

# Dossier on France and Eurabia

Richard B. Sorensen, [www.unholygrail.net](http://www.unholygrail.net)

Copyright © 2007, All Rights Reserved

April 13, 2020

*If it were not for the government, we should have nothing to laugh at in France.*  
~ Nicolas de Chamfort

*Freedom does not always win. This is one of the bitterest lessons of history.*  
~ A.J.P. Taylor, author

## Religious and Moral Base of France

The heart and soul of all peoples lies in the religious and moral milieu of society. France lost its soul in the French Revolution of 1789 and had never regained it. For centuries since the time of Pepin and Charlemagne in the 800s, the hierarchy of the Catholic Church in France had been in bed with the kings and politicians, and many in the upper echelons of the church grew wealthy, powerful, self-satisfied, and unconcerned with the spiritual needs of the people. Payback finally came during the Revolution when many of the hierarchy literally lost their heads to the guillotine in the terror and confusion that followed. All church property was nationalized, and France officially turned its back on religion and became a secular state. From that time on the government switched continuously from monarchy, to republic, to oligarchy, and finally back to a republic dominated by left-wing socialists, but all the while retaining its anti-religious bias.

## French Political Leaders

Along with political instability, the French national pride had taken a number of serious blows since that time, especially the humiliating defeats and occupations of the Franco-Prussian War of 1870 as well as World Wars I and II. The fact the America had emerged victorious from both World Wars as well as the cold war standoff with Russia, and had become the single remaining world superpower, was especially galling to French political leaders, who have long been famous for their pomposity and their hissy fits. Charles De Gaulle, who said, "I am France," and "when I want to know what France thinks, I ask myself," was for many was the personification of French arrogance. De Gaulle had this to say about his own people: "I have tried to lift France out of the mud. But she will return to her errors and vomitings. I cannot prevent the French from being French."

François Mitterrand was another top politician who was obsessed with his place in history. After he was diagnosed with advanced prostate cancer and given only a short time to live, he traveled to Egypt to "commune with the Pharaohs." There he ate his famous last meal, which consisted of a small yellow-throated songbird called the ortolan, which is said to embody the soul of France. Ortolan is a delicacy, but it is illegal to eat in

France because it is an endangered species. The bird's head is first bitten off and discarded, and the rest of the bird is eaten in one mouthful, bones and all. Mitterrand, who was in very poor health, refused further food and died eight days later.

The French political scene is dominated by *énarques* who are graduates of the most exclusive French school of all, the ENA – *École Nationale d'Administration*. This school was established by De Gaulle and intended for the scions of the upper crust, the sons of the existing French political and business leaders, who in turn will become the future leaders of France. *Énarques* are more-or-less “made men,” an informal club that works together to perpetuate its own power and defend its members, creating a culture of political cronyism at the top of French society. *Énarque* credentials are an unspoken requirement for high political office, and high French *énarque* officials return the favor by viciously defending French interests. French negotiators are notorious for their one-sided view of issues and their tenaciousness in pursuing policies to benefit their parochial interests. Like French poodles grabbing and holding on to pant legs, they continue to gnaw on the ankles of others until they finally get their way.

In the lead-up to World War II the French had touted the impregnability of their Maginot line, the defensive shield supposedly protecting them from Germany. But in 1940 the German *Wehrmacht* simply went around it and the entire country of France collapsed within a month, almost without a fight. Charles De Gaulle was the only French general to have attempted a counterattack during the German offensive and it was easily crushed. The French people went through paroxysms of self-flagellation and doubt, hating their own weakness and ashamed at how the Germans had simply walked in and taken over. But at the same time, they were greatly afraid of a military conflict like World War I in which an entire generation of young Frenchmen had perished in the trenches of Verdun.

When Henri came to study this period of French history, he found that the French armistice records had formerly been sealed and a pall of silence had been cast on the subject, until Robert Paxton's 1972 book *Vichy France* opened the floodgates. This book revealed that rather than promoting the resistance and opposing the German invaders, the wartime government of France had instead opposed the allies and attempted to make long-term deals with Hitler, with the goal being the joint Franco-German rule of Europe, and expanding the French colonial empire at the expense of Britain. At the time the Germans were fixated on their own power and ignored these French initiatives, and it was not until after the war that the EU was formed with a Franco-German empire in mind. But this vision remained as the goal of the Vichy government until Hitler's downfall in 1945. Therefore, despite Hitler's duplicity and brutality, the Vichyites preferred an arrangement with the Germans and dreaded the prospect of an American invasion and victory. De Gaulle had to flee to England for his life, as Vichy collaborators condemned him to death, and the Vichy leaders switched sides only when it became obvious that the Third Reich would collapse.

A number of ugly facts were also revealed about the Vichy government, such as the anti-Semitic laws which were enacted even before the Germans asked them to do so, and that seventy-five thousand French Jews, including women and children, were rounded up and

shipped off to German death camps, not by German soldiers, but by the French police, some of whom then grabbed their real-estate and other assets. Other embarrassments included the fact that the last group of defenders of the German Reichstag from Soviet troops included French soldiers who, encouraged by the Vichy government, had volunteered to join the German SS. At the end of the war De Gaulle pardoned and promoted many former Vichy partisans. The latter survived and prospered in post-war France, and included men such as François Mitterand, the former president of France, and Hubert Beuve-Méry, the founder of *Le Monde*, France's largest daily paper.

The French communists who supported De Gaulle after the war were also some of the strongest supporters of Lenin, Stalin and the Bolshevik revolution of 1917 in Russia. Like others in the Vichy government, they had also been pro-Nazi until Hitler betrayed them by betraying Stalin and invading Russia, which to them was the communist Garden of Eden. Many French communists continued to believe that Russia was a worker's paradise even after Nikita Khrushchev's incredible mea culpa of 1958 in which he revealed that life under Stalin had been absolute hell, and that the leader of world communism had been a murderer who had tortured and killed millions of his own people, and in the process had created a huge web of gulags and secret police in an effort to communize and control the entire population. French media personalities such as the actor Yves Montand and the philosopher Jean-Paul Sartre, another Vichy partisan who switched sides at the last moment, instead marched in the streets and supported the Soviet "peace efforts" of the 1950s and condemned America. Concerning communist China, Sartre also asserted that "Mao's revolutionary violence was... profoundly moral," revealing how little the French communists truly understood the real Mao Tse-tung, who was a ruthless and vicious mass murderer as a military man, and later an unfeeling tyrant and sexual tyrannosaurus who infected many girls with the venereal diseases he was carrying. European communists completely ignored the stories of Mao's insane cruelty where his victims were hauled through the streets to their execution with rusty wires through their testicles; stomachs were slit open and their hearts scooped out; babies were grabbed and torn apart at the limbs and thrown into wells; and women had teeth pulled out by pliers, noses and ears were twisted off, and then were hacked to death. Alexander Adler an author and former member of the French Communist Youth League recalled, "They would not, could not believe that Stalin and Mao had committed such crimes." Like the Arab denial of the Holocaust, many French communists stubbornly believed that it was actually Russia who had won World War II, and not America.

