

# Unholy Alliance

**"AN ABSOLUTELY SUPERB BOOK. HOROWITZ** masterfully portrays the Hitler-Stalin Pact of our time. The totalitarian movements we defeated in the twentieth century have mutated. Now Islamist fanatics and today's far Left make common cause to the same end as their predecessors—the destruction of freedom."

—R. JAMES WOOLSEY,  
Former CIA Director

In this tour de force on the most important issue of our time, David Horowitz confronts the paradox of how so many Americans, including the leadership of the Democratic Party, could turn against the War on Terror in Iraq. He finds an answer in a political Left that shares a view of America as the "Great Satan" with America's radical Islamic enemies. This Left, which once made common cause with Communists, has now joined forces with radical Islam in attacking America's defenses at home and its policies abroad. From their positions of influence in the university and media culture, leftists have defined America as the "root cause" of the attacks against it. In a remarkable exploration of the "Mind of the Left," Horowitz traces the evolution of American radicalism from its Communist past to its "anti-war" present. He then shows how this Left was able to turn the Democratic Party presidential campaign around and reshape its views on the War on Terror.

Horowitz's *Unholy Alliance*, writes John Haynes, the noted historian of American Communism, "is an insightful, brilliant examination of the mental world of the radical Left. Horowitz shows how today's radicals, unwilling to reflect on the internal flaws that destroyed

*continued on back flap*

Marxism-Leninism from within, have embraced an all-consuming nihilism in its place. This has led them to a hatred of American institutions and a solidarity with Islamic terrorists that makes the radical Left more properly regarded as dangerous than loony."

*Unholy Alliance* is an eye-opening book that should unsettle conventional assumptions and reveals why intellectuals and political leaders who applaud Michael Moore are no laughing matter. As Harvey Klehr, co-author of *Venona: Decoding Soviet Espionage in America*, writes, "The world Communist movement may be moribund, but its habits of mind and ideological fantasies have not disappeared. This is a fascinating and depressing account."



**DAVID HOROWITZ** is a nationally known author and lifelong civil rights activist. He was one of the founders of the New Left movement in the 1960s. He has written numerous books, including *The Politics of Bad Faith*, *The Art of Political War*, and *Radical Son*, his celebrated autobiography. He is president of the Center for the Study of Popular Culture and the founder of online newsmagazine FrontPageMag.com.

**"DAVID HOROWITZ IS ONE OF AMERICA'S** deepest thinkers about the Left. *Unholy Alliance* is a convincing review of key developments since the collapse of the Soviet Union with a focus on the growing cooperation of the American Left with Islamists bent on America's destruction."

—DANIEL PIPES



Since 1947  
**REGNERY  
PUBLISHING, INC.**

An Eagle Publishing Company • Washington, DC  
www.regnery.com

Distributed to the trade by National Book Network,  
Lanham, Maryland  
Jacket design by Amber Collieran  
Author photo by April Horowitz

---

# 10

---

## Neo-Communism IV: The Nihilist Left

Noam Chomsky is a cult figure among contemporary radicals and their leading intellectual figure. A *New Yorker* profile has identified him improbably as "one of the greatest minds of the twentieth century," while the left-wing English *Guardian* refers to him as the "conscience of a nation."<sup>74</sup> No individual has done more to shape the anti-American passions of a generation. When Chomsky speaks on university campuses, which he does frequently, he draws ten times the audiences that other intellectuals and legitimate scholars normally do. Abroad he has attracted individual audiences as large as ten thousand. According to the academic indexes that establish such rankings, Chomsky is one of the ten most quoted sources in the humanities, ranking just behind Plato and Freud. His most recent tract on the events of 9/11 sold two hundred thousand copies in America alone, despite the fact that it is not really a book but a series of rambling interviews of pamphlet length.<sup>75</sup> Of the hundred odd "books" on current affairs subjects he has published, all but a handful amount to similar collections of table talk, a further indication of the cultlike nature of his influence.

Chomsky claims to be an anarchist, which frees him from the burden of having to defend any real-world implementation of his ideas. In fact, he does not take his "anarchist" ideas very seriously, either as a program or an intellectual doctrine. His comments on the subject in a political career spanning nearly half a century amount to mere fragments—an article here, an isolated passage there. Moreover, his commitment to anarchist principles, which would presumably entail the rejection of all forms of social hierarchy and coercion, is highly selective. He is more than willing to support "centralized state power" when it is mobilized against private businesses,<sup>76</sup> and defends Marxist dictatorships in Nicaragua, Cuba, Vietnam, and other Third World countries—like Iraq—when they are engaged in conflicts with the United States. Even considered strictly as ideas, Chomsky's anarchist thoughts, if they can be dignified as such, are at base authoritarian and therefore incoherent.<sup>77</sup> The utility of Chomsky's anarchism is to provide an impossibly perfect model of freedom by which to judge the democracies of Western societies as "fascistic" and "oppressive."

