

A Report From Hell: Seine-Saint-Denis (Part Four)

by Hugh Fitzgerald



Pulling down the makeshift camp at Calais had to be done, for the good of the French being threatened in Calais. The fault here is with those breaking the law with their makeshift camp, not with the French authorities who dare to enforce it.

So what can be done? Extreme circumstances have prompted extreme responses, with one French intellectual, Professor Christian Moliner, even suggesting a parallel Muslim state should effectively exist in France, so that any Muslims who wished to do so could follow sharia law, in order to prevent civil disturbances.' He said that if this did not come about, there could be a civil war in France.

Moliner, an author on Islam, stated: 'We can never convert the 30 per cent of Muslims who demand the introduction of sharia law to the merits of our democracy and secularism.

"We are now allowing segregation to take place that does not say its name.'"

This suggestion by Professor Moliner is madness. It shows how unhinged the Muslim invasion of Europe has made people. Were the French to meet the demands of those Muslims in France – by his own calculation, at least two million of them – who want to live under the Sharia, then a parallel state within France, run according to the Sharia, would be created. That means millions of people would be outside the French legal system. Family law would presumably allow for polygyny, would include the right of a husband to beat a “disobedient” wife; would

permit a husband to divorce his wife by uttering the triple-talaq; would give a daughter only half the inheritance rights of a son. The criminal law would include barbaric punishments, including amputations for robbery and stoning for adultery, that in the advanced West we rightly cannot countenance. Instead of religious freedom, apostates from Islam could be subject to execution. As for freedom of speech, those wishing to live under this legal regime would be able to punish "blasphemy," which should shut down any public criticism of Islam or of Muhammad.

There is a better way. That is for the French state to reassert itself, to change the rules before the Muslim population gets even bigger. The government can put an end to Muslim immigration; it has a right to decide whom it will allow to enter and settle, and whom it wants to keep out. It need not be defensive about recognizing the unprecedented menace of Muslim immigrants. It has a responsibility to draw conclusions from, rather than ignore, its experience of large-scale Muslim immigration. Despite the great openness the French initially displayed toward Muslims, and the continuing generosity of the French state, such immigration hasn't worked out. A determined and sustained effort should be made to deport all illegal Muslim migrants. Those who are dual nationals, if found to have supported terrorist groups, should be stripped of their citizenship. The French need to recognize that an undeclared war is being waged by Muslims in France against France. Once this is understood, a legal framework sufficient to the task can be created. Of course, this assumes that the French authorities will come to their senses in time. Ideological surrender born of despair, which is what Christian Moliner counsels with his Sharia proposal, should not be an option.

Even Left-wingers belatedly acknowledge the scale of the problem. Veteran politician Jean-Louis Borloo, a former minister, was this year tasked by President Macron to

research and write a report on the burgeoning problem of the Parisian suburbs.

As well as recommending that €5 billion be spent, he stressed the need for 'national reconciliation', especially in districts facing up to the withdrawal of French identity and community, which in turn fuels xenophobia.

How can the French have “national reconciliation” with Muslims, whose Qur’an teaches them to regard themselves as the “best of peoples” and non-Muslims as “the most vile of creatures”? With Muslims, who are taught to wage violent Jihad against Infidels in over 100 Qur’anic verses, and to “strike terror” in their hearts? With Muslims, who are told to never take Christians and Jews as friends? When, as Borloo says, Muslims withdrew from a French identity and the French community, what should the French have done? They didn’t will it; the Muslims did. Why should the “best of peoples” have to reconcile with the “most vile of creatures”? And if the French feel a justified anger after all the sums that have been and are still being spent on ungrateful and hostile Muslim migrants, happy to pocket still more of French taxpayers’ money (and another 5 billion euros, as suggested by Jean-Louis Borloo, will be pocketed, but not change Muslim hearts and minds), it is wrong to call this “xenophobia.”

France has, after all, been open to the world. It has welcomed millions of other, non-Muslim migrants – refugees from the Spanish Civil War in the 1930s, Portuguese workers in the 1950s, Italian miners throughout the 20th century, and more recently, Latin Americans, Chinese, Vietnamese, Christians from black Africa and the Caribbean, Hindus, Buddhists, even Americans – without any of those migrants causing the problems that arise with Muslim immigrants, not just in France, but all over Europe.

Having had the good fortune to spend much of my working life

reporting from around the world, and Africa in particular, I adore melting pots of different cultures, languages and races.

And I have almost always been treated with kindness and respect in Muslim countries.

In Muslim countries, there is no doubt who rules; the resentment Muslims feel in Infidel lands is absent. When sure of their position, as “the best of peoples,” they have no need to prove their superior status to a visiting journalist. And why not show a little “kindness” and feigned “respect” if the result is good coverage? These are, after all, people well-versed in the art of taqiyya.

Yet, frankly, the time I spent in Paris has convinced me of the difficulty of achieving genuine integration between these defiant, troubled inner-city Muslim communities and mainstream French society.

Indeed, the only person to shake my hand during my visit was the rabbi. Everyone else offered me their wrist, not wanting to touch hands with an infidel – someone unclean.

As a metaphor for what is happening in the French capital, it couldn't be more sad – or more troubling.

Indeed. How can one expect or plan for “national reconciliation” with people who won't even shake your hand because, as an Infidel, you are regarded as unclean? People who think it amusing to pretend to shoot down French helicopters, people who are happy to violate French laws, to openly deal in drugs and stolen goods, to threaten the forces of order, who enter Saint-Denis only in groups of four? And these people, beneficiaries of so much that the French state provides, add to this largesse the sums they make by trafficking in drugs, or by robbing French people on the

street, or burglarizing their homes, at the same time complain that it is they who are being harassed for no apparent reason. It is not Muslims, but Unbelievers, who are afraid to walk the streets, and not just in Saint-Denis.

In this now-deleted Report From Hell, realism briefly broke through, and left Andrew Malone, a veteran journalist, thoroughly alarmed about what he experienced in Saint-Denis and what he fears is still to come. What's to come is even more, and even bigger, Muslim ghettos in France, though these "ghettos" are not forced on Muslims, but rather created by them, as their violent behavior drives out Christians and Jews from whatever area Muslims settle in, in numbers sufficient to make that area their own. It is in those areas that they create an economy based on government benefits and crime, including the drug trade, and – carried out in "French" areas of Paris – street robberies and house burglaries. And it is in Seine-Saint-Denis that jihadis have planned attacks, and after carrying them out, hidden from the police, as did those who were responsible for the mass murders at the Bataclan nightclub.

This report from Saint-Denis is a cautionary tale. The French need to make up for their own earlier optimistic misunderstandings of Islam, that some still cling to, with their dreams of "national reconciliation," and to understand that a silent invasion has taken place in their country, as in much of the rest of Europe. There is still time, using laws now on the books and laws not yet on the books, to reduce the threat in France to manageable proportions. But first you have to recognize, rather than deny, that threat.

Andrew Malone's forthright observations on the Muslim "ghetto" of Seine Saint-Denis are a good place to start. But it is not at all a good sign that the Daily Mail deleted his report under pressure, with promises to restore it that never came to fruition. That incident in itself is an indication that the crisis in France, as well as in Britain and Europe as a whole,

may be too far advanced now to address adequately.

First published in *Jihad Watch*, [here](#) and