An intense struggle for political control ensued after the war between the forces of the left and right, with much of the French public simultaneously fearful of and apathetic to the outcome. The French response to the American invasion in Normandy was therefore conflicted and half-hearted. Reminders of the huge US D-Day losses generated feelings of thankfulness as well as guilt, and the ultimate American victory over Germany caused joy as well as resentment. Many of the common people felt and still feel a great debt of gratitude to the American and British forces, especially those who live in the Normandy region of France, but that feeling was not shared by those in power.

### **Language and Culture**

France's long history of European domination where the French language had been the international tongue of diplomacy, and French food, clothing, perfumes, and culture were often the envy of the world, had led to a legendary national arrogance in which the French considered their language and culture to be superior to everyone else. Therefore, the fact that the English language has replaced French as the world's lingua franca was another serious blow to French pride – even the term “lingua franca” is an acknowledgement that French was once considered to be the general tongue. What was even harder for the French to swallow was that the language which replaced theirs in world significance was that of the England, France's long-time enemy and hated rival, as well as the upstart country of America, England's protégé. Through the Académie Française, the quasi-governmental group dedicated to maintaining the purity of the French tongue, the French have attempted to create native language equivalents for every English word and phrase, for example, replacing the word “software” with “logiciel”. But despite those efforts, the international use of French is on the decline, and English is now the global requirement for educated people and necessary for many activities and occupations. In an act of ultimate sacrilege, even the EU Parliament proceedings in Strasbourg are done in English.

### **Anti-Americanism**

In the current age of fast travel and instant communications, the common people of America and Europe have intermingled and enjoy each other's culture. But life is different at the top, and while American politicians generally ignore the French, their counterparts in France despise America. Like the intense all-consuming Arab hatred of the Jews, French politicians have increasingly defined themselves in negative terms – what they are against instead of what they are for. They are against America and everything that America stands for, especially free enterprise and religious liberty. François Mitterand, the former French President, said,

France [i.e., the general French populace] does not know it, but we are at war with America. Yes, a permanent war, a vital war, a war without death. Yes, they are hard, the Americans, they are voracious, and they want undivided power over the world.

French foreign policy, typically obsessed with its own status, has therefore largely come to be based on a knee-jerk anti-Americanism. As Lionel Jospin, a former French prime minister said, “If French is no longer the language of a power, it can be the language of a counter power.” France is aggravated by American success and irritated that Americans ignore them. But at heart the French are conservative and secretly admire America, and their disdain for it is thus driven primarily by the deep emotions of envy and jealousy.

Alain Duchamps, an academic, writes, “We cannot understand why the Americans succeed and have such strength, while we with our moral high ground and intellectual traditions become weaker and weaker and less important to the rest of the world,” thus making a huge assumption that France actually has any moral high ground from which to issue its criticisms.

Dominique Moisi, the historian says, “It is schizophrenic – how could a country of such great culture like France fall so madly in love with American culture? The combination of love and hate is because the US represents a mirror for the French. It is both our dream and our nightmare.”

Jean-Francois Revel, a wartime Resistance hero and member of the Académie Française says in his book, *The Anti-American Obsession*, that the French, “sweepingly condemn American society, branding it as practically the worst association of human beings that history has ever seen,” and that their condemnation is based on “sheer ignorance and/or sheer determination to ignore the facts.”

This anti-American mindset is continually trumpeted and nurtured by the French press, which unlike virtually every other free country in the Western world, is subsidized by and thus beholden to the French government. Not surprisingly, French papers are largely ignored and considered to be irrelevant because they are essentially syncophantic lackeys for French politicians. The total readership of the largest French national dailies such as *Le Monde*, *Libération*, and *Le Figaro* is only around one percent of the French population, and the main readers are the politicians inside the Ile de France, the French equivalent of the American phrase “inside the beltway,” who are continually looking for validation of their own biases. The favorite American in France, especially in French government and media circles, is Michael Moore, the filmmaker, who Henri considered to be a *gros merdy étron*<sup>1</sup> that should be flushed.

This intense negative bias is, however, usually concealed during moments of world press exposure by gaseous phrases that are spoken with a straight face, such as “France is America’s oldest ally,” or the front page headline from *Le Monde* following the 9/11 attacks – “We are all Americans.” In order to understand such comments and fit them into context, it is helpful to hear the words of a French media executive: “France is a country of compromise. It has become the basis of this culture. Saying one thing while doing another is a way of life here. Cynical behavior is seen as chic. To be called a cynic is to be given a compliment.”

### **Culture of Cynicism and Hypocrisy**

Evidence of French cynicism abounds, and France has always believed that it can exempt itself from rules it tries to force on others. French environmentalists rant about American nuclear waste but say little about the fact that unlike America and every other western country, France produces virtually all of its electricity from nuclear reactors. While much of the rest of the Western world is trying to move away from nuclear power, France has announced its intention to build even more nuclear plants.

Even more blatant is French criticism regarding the Kyoto Treaty on greenhouse gases. America did not have any problems with the spirit of the treaty, but rather with the

---

<sup>1</sup> A fat shitty turd

penalties in the fine print, which essentially made the document a bald attempt to use environmentalism to extract cash from the US and transfer it to third world countries. However, most French cars and trucks run on diesel fuel (called “gasol” in France), which is much more dangerous and polluting than gasoline, and with the largest population of diesel vehicles in Europe, France would never be able to live within its own emission limits if the treaty was ever implemented. Diesel pollution is killing people in France, but it is cheaper than gas, and therefore it is the fuel of choice. Even so it costs over twice as much as gasoline in the US due to exorbitant French taxes.

However, the whopper of French hypocrisy was their accusations against America concerning the 2004 war in Iraq. The destruction of Saddam Hussein and the Ba’athist party may very well have been a huge American mistake by President Bush, as Saddam’s purported weapons of mass destruction turned out to be largely desires in his own mind, and/or they were removed to Syria before they could be found. Iraqis are responsible for their own country and government, and Iraq was therefore not worthy of the American blood and money shed there. Furthermore, US efforts to create an Iraqi democracy fly in the face of the general Islamic desire for a theocratic dictatorship. Virtually every country in the Arab/Muslim world is a dictatorship with all of the associated problems of corruption, poverty, and a down-trodden populace, and many of the political forces in Iraq seek a return to that type of government.

But French animosity toward American objectives was not due to them suddenly getting religion and being concerned for the Iraqi people. In contrast to Jacque Chirac’s moralistic UN stance, France had long been prostituting itself with Saddam and his sons Uday and Qusai, and for years French leaders had propped up the Ba’athist party and ignored Saddam’s brutality. The French government was always involved in major contracts between French companies and foreign governments, and government officials and their political parties typically got a cut of all of the action. A number of prominent politicians had fed from the Iraqi oil trough, including Jacques Chirac, for whom Saddam was a frequent house guest. Chirac came to power and stayed in power by means of payments and kickbacks made to him and his party by Iraq, which allowed him to buy votes and dominate elections. France was the country that continually sold weapons to Iraq, as well as the nuclear reactors that Saddam was attempting to use to create weapons-grade plutonium before they were destroyed by Israel. Virtually the entire arsenal of military weapons that Saddam used against Iran, Kuwait, and his own people were supplied by France. For example, the planes used to spray and kill the Kurds with various biological weapons were all Mirage jets from the Dassault Corporation that had been fitted with aerosol sprayers. The French military industry, including firms such as Dassault and Thompson CSF, actually produced more weaponry for Iraq than they did for domestic consumption and other export nations combined. At some points during their relationship with Saddam, an amazing figure of over sixty percent of French military production went to Iraq. When America took Saddam apart, first in the Gulf war and finally in the 2003 invasion, they destroyed those weapons as if they were toys, and this was a huge embarrassment for France and for the French military firms who had built them.

