by Salah-Aldeen Khadr, the London-based editor and executive producer, on Thursday suggesting a list of questions that should guide their coverage of events.

He said it should be "the best it can be" but asked staff to question whether the terrorist attack was "really an attack on free speech", asking if an "attack by 2-3 guys" on "a controversial magazine" was equal to a "civilizational attack on European values".

He suggested that the massacre could be viewed as a "clash of extremist fringes" – implying Islamic fundamentalists were on one side and staff at the magazine on the other.

He added: "Defending freedom of expression in the face of oppression is one thing; insisting on the right to be obnoxious and offensive just because you can is infantile. Baiting extremists isn't bravely defiant when your manner of doing so is more significant in offending millions of moderate people as well. And within a climate where violent response – however illegitimate – is a real risk, taking a goading stand on a principle virtually no one contests is worse than pointless: it's pointlessly all about you."

The email sparked a heated response. The US-based correspondent Tom Ackerman responded by quoting an excerpt of a New York Times article by Ross Douthat. It read: "If a large enough group of someone is willing to kill you for saying something, then it's something that almost certainly needs to be said, because otherwise the violent have veto power over liberal civilization."

Mohamed Vall, based in Qatar, who reported for the TV station's Arabic-language service before joining its English wing, said supporting Charlie Hebdo risked encouraging more killings. "And I guess if you encourage people to go on insulting 1.5 billion people about their most sacred icons then you just want more killings because as I said in 1.5 billion there will remain some fools who don't abide by the laws or know about free speech.

"What Charlie Hebdo did was not free speech it was an abuse of free speech in my opinion," he said. "Go back to the cartoons and have a look at them! It's not about what the drawing said, it was about how they said it.

"I condemn those heinous killings, but I'M NOT CHARLIE," he wrote.

Jacky Rowland, the Paris correspondent, reminded others of the hashtag #journalismisnotacrime, which the channel had promoted in the wake of the arrest and jailing of three al-Jazeera journalists in Egypt.

### Article 3: From Now On, No More Mr. Wise Guy

By Leonard Pitts Jr, *Miami Herald*, Jan. 10, 2015

Dear Terrorists:

OK, you win. We surrender.

Never thought I'd say that, but then, I never thought I'd see gunmen burst into the offices of a satirical magazine as happened last Wednesday in Paris. Never thought I'd see 12 people killed — most were employees, two were police officers — because a magazine published provocative cartoons mocking extremist Islam.

Here in the United States, as in France, as in pretty much every free place on the globe, we've cherished this crazy idea that people should be free to say whatever they darn well please. We have particularly believed in the power of humor, not simply as a means of expression, but as a way of puncturing the powerful and pricking the pretentious, of defying those who seek to make us fear.

But the bloodshed at Charlie Hebdo magazine forces us to realize the error of our ways. So I am here to announce that you have achieved your goal. From this moment on, no one on the planet — the entire *planet*, do you hear? — will ever, ever, ever again make fun of you. This is The End of Satire.

So you'll hear no more cracks about Osama bin Gotten.

No one will ever again say you're full of Shiite.

And you won't have to hear anyone sing, "Bomb bomb bomb, bomb bomb Iran" to the tune of an old Beach Boys song.

I even hear Jon Stewart is quitting *The Daily Show* to host a program on The Food Network, specializing in New Jersey cuisine. Mad magazine is going out of business and its famed mascot, the infidel Alfred E. Neuman, just became the latest journalist beheaded by ISIS. Bill Maher is teaching religious studies in Mississippi, Lewis Black is practicing Zen Buddhism and Stephen Colbert now claims "Stephen Colbert" was nothing more than a character he played.

You know, this isn't easy for us. In America, we have a tradition, stretching from Mark Twain to Will Rogers, to Dick Gregory to Norman Lear to the aforementioned Jon Stewart, of using humor to make trenchant political points. Probably, the French have a similar tradition.

But we finally get what you're saying: Allah don't play that.

And not just Allah. Back in December, North Korean leader Kim Jong Un threatened "merciless" retaliation over *The Interview*, a (by all reports) silly comedy about two idiot American journalists who are asked to assassinate him. The FBI says a devastating cyber attack on Sony Pictures, which released the film, originated in that hermit kingdom.

Take all that in conjunction with the 2006 riots after publication of cartoons depicting the Prophet Mohammed, the 2010 threat of a fatwa against *South Park*, a 2011 firebombing at Charlie Hebdo and last year's crackdown on Bassem Youssef, host of an Egyptian version of *The Daily Show*, and one thing becomes clear:

While we've fought forces of corruption, hypocrisy, totalitarianism and terror with reason, sanctions, humanitarian pleas and even violence, it turns out that what they really hate is when you laugh at them.

So, OK, message received. We won't laugh at you again, ever, ever ever. You win.

Indeed, I propose a new law: One may no longer place one's tongue in one's cheek under penalty of death. I'm also voting Boko Haram for school board.

Yes sir, satire is dead, and you killed it. Trust me. From now on, we will treat you only with the respect you deserve.

Possible Response Questions:

- After reading these articles, should the world protect freedom of speech absolutely, or are there aspects that should not be protected? Explain your answer.
- Which part of these articles did you find most convincing? Why?
- Select any passage and respond to it.