

Revisiting Robert Redeker, 2006: Le Coran est un Livre d'Inouïe Violence

As a companion-piece to the editorial by 'Charlie Hebdo' on the subject of Islamisation I think it proper to re-post – in French and in English – the lapidary essay by the French high school teacher and philosopher (philosophe; professeur au lycee), Robert Redeker, that appeared in Le Figaro, September 19, 2006. For he also, whilst intelligently discussing and critiquing the violent figure of Mohammed and the violent content and violent doctrine of the Islamic canonical texts, focuses attention on precisely the same phenomenon as would the Charlie Hebdo editorial on March 30 2016, nine years later: the Islamisation of sensibility in France, “une soumission plus ou moins consciente aux diktats de l’Islam”.

And the response? – a storm of frenzied accusations against the author, made both by Muslims and by Islamophiles, and then a deluge of death threats, issued by Muslims, that resulted in M Redeker having to resign his position and disappear into hiding, where he remains to this day. Just. one. article. he wrote just. one. article, a perfectly truthful and accurate little essay about Islam, and about Mohammed, and about what was happening to the public space, and the public conversation, in France.

At the jihadwatch forum in that year a French contributor supplied the entire text of the article, in French; and thus prevented it from vanishing down the digital memory hole.

Here is the original French.

“Le Coran est un livre d'inouïe violence” (The Qu’ran is a book of extraordinary violence)

Robert Redeker (Philosophe. Professeur au lycée Pierre-Paul-Riquet à Saint-Orens de Gammeville. Va publier Dépression et philosophie (éditions Pleins Feux).

“Les réactions suscitées par l’analyse de Benoît XVI sur l’islam et la violence s’inscrivent dans la tentative menée par cet islam d’étouffer ce que l’Occident a de plus précieux qui n’existe dans aucun pays musulman : la liberté de penser et de s’exprimer.

“L’islam essaie d’imposer à l’Europe ses règles : ouverture des piscines à certaines heures exclusivement aux femmes, interdiction de caricaturer cette religion, exigence d’un traitement diététique particulier des enfants musulmans dans les cantines, combat pour le port du voile à l’école, accusation d’islamophobie contre les esprits libres.

Comment expliquer l’interdiction du *string* à Paris-Plages, cet été ? Étrange fut l’argument avancé : risque de «*troubles à l’ordre public*». Cela signifiait-il que des bandes de jeunes frustrés risquaient de devenir violents à l’affichage de la beauté ? Ou bien craignait-on des manifestations islamistes, via des brigades de la vertu, aux abords de Paris-Plages ?

“Pourtant, la non-interdiction du port du voile dans la rue est, du fait de la réprobation que ce soutien à l’oppression contre les femmes suscite, plus propre à «troubler l’ordre public» que le *string*.

“Il n’est pas déplacé de penser que cette interdiction traduit une islamisation des esprits en France, une soumission plus ou moins consciente aux diktats de l’islam.

“Ou, à tout le moins, qu’elle résulte de l’insidieuse pression musulmane sur les esprits. Islamisation des esprits : ceux-là même qui s’élevaient contre l’inauguration d’un Parvis Jean-Paul-II à Paris ne s’opposent pas à la construction de mosquées. L’islam tente d’obliger l’Europe à se plier à sa vision de l’homme.

“Comme jadis avec le communisme, l’Occident se retrouve sous surveillance idéologique.

“L’islam se présente, à l’image du défunt communisme, comme une alternative au monde occidental.

“À l’instar du communisme d’autrefois, l’islam, pour conquérir les esprits, joue sur une corde sensible. Il se targue d’une légitimité qui trouble la conscience occidentale, attentive à autrui : être la voix des pauvres de la planète.

“Hier, la voix des pauvres prétendait venir de Moscou, aujourd’hui elle viendrait de La Mecque !

“Aujourd’hui à nouveau, des intellectuels incarnent cet oeil du Coran, comme ils incarnaient l’oeil de Moscou hier. Ils excommunient pour islamophobie, comme hier pour anticommunisme.

“Dans l’ouverture à autrui, propre à l’Occident, se manifeste une sécularisation du christianisme, dont le fond se résume ainsi : l’autre doit toujours passer avant moi. L’Occidental, héritier du christianisme, est l’être qui met son âme à découvert. Il prend le risque de passer pour faible.

“À l’identique de feu le communisme, l’islam tient la générosité, l’ouverture d’esprit, la tolérance, la douceur, la liberté de la femme et des moeurs, les valeurs démocratiques, pour des marques de décadence.

“Ce sont des faiblesses qu’il veut exploiter au moyen «d’idiots utiles», les bonnes consciences imbues de bons sentiments, afin d’imposer l’ordre coranique au monde occidental lui-même.

“Le Coran est un livre d’inouïe violence.

“Maxime Rodinson énonce, dans *l’Encyclopédia Universalis*, quelques vérités aussi importantes que taboues en France.