France was also the main oil dealer for Iraq, and the country's international debt to France was in the billions – all this would potentially be lost if America invaded and the Ba'athist regime was ousted. French intransigence at the UN and their shrill cries of "American unilateralism!" were therefore simply mercenary efforts intended to protect their investment and stop the gravy train from ending, combined with their fear that America would gain even more world influence and prominence at French expense. Memos found in Iraq after the war showed that France had been betraying the US by sending secret information about American actions to the Iraqi government. In regard to French demands that America seek UN approval for action against Iraq, France has repeatedly sent troops to Chad, Congo, and other African nations when French interests were threatened, and did not bother to even inform the UN of its actions.

### **Colonies and International Involvement**

Once the nature of France's colonial involvement is understood, the colossal hypocrisy of their statements about American policy and their lack of any moral high ground whatsoever becomes readily apparent. The history of French involvement in Iraq was not an aberration – it was instead typical of the way French leaders had dealt with all of their foreign interests. Richard Perle sums this up as follows: "Few governments in the world praise human rights more ardently than does the government of France, and few have a worse record of supporting tyrants and killers."

France always considered its African colonies, when it had them, as a *vache* – a cow to be milked – a source of slave labor and cheap resources. The French Foreign Legion, fierce and vicious, created an African empire for France that was administered by back room deals with local dictators or strongmen, similar to the way in which Chirac later dealt with Saddam in Iraq. Elf Aquitaine, the oil company created by Charles De Gaulle, was the designated corporate representative for France in Africa. They were involved in both legitimate business as well as corruption and served the French government in a number of ways: negotiating deals for oil, uranium, and other resources; gathering intelligence; serving as bagmen for political payoffs; laundering money; gun running; and getting the Foreign Legion involved if the dictators and strongmen that they dealt with became too uppity or decided that they wanted to change their business arrangements. Elf was kept on a short leash and the actions of the company were for the most part controlled by the French government through a coterie of quasi-official politicians such as Jacques Foccart, Charles Pasqua, and others who worked for De Gaulle and later French presidents. Elf eventually became involved so deeply in corruption and payoffs to so many countries and competing politicians that it led to resentments, backstabbing, betrayal, and eventually public revelation of a small portion of its filthy and disgusting laundry.

Thus, France did not display even a pretence of interest in the residents of its colonial empire. Instead it used corrupt deals backed by military force to keep the existing regimes in power in order to maintain the flow of resources. This occurred in many African countries such as Rwanda, Gabon, Togo, Cameroon, Congo, Angola, Cote-d'Ivoire, and the Central African Republic, and one of the reasons why Africa has been

kept poor and dependent has been and continues to be French intrusiveness. France's incestuous relationships with Africa became known as "Françafrique" – "friq" is French slang for "cash". Johnathan Fenby in his book *On the Brink*, wrote:

For decades France backed its favored dictators with 8,000 troops stationed across the continent and an equal number on standby at home. In all the French have intervened on more than two dozen occasions since the 1960s to put down rebellions and mutinies, to prop up French friends, and to perpetuate what the *Wall Street Journal* dubbed a "virtual empire." ... At the height of the Rwandan tragedy, France helped to supply weapons to the massacring Hutus [they are French-speaking], who came to be known by the French term of *les génocidaires*, and sent in troops to provide a safe haven for the killers [their targets were the Tutsi people who are English-speaking]... Some years later, *Le Figaro* quoted Mitterand as having said that, "in countries like Rwanda, genocide wasn't such a big deal."

Meanwhile the UN's own commander in Rwanda, General Roméo Dallaire, noted that "there would have been much more of an outcry if people had shot 800,000 mountain gorillas than 800,000 humans." Other reports indicated that the French actually trained the Hutu killing squads themselves, and then pressured the EU to provide \$300 million in funding to establish a large African army in order to "maintain peace." Much of this money would then be used to buy weapons and military expertise from France, providing additional sources of graft for French politicians and the military industry.

The country of Cote-d'Ivoire was handled in typical French style. French traders first came in the 1840s and began a conquest of the interior which was only accomplished after a long war over a series of decades. Their goal was to develop export crops – coffee, cocoa, and palm oil, and they enacted a forced slave-labor system to cultivate the land. But France gradually changed their tactics as independence movements swept Africa. When the country became independent in 1960, France did deals with Houphouët-Boigny, the first president, and helped to prop up his government in return for export concessions. Houphouët-Boigny became the absolute dictator of the country with the assistance of French troops.

In 1965 Jean-Bédél Bokassa, a former sergeant in the French colonial army, became the dictator of the Central African Republic, an impoverished country in the middle of Africa. With the active assistance of the French government he ruled the country with an iron fist for fourteen years, periodically welcoming French politicians and entertaining them, and providing large amounts of uranium for French nuclear reactors. Bokassa drained the country's meager treasury, transferred its assets to private Swiss bank accounts in his own name, and spent millions to stage a huge coronation at which he proclaimed himself emperor. He paid for this largely with IMF loans granted by the French IMF director Michael Camdessus. Like Idi Amin in Uganda, Bokassa became an insane sadist who murdered and dismembered political opponents and other people he did not like, as well as their children. He eventually became so corrupted and cruel that the population revolved, and France had to disown him. When he was deposed and overthrown, his palace refrigerators were found to still be packed with the body parts of his former enemies who he would periodically eat, and he was later accused of



cannibalism. But despite this the French Legion put his cousin David Dacko into power, and Bokassa and his family, 17 wives and 50 children, were granted political asylum in France when he was forced to flee for his life.

In Gabon the French have had a long history of intrusion dating back to De Gaulle and his African bagman Jacques Foccart. Omar Bongo, the President of Gabon came to power in a 1967 coup in which French military forces helped him depose the prior president. Bongo is the longest-serving leader in Africa, and has been supported by French influence all along, winning several sham elections in order to stay in power. Elf Aquitaine had a protected monopoly on Gabonese oil production.

The 1997-98 civil war in Congo-Brazzaville is one of the clearest demonstrations of the naked greed that has characterized French actions in Africa. An election had overturned the rule of the French-supported strongman Denis Sassou-Nguesso and replaced him with Pascal Lissouba. What motivated France to ignore the will of the people in this African country, and to help usher in a civil war that killed thousands of Congolese and impoverished the survivors? Lissouba, seeking to distance himself from the domination of France, had offered oil-drilling contracts to Exxon instead of Elf Aquitaine, which threatened Elf's oil monopoly. With French military assistance, Sassou-Nguesso began a war that ousted Lissouba and returned the country to a military dictatorship. This war was ignored by the press even though it resulted in the death of 10,000 people, and another 800,000 were forced to flee their homes.

The French incursions in Vietnam and elsewhere in Southeast Asia were undertaken for similar reasons as in Africa, and then given over to America when they became too difficult and expensive to handle. This is the French legacy of international involvement.

### **Economics**

Economically, France has descended into a morass of debt, welfare handouts, government micromanagement, and socialistic laziness. Most French workers have five to eight weeks of vacation each year plus holidays, and on top of this the work-week had been reduced to thirty-five hours, resulting in very low worker productivity. One of the recent bestsellers in France was *Bonjour Paresse*, or "Hello Laziness." Virtually the entire country takes off the month of August, and it has become almost impossible to get anything fixed during that time. The problem became so serious that it reached the national level, and the French president declared that companies and workers needed to split their vacations between July and August. The result was that now people cannot get anything fixed in July either.

Even during the rest of the year, getting service in France can be difficult. A woman had purchased a brand-new French-made car, only to run into problems with the car's starter – sometimes it worked and sometimes it did not. The authorized garage refused to even look at it, and the mechanic explained that the warranty only covered the starter in the event of a "full breakdown," not one that happened only occasionally. He gave her the phone number of a twenty-four-hour service line to call in the event that the starter did

fully break down, which it eventually did. When she called the twenty-four-hour hotline, no one answered.

But everyone still expects their government-supported benefits to be paid. French labor unions are a serious problem and a huge drag on the economy – in a stroke of French oxymoronism, there is even a labor union for the unemployed. The French government is by far the largest employer, providing a huge pool of people eager for more regulations to guarantee their jobs, and more taxes to pay their salaries – just so long as others are taxed. Influenced by powerful communist-dominated unions, featherbedding and institutional torpor have become the order of the day. French compulsory public education begins at age two in order to thoroughly indoctrinate the young and ensure that they are not led astray from the pure socialistic mother's milk fed to them by the government.

The English word “entrepreneur” was French in origin, but sadly the French have largely abandoned the word and forgotten its meaning. Stung by high taxes, recalcitrant workers, union strikes, and oppressive government regulations, companies and professionals are increasingly bidding *adieu* and leaving France. It was recently discovered that over 265,000 of the best and brightest doctors, scientists, and engineers had left France in the last ten years, and the best students often go to American universities.

The other popular corporate alternative to leaving the country is seeking tight links to the government in order to obtain favorable treatment and become part of the system of cronyism and corruption that is French government. The corruption is so deep and widespread that most simply shrug it off and feel that it cannot be corrected.

A glaring example of this is past president, Jacques Chirac. Despite Chirac's characterization of himself as coming from a poor background, the reality is that his father was a top executive at Dassault Aviation, and Jacques became a protégé of Marcel Dassault, the owner and founder of the company. When the Germans took over France in 1940, Marcel drove the boy Jacques and his mother to safety in southern France, and later helped to script Chirac's political career, starting with pro-business and lower-taxes speeches, and then becoming a socialist after being elected. Chirac's father François was a partner at Dassault Aviation, and Jacques later rewarded the company with numerous military contracts, even ordering the government to pay Dassault for development costs of outdated versions of Rafale fighter jets over the objections of André Giraud, his defense minister.

Chirac has at least nine pending investigations of fraud and graft, including vote rigging, skimming public contracts, forging invoices, making false expense claims, and paying party activists from public funds. To avoid these, he helped author legislation that prevents him from being prosecuted while in office, and he has the means to ensure that he will “remain in office” of one sort or another for the rest of his life. His trial was set to begin in March 2011, but has been delayed.

Roland Dumas, the disgraced French finance minister, was the President of the Constitutional Council at the time and was responsible for forcing through the changes to French law providing complete judicial immunity for Chirac. Dumas was also one of Saddam Hussein's attorneys, and when his mistress' book *The Whore of the Republic* was published, it raised questions as to who the real whore was – Dumas, his mistress, or both of them.

Corruption is worst at the top, but it has filtered its way into all levels of French government. In French mayoral elections of 2000, eight mayors with criminal records were elected, and another ten have a variety of charges pending against them.

Comparing the productivity of France to America led to French hand-wringing and teeth-gnashing, but instead of reducing taxes, eliminating socialism, and improving competitiveness, French political and business leaders have consistently taken the opposite tact of using crises as an excuse to create even more government controls, and then trying to get others to bail them out. Énarques have a pathological hatred of markets because they hate it when any group of uncredentialed people, i.e., non-énarques, such as stock traders or small business owners, gain any degree of the control that they reserve completely for themselves. Markets and market forces are therefore seen largely as “Anglo-Saxon evil” in the same way that the hapless King John of England, who was actually French, viewed the Magna Carta when he was forced to sign it in 1215. Despite capitalistic influences in France, French political leaders have always hated the free market and have grimly tried to control. They accuse it of all kinds of evil to the detriment of the French public, in a continual replay of King John's resistance to the Magna Carta. The economist John Maynard Keynes observed the following:

Each time the franc loses value, the [French] Minister of Finance is convinced that the fact arises from everything but economic causes. He attributes it to foreigners [i.e., British or Americans] in the corridors of the Stock Exchange, and to the unwholesome and malign forces of speculation. The attitude is rather close to that of the witch doctor who attributes the illness of cattle to the “evil eye,” and the storm to an insufficient quantity of sacrifices made before some idol.

When it came to economics in the EU, France's leadership and involvement was largely centered on strategies of using the value of the euro to support French deficits, and to insure markets for French goods, as well as providing subsidies and protecting French farmers and companies from competition. Essentially the idea was to get others to pick up France's tab to the extent that this was possible.

French finance ministers, énarques all, were obsessed with keeping the value of the French franc high and on par with the German mark, in a policy known as *Franc Fort*. This was done partly because of French pride – a high value for the currency supposedly indicated that the finance ministers were doing their jobs. It was also done because the Maastricht Treaty, which specified the terms of EEC monetary union, required that the currency values of all EU member countries remain within a narrow percentage range of each other. The goal of the French finance ministers was to obtain control of the German *Bundesbank*, the largest and most influential bank in Europe, as well as other German

assets after the European monetary union was finally put in place, so they had to play along and follow the rules until they could achieve this objective. In the meantime the French economy was in decline, and in order to prop up the value of the franc, the finance ministers were forced to keep French interest rates high to satisfy investors so that they would not dump franc-denominated investments and cause a decline in the value of French currency. This caused further erosion in the French economy, with low levels of business growth and high levels of unemployment, all to support a power play on behalf of the French insiders. The real motivations behind European monetary union were therefore not to create a socialistic utopia for the benefit of all as advertised, but rather to create a system where one group could dominate everyone else. The proponents of the system are perfectly willing to screw over the general populace, even those in their own nation, in order to achieve their aims. As one anonymous *énarque* explained, “Of course we want monetary union. Ninety percent of the elite want it. There is a little danger because the people do not want it, but we will take care of that.” French government forces have now largely achieved their goal; Jean-Claude Trichet, a former governor of the Banque de France, a dyed-in-the-wool *énarque*, and by many accounts completely clueless about economics, is currently the president of the European Central Bank.

France’s economic troubles have gotten deeper and more intractable, with a growing gap between rich and poor, rising unemployment at double-digit levels, larger welfare lines, increases in violent crime, hikes in the cost of living, Arab immigrants taking more jobs, and the resulting anger, frustration, apathy, and cynicism of the general populace, who have responded with intense criticism of the government, cheating on their taxes, and trying to grab all of the government benefits and scraps that they can get. The number of bankruptcies in France exceeds those in America despite the fact that the American population is more than four times larger. Many former French commercial success stories such as Airbus and French Telecom are on life support and require continual government bailouts; French Telecom debt exceeds \$15 billion. A recent World Economic study ranked France twenty-sixth among all nations in terms of growth markets – behind Portugal.