“D’une part, «Muhammad révéla à Médine des qualités insoupçonnées de dirigeant politique et de chef militaire (...) Il recourut à la guerre privée, institution courante en Arabie (...) Muhammad envoya bientôt des petits groupes de ses partisans attaquer les caravanes mekkoises, punissant ainsi ses incrédules compatriotes et du même coup acquérant un riche butin».

“D’autre part, «Muhammad profita de ce succès pour éliminer de Médine, en la faisant massacrer, la dernière tribu juive qui y restait, les Qurayza, qu’il accusait d’un comportement suspect».

“Enfin, «après la mort de Khadidja, il épousa une veuve, bonne ménagère, Sawda, et aussi la petite Aisha, qui avait à peine une dizaine d’années. Ses penchants érotiques, longtemps contenus, devaient lui faire contracter concurremment une dizaine de mariages».

“Exaltation de la violence : chef de guerre impitoyable, pillard, massacreur de juifs et polygame, tel se révèle Mahomet à travers le Coran.

“De fait, l’Église catholique n’est pas exempte de reproches. Son histoire est jonchée de pages noires, sur lesquelles elle a fait repentance.

“L’Inquisition, la chasse aux sorcières, l’exécution des philosophes Bruno et Vanini, ces mal-pensants épicuriens, celle, en plein XVIIIe siècle, du chevalier de La Barre pour impiété, ne plaident pas en sa faveur.

“Mais ce qui différencie le christianisme de l’islam apparaît : il est toujours possible de retourner les valeurs évangéliques, la douce personne de Jésus contre les dérives de l’Église.

“Aucune des fautes de l’Église ne plonge ses racines dans l’Évangile. Jésus est non-violent. Le retour à Jésus est un

recours contre les excès de l'institution ecclésiastique.

“Le recours à Mahomet, au contraire, renforce la haine et la violence. Jésus est un maître d’amour, Mahomet un maître de haine.

“La lapidation de Satan, chaque année à La Mecque, n’est pas qu’un phénomène superstitieux.

“Elle ne met pas seulement en scène une foule hystérisée flirtant avec la barbarie.

“Sa portée est anthropologique. Voilà en effet un rite, auquel chaque musulman est invité à se soumettre, inscrivant la violence comme un devoir sacré au cœur du croyant.

“Cette lapidation, s’accompagnant annuellement de la mort par piétinement de quelques fidèles, parfois de plusieurs centaines, est un rituel qui couve la violence archaïque.

“Au lieu d’éliminer cette violence archaïque, à l’imitation du judaïsme et du christianisme, en la neutralisant (le judaïsme commence par le refus du sacrifice humain, c’est-à-dire l’entrée dans la civilisation, le christianisme transforme le sacrifice en eucharistie), **l’islam lui confectionne un nid, où elle croîtra au chaud.**

“Quand le judaïsme et le christianisme sont des religions dont les rites conjurent la violence, la délégitiment, l’islam est une religion qui, dans son texte sacré même, autant que dans certains de ses rites banals, exalte violence et haine.

“Haine et violence habitent le livre dans lequel tout musulman est éduqué, le Coran.

“Comme aux temps de la guerre froide, violence et intimidation sont les voies utilisées par une idéologie à vocation hégémonique, l’islam, pour poser sa chape de plomb sur le monde.

Benoît XVI en souffre la cruelle expérience. Comme en ces temps-là, il faut appeler l'Occident «le monde libre» par rapport à au monde musulman, et comme en ces temps-là les adversaires de ce «monde libre», fonctionnaires zélés de l'oeil du Coran, pullulent en son sein.”

And now, in English. Translation as originally supplied at the following site (I hope that the link remains valid).

<http://extremecentre.org/2006/09/28/robert-bedeker-english-translation/>

“What should the free world do while facing Islamist intimidation?”

“The reactions caused by Benedict XVI’s analysis of Islam and violence highlight the underhanded maneuver carried out by Islam to stifle what the West values more than anything, and which does not exist in any Moslem country: freedom of thought and expression.

“Islam tries to impose its rules on Europe: opening of public swimming pools at certain hours reserved exclusively for women, ban on caricaturing this religion, demands for special diets for Muslim children in school cafeterias [*and beyond that, the process that ‘Charlie Hebdo’ has noticed, the Muslim imposition of Muslim food taboos upon **everyone**, the normalising of ‘halal’, the gradual disappearance of traditional Infidel foods such as ham and bacon as Muslims, more and more, ‘take over’ the food industry or bend it to their will – CM*], struggle to impose the veil at school, accusations of Islamophobia against free spirits.

“How can one explain the ban on the wearing of thongs [*that is, ‘le string’, the string bikini – CM*] on the Paris-Beaches* this summer? The reasoning put forth was bizarre: women wearing thongs would risk “disturbing the peace”. Did this mean that bands of frustrated youths would become violent while being offended by displays of beauty? Or were the

authorities scared of Islamist demonstrations by virtue squads near Paris-Beaches?

“However, the authorization of the veil on the street is more disturbing to public peace than wearing a thong, because it invites complaints against the upholding of the oppression of women.

“This ban represents an Islamization of sensibilities in France, a more or less conscious submission to the diktats of Islam.