It is here that the general business culture of France and other continental EU countries, especially Belgium and Germany, contrasts most sharply with America and Britain. All are capitalistic in that they have a stock market, privately owned corporations, employees, etc., and from 10,000 feet up they look similar. But in America and to a lesser extent Britain, companies operate in a more free-market environment, allowing them to hire and lay off workers, undertake new initiatives, retrench if necessary, and respond more quickly to the changes in the business landscape. They also have fewer government safety nets underneath them to shield them from failure and poor decision-making. Thus companies are forced to make wiser decisions and better use of their resources, and to move more quickly to satisfy their customer’s needs by providing better products at lower prices than their competitors in order to retain their customer’s loyalty.

But in France and much of the EU, companies are micromanaged by the government with little latitude or freedom, in a system known as “corporatocracy,” or “Rhenish

capitalism.” The government creates monopolies and fiefdoms of these companies; staff, money and influence continually moves between the corporations and government in a club-like insider atmosphere that is rife with influence peddling. This makes it very hard for new firms to break in and effectively compete with the existing members of the club, who collude to fix prices and keep newcomers out. This is also true of a few American firms that work closely with the government, but in France and Germany the practice is spread across the entire economy.

Protected companies in general become stodgy, slow, unwieldy, inefficient, dependent on government bailouts, and reluctant to take on new initiatives and employees. Entrepreneurs scare them. In the words the economist Joseph Schumpeter, “It is the oldest, largest, heaviest, and most decayed trees that are most at risk of being uprooted,” by the winds of economic competition. The prospect of having competitors that move faster, provide better products at a lower cost, and therefore threaten their control and eat their lunch, motivates the managers of corporatist companies to take action. But the action that these managers usually take is to hire more lawyers and lobbyists to persuade the government to make new rules to keep entrepreneurs out, rather than focusing their efforts on making their own operations more efficient. Companies and unions together become ossified, and the public has to pay the price in terms of higher taxes and prices, and fewer economic opportunities. Small businessmen and entrepreneurs who are the real engine of economic growth and job creation therefore have few advocates and no real seat at the table in France and the European Union.

Stodgy and ossified companies are typical of all socialist economies. The EU, like Soviet Russia, criticizes free-market systems as being “unfair and cruel to workers”; Mitterand, for example, often sermonized against free-market economics, and was quoted as saying, “money rots the very conscience of the people,” apparently because he and his socialist party knew that principal so intimately, as they themselves were thoroughly corrupted. But the reality is the exact opposite – unemployment is higher in France and Germany than in the US because there are few incentives and many disincentives for entrepreneurs to launch new businesses and hire more people. The main problem with a free-market economy is that power and control becomes democratized and vested in the hands of business owners instead of bureaucrats, which is the real reason why socialistic governments hate it.

Unfunded pension liabilities are another ticking time bomb, especially because France has a negative birth rate, and therefore a declining number of young workers to support retirees. French society has become accustomed to a lifestyle of leisure and children are an inconvenience. The French government provides financial incentives for larger families of three or more children, but even the prospect of money from the government has not convinced many French parents to have more babies. Pension liabilities now total around two hundred percent of the current French GDP and growing.

There are some hopeful signs of individual French companies finally going against the grain and demanding longer workweeks and greater productivity from workers. To its credit, the French government of Chirac and De Villepin has recently attempted to create

job programs for youth, among whom the unemployment rate ranges from twenty-five to fifty percent across France. Companies are hesitant to hire new workers because French law makes it very hard to fire unsatisfactory employees; the government jobs program would attract firms to hire young workers and increase the number of entry-level jobs. But this initiative has met with riots and intense opposition from labor unions, university students, and leftist groups, who are against it because the measure would allow companies to terminate workers. Aside from these efforts, French political leaders in general have lacked the courage to publicly admit that these deep-rooted problems exist, let alone address them, because the solution would involve economic pain and sacrifice that the French are unwilling to make or even to seriously consider. Instead some are griping that even more government subsidies and leisure is needed.

Many books describing these problems have recently been published in France, such as: *France is Falling Down* by Nicolas Baverez, *Adieu to a Departing France* by Jean-Marie Rouart, and *French Disarray* by Alain Duhamel. According to Baverez, “France is becoming an industrial and entrepreneurial desert.” The best recent comparison of the economies of the US vis-à-vis Europe – France, Germany, and Italy – was the book *Cowboy Capitalism: European Myths and American Realities*, by Olaf Gersemann, a German reporter. It has been hailed by top economists as a landmark study in readable economics, and it absolutely demolished the notion that the French and European system of corporatism and social welfare creates a better economy and working environment than the free-market system in America. The European systems are worse in virtually every way unless you are a government insider.

### **France and the Arabs**

During and after World War II the French general and later president Charles De Gaulle was mistrusted and snubbed by the other allied commanders and countries for his arrogance and focus on his own interests. He was deliberately kept in the dark about the timing of the D-Day invasion, and France was not invited to the allied war counsels at Yalta and elsewhere. To salvage French pride, he therefore he began a clever attempt to recreate a French-led empire in competition with America and Russia. He eventually brought France into the European Union, but unlike other internationalists, De Gaulle’s vision was an EU dominated by France, where Germany, the perpetual aggressor, would be kept in a permanent position of subservience. This would enable the French-led Europe to become a rival to the United States and would restore France to its former position of world dominance.

What is less well-known is that De Gaulle also began a union of Arab and African countries with essentially the same purposes. Unlike both England and America, which had to a great degree given up their colonial domains, De Gaulle’s goal was to rebuild the French colonial empire under a different guise that was indirect and hidden, in order to continue providing oil and other resources to France on favorable terms.

Algeria was the original foundation of French colonialism. This large and influential African nation was conquered by French forces in 1830 and formed the basis of French ambition for an African colonial empire which was undertaken in order to compete with their archrivals, the British. The vision of Napoleon III in the 1860s was a French empire stretching from Algeria to Turkey, but France was never able to fully accomplish this, and a few years later they were defeated by the Germans in the Franco-Prussian War of 1870, in which Napoleon III himself was captured and sent into exile. French daydreams of empire were thus crushed, and further dismembered by the African independence movements. De Gaulle seemingly washed his hands of Algeria following the violent independence movement of 1954; thousands of people with European roots known as  *pied-noirs*  and living in Algeria, were caught in the crossfire – persecuted by the Muslims and abandoned by France. But even though the old-style colonial rule ended, France was not finished with Africa, and De Gaulle adopted a more subtle policy of behind-the-scenes control via the French Foreign Legion and Elf Aquitaine.

France has been deeply with involved with the Arab and Islamic world for a long time. Napoleon III styled himself as the “protector of Islam,” and along with help from the Vatican which controlled the Christian holy sites in Israel, France resisted the efforts of Jews in Palestine to gain influence, especially when the British began to establish a Jewish protectorate there during and after WWI. France has therefore long been the most anti-Semitic of all of the Western nations, and the French-Arab connection has great appeal for both parties, as it was based on their mutual antipathy toward Israel, America and Britain.

### **Arab Response to French Initiatives**

But the Arab countries had a different idea. Unlike the rest of the world they unite with others not on the basis of history, economics, or even ethnicity, but strictly in terms of religion. Their allegiance is to Islam, and that is the main factor in forming international alliances. Arab and Muslim politics is, to a large extent, simple and binary: if you are Muslim, you are a brother, if not, you are an enemy. This has not stopped Muslim countries from warring against each other, usually with the claim or the excuse that the other’s religion has been corrupted, but in times of crisis they unite against their common enemies. Moslem armies had almost succeeded in conquering Europe in the centuries following Muhammad, and they saw the French initiative as a chance to finish the process and bring France and ultimately the rest of Europe back under the dominion of Islam.

Islamic societies in general are not interested in personal freedom. Their goal is the opposite – the conformity of the entire society to the will of the Allah as interpreted by those in power, therefore it is not surprising that every Islamic nation in the world is a dictatorship or one sort of another. One Iranian had this to say about his own country:

Today we are all poor third-world countries sinking deeper and deeper day after day. Human rights are non-existent, women are second-class citizens, minorities are persecuted, poverty is rampant, and we are known as nations of terrorists. This is what Islam has given us. Look at our countries; all Islamic counties; look at us!

See how miserable, barbaric and pitiful our societies are. If we are not fighting with others, we are fighting among each other. What do you expect from a people who are brought up to believe that [as said by Muhammad], “Paradise is under the shade of the sword”? What do you expect of people that eulogize martyrdom and celebrate death? What do you expect from a society whose spiritual leader [Ayatollah Khomeini] said, “Economy is for the donkey”? What do you expect from a society that dresses up their toddlers as suicide bombers?

### **Dhimmitude and the Islamic World View**

In Islamic thought the world is divided into two portions: *Dar al-Islam* – the “House of Islam” where Muslims rule and where *Sharia* – Islamic law is in effect, and *Dar al-Harb* – the “House of War” which consists of the rest of the world. Jihad will therefore continue until the entire world is conquered and/or converted and brought into Dar al-Islam. Included in the House of Islam are *dhimmis*, non-Muslim regions and peoples that have been conquered and are now subservient and obedient to Islam.

Jews and Christians under Muslim rule had to acknowledge the superiority of Islam at all times, and criticism of Sharia drew extreme punishment. Dhimmi peoples had to adopt a servile language and obsequious demeanor for their own preservation. The law stated that dhimmis were permanently inferior and should be continually humiliated; the life of a dhimmi man was valued at half that of a Muslim, and half again less for a dhimmi woman. Dhimmis were forbidden to possess arms and could not defend themselves from either physical or legal attacks – they could only beg for mercy. They could be judged under the provisions of their own laws, but dhimmi legislation was not recognized in Muslim courts, and Sharia always superceded dhimmi law. Dhimmis were forbidden to have authority over Muslims, to own or buy land, to marry Muslim women, or to have Muslim servants. They were also required to wear distinctive and subservient clothing, their living arrangements were regulated, and they could not ride a horse or a camel. A dhimmi had to hurry through the streets, passing only on the left (impure) side of a Muslim; he also had to lower his eyes and accept any and all insults without reply. Fawning and cravenness were thus the prescribed dhimmi behavior and attempts at resistance and independence were met by harsh reprisals. Slavery was and is officially sanctioned as long as the slaves are non-Muslim, and some Muslim countries still continue to allow this practice. In Saudi Arabia, for example, slavery was not banned until 1966, but it still continues in covert and hidden ways.

Killing a Muslim is a crime punishable by death, but if a Muslim kills a non-Muslim it is a misdemeanor under Sharia law. Violence by Muslims against non-Muslims is often ignored and even encouraged, and the killing of Jews is noble and commendable. For example, in the Palestinian town of Taibe in Samaria the cars and houses of Arab Christians were firebombed by Muslims, and the residents of the town forced to flee as their homes burned to the ground. The Palestinian Authority police force did not even bother to show up until hours later. The reason for this action was that a Christian man from the town dated a Muslim woman, and the entire Christian settlement was attacked in revenge. The woman was forced to drink poison and murdered by her own family in what



is known as an “honor killing.” These are common among many Muslims in the Arab and African world, and are considered the appropriate action to take in such circumstances.

In Afghanistan there are many crimes against Sharia law occurring daily with impunity, such as opium dealing, alcohol being sold publicly, and prostitution. But something recently happened there that is supposedly much more deadly – an Islamic man named Abdul Rahman converted to Christianity. He was arrested, thrown in jail, and faced the death penalty, but was released on the grounds of “mental instability” after political pressure was applied to the Afghani government by the US. Furthermore the judge, the attorneys, and his family all agree that he should die, and he did not even have a lawyer. His father told reporters, “You cannot make anything out of such a son – he is useless”; one of his jailers was quoted as saying, “We will cut him into little pieces”; a Muslim cleric in a nearby town declared that “Abdul Rahman must be killed – Islam demands it”; and after he was released, crowds of Afghani people marched in protest of the court decision, shouting “Death to Christians!”

Another example of dhimmitude in action is in Jakarta, Indonesia, which is largely Islamic. Several Muslim children came to play with Christian kids at a church-run school. When this was discovered Muslims went into a rage; the women running the school were put on trial and sent to prison for three years. Hundreds of Muslim activists were bused to the courtroom each day by Islamic societies; they stormed the trial, disrupted the proceedings, and threatened the judges as well as the entire Christian community with death unless a guilty verdict was returned. Many of the churches in the area were firebombed and forced to close because of Muslim hate attacks directed against them, and Islamic radicals have engaged in targeted beheadings, torture, and property destruction of Christians while the police looks the other way.

Dhimmi laws were not historically enforced to the same extent in all Islamic societies, but they clearly have the potential of creating institutionalized discrimination worse than many forms of slavery. Furthermore, Sharia is the law of Allah and the Quran, and thus it is not open to debate or modification. Therefore the conditions described above are, in general, the way that Muslims have treated, and will continue to treat non-Muslims whenever Islam becomes the dominant political force.

### **Andalusia and Historical Revisionism**

To prepare the way for dhimmitude in Europe, Muslim think-tanks have been promoting an historical entity known as *Andalusia*. This was a region in Spain where the Castilians were once a dhimmi society under the rule of the Moorish Caliphate, which invaded Spain in 711, conquered the country by 720, and ruled the land for the next seven-hundred years. According to Islamic propaganda, Andalusia was a golden age for Spain, when a benign Muslim government ruled for the benefit of all, and backward European Neanderthals were civilized by enlightened Islamic rulers. It is alleged that all of Europe was supposedly populated by savage barbarians who owed the entire development of their culture to Islam. Jews and Christians were supposedly grateful to live under the protection of Muslim rule, and their scholars were said to have knelt in awe

at the feet of Muslim sages, who had discovered and developed all of the secrets of science.