“At the very least it is the result of the insidious Muslim pressure on people’s minds: even those who protested the introduction of a “Jean Paul II Square” in Paris would not be opposed to the construction of mosques. Islam is trying to force Europe to yield to its vision of humanity.

Robert Redeker is here making exactly the same point as the editor/s of ‘Charlie Hebdo’. – CM

“As in the past with Communism, the West finds itself under ideological watch.

“Islam presents itself, like defunct Communism, as an alternative to the Western world. In the way of Communism before it, Islam, to conquer spirits, plays on a sensitive chord. It prides itself on a legitimacy which troubles Western conscience, which is attentive to others: it claims to be the voice of the oppressed of the planet. Yesterday, the voice of the poor supposedly came from Moscow, today it originates in Mecca! Again, today, western intellectuals incarnate the eye of the Koran, as they have incarnated the eye of Moscow. They now excommunicate people for Islamophobia, as they once did for anti-communism.

“This openness to others, specific to the West, is a secularization of Christianity that can be summarized thus: the other person must come before myself. The Westerner, heir

to Christianity, is the one that bares his soul. He runs the risk of being seen as weak. **With the same ardor as Communism, Islam treats generosity, broadmindedness, tolerance, gentleness, freedom of women and of manners, democratic values, as marks of decadence.**

“They are weaknesses that it seeks to exploit, by means of useful idiots, self-righteous consciences drowning in nice feelings, in order to impose the Koranic order on the Western world itself.

“The Koran is a book of unparalleled violence.

“Maxime Rodinson states, in *Encyclopedia Universalis*, some truths that in France are as significant as they are taboo. On one hand: “Mohammed revealed in Medina unsuspected qualities as political leader and military chief (...) He resorted to private war, by then a prevalent custom in Arabia (...). Mohammed soon sent small groups of partisans to attack the Meccan caravans, thus punishing his unbelieving compatriots and simultaneously acquiring the booty of a wealthy man.”

‘There is more: “Mohammed profited from this success by eradicating the Jewish tribe which resided in Medina, the Quarayza, whom he accused of suspect behaviour.”

‘And: “After the death of Khadija, he married a widow, a good housewife, called Sawda, and in addition the little Aisha, barely ten years old. His erotic predilections, held in check for a long time, led him to ten simultaneous marriages.”

‘A merciless war chief, plunderer, slaughterer of Jews and a polygamist, such is the man revealed through the Koran. *And in the Sira and the Sahih Hadiths. Indeed, the details M Redeker is here recounting are primarily to be found not in the Quran but in the other components of the Islamic trilogy, the Sira or life of Mohammed, by Ibn Ishaq, and the Hadiths. – CM*

‘Of course, the Catholic church is not above reproach. Its

history is littered with dark pages, for which it has officially repented. The Inquisition, the hounding of witches, the execution of the philosophers Giordano Bruno and Vanini, those wrong-thinking Epicureans, in the 18th century the execution of the knight of La Barre for impiety, do not plead in the church's favor.

'But what differentiates Christianity from Islam is obvious: it is always possible to go back to true principles of the Gospels, the peaceful character of Jesus as opposed to the deviations of the Church.

'None of the faults of the Church have their roots in the Gospel. Jesus is non-violent. Going back to Jesus is akin to forswearing the excesses of the Church.

'Going back to Mahomet, on the contrary, reinforces hate and violence. Jesus is a master of love; Mahomet is a master of hatred.

'The stoning of Satan, each year in Mecca, is not only an obsolete superstition. It not only sets the stage for a hysterical crowd flirting with barbarity. Its meaning is anthropological. Here is a rite, which each Muslim is invited to submit to, that emphasizes violence as a sacred duty in the very heart of the believer.

'This stoning, accompanied each year by the accidental trampling to death of some of the believers, sometimes up to several hundreds, is a rite that feeds archaic violence.

'Instead of getting rid of this archaic violence, and thus imitating Judaism and Christianity (Judaism starts when it abandons human sacrifice, and enters civilization; Christianity transforms sacrifice through the Eucharist), Islam builds a nest for this violence, where it will incubate.

'Whereas Judaism and Christianity are religions whose rites spurn violence, by delegitimizing it, Islam is a religion that

exalts violence and hatred in its everyday rites and sacred book.

'Hatred and violence dwell in the book with which every Muslim is brought up, the Koran.

'As in the Cold War, where violence and intimidation were the methods used by an ideology hell bent on hegemony, so today Islam tries to put its leaden mantel all over the world.

'Benedict XVI's cruel experience bears witness to this.

'Nowadays, the West has to be called the "free world" in comparison to the Muslim world; likewise, the enemies of the "free world", the zealous bureaucrats of the Koran's vision, swarm in the very center of the free World.'

Words as true today as when they were written nine years ago. Let them stand alongside that 'Charlie Hebdo' editorial, as a warning to those who continue to refuse to see the direct connection between Him Who Must Not be Named, They Who Must Not be Named, The Religion That Must Not be Named, and... the pile of dead and maimed Infidels in the airport and on the train in Brussels... as also in many, many other places across the world.