The noblest civilization ever known to mankind is our Islamic civilization. Today, Western civilization is nothing more than a product of its encounter with our Islamic civilization in Andalusia and other places.  
Sheikh Abd al-Rahman, Imam of the al-Haraam mosque in Mecca, February, 2002

It was the Islamic State that established that established a beacon of science for all humanity in the spheres of engineering and law. The era of the Islamic State became a golden age, at a time when Europe was living a life of ignorance, like beasts, without knowing law, human rights, or women's rights. In France there was [even] debate regarding whether women were considered human. Islam arrived and illuminated the minds of men. Andalusia is testimony to this... Let all hear: this same Islamic culture that enlightened the land, takes precedence over Europe.  
Sheik Jamal Al-Nazzar, from a Friday sermon in Iraq, 2003

The early Muslims produced great mathematicians and scientists, scholars, physicians and astronomers, etc. and they excelled in all fields of knowledge of their times, besides studying and practicing their own religion of Islam... The Europeans had to kneel at the feet of Muslim scholars in order to access their own scholastic heritage.  
Mahathir Muhammad, Prime Minister of Malaysia, 10<sup>th</sup> OIC Summit, October, 2003

Before Israel dies, it must be humiliated and degraded. America will be of no avail to them. Their generals will be of no avail to them. The last of their generals has been forgotten. Allah has made him disappear. He's over. Gone is that Sharon behind whose back they would hide and find shelter, and with whom they would feel relatively secure. Today they have frail leaders... Allah willing, we will make them lose their eyesight, we will make them lose their brains... We say to this West, which does not act reasonably, and does not learn its lessons: by Allah, you will be defeated. Israel will be defeated, and so will whoever supported or supports it... I say to the [European countries]: hurry up and apologize to our nation, because if you do not, you will regret it.  
 Hamas leader Khaled Mash'al, from a sermon in Damascus, 3 February 2006

The problem with the above statements and thinking is that they are all presumptuous lies and half-truths. Virtually all of the advancement in the fields stated above came not from Islam, but from the Greeks, the Romans, Byzantines, Hindu, and Judeo-Christian peoples and cultures.

The Andalusian utopia is also a complete myth, and its actual history was very different than what is stated in Muslim propaganda. There were continual revolts against Muslim rule as well as feuds between competing Muslim groups. Dhimmi uprisings were crushed with massacres, pillaging, deportations, slavery, beheadings, and extreme brutality. As specified in Sharia law, dhimmis could not defend themselves, and if one dhimmi harmed a Muslim, the entire community was liable to enslavement, pillage, and arbitrary killing. The Spanish ultimately engaged in a long series of wars against their hated Moorish

enemies, who had come from North Africa to enslave them. In light of the true history of Spain, the harsh expulsion of the Moors back to North Africa after 1492, becomes completely understandable.

### **Contemporary Jihad**

This pattern of jihad followed by the dhimminization of conquered peoples continues today. For example, the genocide in Sudan, which receives very little press, is a continuing attempt to Islamicize and wipe out the Christian population in the western area of the country. Over two million people have been driven from their homes, and the attacks and firebombing of towns in the west has finally stopped because there are no more towns left to burn; the war is now focused on periodic attacks of refugee camps. Omar al-Bashir, the dictator of Muslim Sudan, is considered by many to be the worst and most vicious dictator in the world.

The recent war in Cote-d'Ivoire also received very little press – like the case of Sudan, it was an attack from the Muslim north on the non-Muslim south. France sent troops to its former colony, but they mostly stayed in protected enclaves and observed the fighting. When the French government attempted to step in and arrest some of the leaders of the northern Muslim forces to quell the violence, they were stopped by a huge outcry from French Muslims who are entirely on the side of the jihadists. As Islamic forces carry out vicious wars of jihad in Africa, Europe and the UN have functioned for the most part as passive observers.

### **Guilt Pandering and the Crusades**

Muslims continually criticize Western attacks against Islam, whereas the many wars of Islamic jihad waged against numerous peoples and countries is completely excused and passed over. The centerpiece of Muslim hate speech is the Crusades, in which Antioch, Jerusalem, and a few other Muslim areas were taken by Christian forces. The Crusades were not an isolated war, but rather were a response to centuries of Muslim aggression in which Persia, Egypt, North Africa, Turkey, Spain, Sicily, Sardinia, Corsica, Malta, and many other regions were all raided and conquered by the sword, and Europe was continually threatened. Muslim speakers lacerate Christians for the Crusader conquest of Jerusalem and the innocents that were killed there, while completely ignoring Muslim aggression which was larger by orders of magnitude. After the Muslims retook the city of Antioch in 1268, the commander ordered that the gates be shut, and every man, woman, and child in the city was hunted down and slaughtered. It was the worst atrocity performed by either side in the entire crusader era, and it was committed by Muslims against Christians.

In America “whiteness” studies are taught on some college campuses in a continual attempt to denigrate the history of white people and generate American guilt over the past treatment of Indians, blacks, and other minorities. This is done to demonize traditional American history and create an environment where demands for reparations and affirmative action will be granted ad infinitum. The same type of teaching occurs on an

even wider basis in Europe to indoctrinate college students with Europe's guilt over the Crusades, as well as to cast the Palestinians as innocent victims, and place all of the blame for the conflict on Israel and America, supposedly the source of world evil. The EU has taken billions of euros from European taxpayers and given it to organizations that will push Eurabia; the money has gone to establish schools, rewrite history books, and fund college professors who preach dhimmitude and anti-Americanism. All of this effort is having an effect: in a 2003 survey conducted by the European Commission, respondents identified Israel as the greatest threat to world peace. Europeans are thus being brainwashed with their own money into believing that America and Israel are their enemies and Islamic societies are their allies, when the very opposite is true. Furthermore, Europe is teaching its children to be ashamed of their own ethnicity and history, and to be apologetic to Muslims in the manner of a craven dhimmi. It is as if Europe leaders are suffering from Stockholm Syndrome – like a battered wife they are identifying with their potential tormentors. Because of the threat of al-Qaeda attacks, Europe supposedly needs to distance itself from the America, but through its continual dhimmi behavior of fawning, pandering, and appeasement they are making themselves contemptible and emboldening Islamic jihadist leaders, as Neville Chamberlain did with Hitler.

### **Muslim/Christian Theological Initiatives**

Arab propagandists have also succeeded in getting a number of Christian and quasi-Christian pastors and theologians to dhimmimize Christianity. Efforts of the extremely liberal World Council of Churches and other groups to eliminate the differences between Islam, Judaism, and Christianity/Catholicism have been twisted by Muslim leaders into a claim that Judaism and Christianity are simply inferior versions of Islam, which has supposedly superceded them. These efforts ignore the unbridgeable gulf between Christianity and Islam. Christianity is a religion of faith based on a divine and human savior who sacrificed himself to satisfy the justice of God, and who called on his followers to love and care for even their enemies. In contrast, Islam is a religion of works where you must perform the five duties; then you are superior to non-believers and are called to fight against them to either conquer or forcibly convert them. Islam is the work of one man who saw a series of visions that were memorized by his followers which eventually became the Quran, and then he died. Christianity is rooted in the Old Testament, written by many authors and going back thousands of years; Christ, the central figure, was killed and then rose from the dead.

A full-blown set of doctrines known as "Palestinian replacement theology" has been developed by Muslim thinkers. It is based on the ancient heresy of Marcionism, which denied the Jewish antecedents to Christianity and sought to eliminate the Old Testament in the Bible. In this theology, Jesus Christ has been co-opted and transformed into a Palestinian who suffered at the hands of evil Jews, in a perverted parody of how current Palestinians are supposedly tortured by Israel. Thus a theological environment is created where Israel and the Jews can be blamed for Muslim aggression, and Christians in America, the supporters of Israel, become the enemy and the bogeyman of both Europe and the Muslim countries, and are relentlessly denigrated by government, media, and

higher education. Sadly, the remaining Arab Christians in Palestine have been so thoroughly dhimminimized and cowed by the Muslim culture of extreme hatred surrounding them that they have been one of the major sources of Christian support for Palestinian replacement theology.

### **The Religion of Peace**

Muslim apologists attempt to downplay and hide all of these actions, and instead present Islam as a religion of peace. This is certainly true for many individual Muslims and families, and it is also true for some Islamic countries, especially in regions where Muslims do not control the government, or where the entire population is Islamic. Many Muslim individuals and families are loving, caring people who reject the messages of hate, and want to live in peace with their neighbors, whether they are Islamic or not. There are also a few brave Muslim leaders who have spoken out and criticized hate speech and warmongering. However, the aim of the Islamic world leadership is to follow Muhammad, their prophet, who commanded them to conquer the world for Allah.

I was ordered to fight all men until they say “There is no god but Allah.”  
Muhammad

I shall cross the sea to their islands to pursue them until there remains no one on the face of the earth who does not acknowledge Allah.  
Saladin

We will export our revolution throughout the world... until the call “There is no god but Allah and Muhammad is the messenger of Allah” is echoed all over the world.  
Ayatollah Khomeini

I was ordered to fight the people until they say there is no god but Allah and his prophet is Muhammad.  
Osama bin Laden

Strict Muslim societies such as Iran seek to return to Sharia law, which demands and institutionalizes subservient dhimmi status for all non-Muslims. Thus, the religious leaders of Islam who supposedly speak for God are continual promoters of intolerance, discrimination, violence, and an all-consuming hatred.

### **Muslim Frustration and Deception**

Why lies behind this hatred and frustration? Like France, the Arabs feel that they were once the world’s most powerful society, and they long for a return to their position of world dominance so that everyone will bow down to them. Furthermore, the Quran teaches the superiority of Muslims over non-Muslims in every way. Therefore, it is intolerable to Muslim leaders and intellectuals that Western societies are wealthier, stronger, and more powerful than those of Islam, and it is especially intolerable that the tiny country of Israel has been able to successfully defy the combined might of the Arab world. Muslims are thus confronted with the agonizing reality that their societies are the

ones that are poor and inferior, but unfortunately they are fixated on and limited by the teachings of the Quran and Sharia law, and therefore they cannot come to terms with reality in order to make the necessary societal changes that would produce the freedom and prosperity that countries such as America and others in the west have experienced. So instead they construct an elaborate web of lies to explain the world to themselves and others.

The recent Danish cartoon debacle is a good example of this need to deceive and to continually press the nerve of hatred. When a dozen anti-Muslim cartoons were first published in a Danish newspaper nobody cared, so the Danish Imam Abu Laban went to work. He added a number of other images that had never been published by the Danes, including a cartoon of a dog taking a Muslim who was kneeling in prayer, and he ultimately claimed that the Danish papers had published 120 cartoons. Similar to the lies that Muslims tell about Jews, Abu Laban warned that the Danes were making a movie designed to mock Muhammad, that the Danish government was burning, desecrating, and banning the Quran, and that it was attempting to outlaw Islam by prohibiting the construction of mosques, which ironically is standard Sharia policy for synagogues and churches in Muslim lands. Eventually his efforts bore fruit – Muslim anger was aroused, Danish products were boycotted, and there were anti-Danish riots in a number of Muslim countries in which fifty people were killed and many injured.

### **Muslim Goals for France and Eurabia**

The Arab objective was thus to turn the French plan to dominate them on its head. France was slated to become the first European land of dhimmitude, followed by Denmark and the rest of Europe. The term *Eurabia* had been coined to describe this political initiative and the resulting combination of European and Arab nations, who have virtually nothing in common except their mutual desire to exploit each other. The Arabs have single-mindedly used the Eurabian initiatives to continually push their two major agenda items: the annihilation of the Jews and the State of Israel, and a universal jihad to Islamicize the entire world. Through alliances with existing anti-Semitic groups in Europe, as well as threats of terrorism and oil shortages, they have succeeded in cowing Europe. European energy fears are largely overblown, because most of the Arab oil-producing nations have one-dimensional economies that are based almost entirely on oil revenue, and they need to sell their oil just as much as Europe needs to buy it. Nevertheless, the general mindset of European leaders toward Arabs is pandering – excusing Palestinian terrorism and legitimizing Palestinian demands to take over Israel and Jerusalem.

French and international journalists cover the Iraq war in microscopic detail, scrambling for any possible errors and scraps of news that would be detrimental to American influence, such as the Abu Ghraib prison conditions, which were front page news for weeks. But the cruel wars of Africa that reveal the disgusting history of French and Islamic perfidy go almost entirely unreported.

### **French Acquiescence and Self-Dhimination in response to Jihad**

French political leaders have actively assisted the dhimminizing process in their own country through immigration laws and employment policies. Citizens of former African colonies were allowed to obtain French citizenship and freely enter the country, and Moorish, Algerian, and Turkish workers were invited to take jobs that the French did not want. Therefore, the population dynamics of France have gradually shifted to the point where between ten and fifteen percent of the population is now Islamic. Muslim women are told to stay home and raise their children, and Arab families are encouraged by their leaders to have large families so that they can become dominant in society more quickly. Exacerbating this trend is the low native French birth rate, and with the substantially higher Muslim birth rate, it is estimated that Muslims will become a majority in France within several decades, if current trends continue.

Since the French revolution of 1789, the government and media of France have been militantly secular and anti-Christian, so the introduction of large numbers of people with a strong and aggressive religious faith was especially distressing. Not having any religion themselves, the French are at a loss as to how to handle this onslaught. As the Arab population has increased, Muslim suburbs and ghettos have developed, especially in the larger cities such as Paris, with corresponding increases in the rates of crime and violence. Native French concern and resentment has also grown, reducing dialog and cooperation, and sometimes causing tense and ugly stand-offs between the two sides. This led to anti-immigration political movements and personalities such as Jean-Marie Le Pen, who surprised the French establishment with the strength of his support, and who has polarized France with his strong rhetoric. Le Pen opponents used the slogan, "Vote for the crook [Chirac] and not the fascist [Le Pen]."

Another result of Muslim immigration into France has been more persecution and hate crimes against Jews, who are a convenient target for the anger of both sides, especially as the French media, under pressure from the Arab League, blames Israel for Muslim aggression. In the words of a French media luminary, Israel is the "shitty little country" that is responsible for all of the Arab and Muslim unpleasantness.

The increasing hostility and alienation that Arab immigrants have experienced cements them as a nation within a nation. Thus, an Islamic fifth column is being created within France, a large pool of potential recruits for Islamic terrorism and jihad. Nevertheless, people scoffed at the notion of any sort of large-scale revolution of French Muslims – how could an outbreak of violence be possible in the most tolerant and advanced society in Europe?