The destructive antipathy of radicals like Chomsky toward the existing social order in the West is, as noted, a form of political nihilism. Revolution is a two-sided enterprise. In order to create the revolutionary future, it is necessary first to mobilize massive hatred against the existing world in order to destroy it. Political nihilism is the half of the revolutionary project that has remained intact after the collapse of the Soviet bloc. If no practical model of the revolutionary future exists—and none is possible—then revolution is destruction and nothing else.

Nihilism is manifest even in Chomsky's prose style. "To read Chomsky's recent political writing at any length is to feel almost physically damaged," observes *New Yorker* reporter, Larissa MacFarquhar. "The effect is difficult to convey in a quotation because it

is cumulative. The writing is a catalogue of crimes committed by America, terrible crimes, and many of them; but it is not they that produce the sensation of blows: it is Chomsky's rage as he describes them. His sentences slice and gash, envenomed by a vicious sarcasm. . . . He uses certain words over and over, atrocity, murder, genocide, massacre, murder, massacre, genocide, atrocity, atrocity, massacre, murder, genocide. . . . Chomsky's sarcasm is the scowl of a fallen world, the sneer of Hell's veteran to its appalled *naifs*.<sup>78</sup> It is, in fact, a form of literary fascism, attempting to bludgeon the reader into acceptance.

Larissa MacFarquhar's *New Yorker* profile made its appearance just after the successful liberation of Baghdad, and began with three characteristic Chomsky observations. These capture a worldview that is not interested in criticizing particular policies that Americans may have pursued, but in alleging atrocities of such magnitude that America will be condemned in its essence:

When I look at the arguments for this war, I don't see anything I could even laugh at. You don't undertake violence on the grounds that maybe by some miracle something good will come out of it. Yes sometimes violence does lead to good things. The Japanese bombing of Pearl Harbor led to many very good things.<sup>79</sup>

These comments are noteworthy both for their malice toward America and their misrepresentation of historical events. The interview was conducted before the war, which was concluded in a few weeks, perhaps the swiftest and most bloodless conquest on record. Obviously the military planners of Operation Iraqi Liberation did not count on a "miracle" to achieve a positive result but had reasonable expectations that their objective was both practical and worthwhile.

Any reasonable observer of American policymakers would have assumed this before the war began. The very absurdity of Chomsky's claim underscores the irrational nature of his attack.

The second half of Chomsky's statement is even more perverse, if possible. There are innumerable cases Chomsky might have offered as examples of justifiable violence. The sneak attack on Pearl Harbor is not one of them. Even the Japanese concede that. This makes his point appear preposterous, which is a calculated Chomsky effect. It is his way of setting up an equally typical Chomsky "revelation" for the naifs in hell. Chomsky's choice of Pearl Harbor as an act of noble violence is his attempt to refute the argument for the war on terror in its very core.

Pearl Harbor, as Chomsky is well aware, has been invoked as a historical analogue for 9/11. By using the same parallel, Chomsky intends to reverse the meaning of both events. Like 9/11, Pearl Harbor is an event symbolizing America's shattered innocence and its determination to respond to a malevolent aggressor. Praising the act of infamy is Chomsky's way of assaulting America's will to defend itself. In reversing the meaning of both events, Chomsky expresses the loathing he feels for his own country and provides the Left with a rationale for opposing America's self-defense.

Chomsky's view of Pearl Harbor echoes not only his view of 9/11 but also Osama bin Laden's. Bin Laden claimed that 9/11 was a response to America's "invasion" of the holy lands of Islam. Thus Chomsky explains how Pearl Harbor led to good things: "If you follow the trail, [Pearl Harbor] led to kicking Europeans out of Asia—that saved tens of millions of lives in India alone. Do we celebrate that every year?"

In point of historical fact, Pearl Harbor led to the eventual expulsion of the Japanese empire from Asia, where its brutal rule left behind a trail of atrocities in China, Korea, Malaya, and elsewhere.

But acknowledging these realities would undermine Chomsky's case. His reference to tens of millions of Indian lives saved by independence (which had nothing to do with Pearl Harbor or its effects) is another Chomsky fiction that stands history on its head. One of the recognized achievements of British rule in India was to establish internal peace in place of the intercommunal violence that existed previously and that has recurred ever since. Whatever else may be said of British rule, it *saved* Indian lives that would otherwise have been lost to this violence, a fact epitomized in the communal slaughter that was initiated in the precise moment the British departed. A million Indians were killed in the civil strife that broke out between Hindus and Muslims on the eve of independence, leading to the partition of the country and the creation of a Muslim state in Pakistan.

It is difficult to know if Chomsky believes his own lies. In the very same *New Yorker* profile, Chomsky indicates—without acknowledging any irony or contradiction—that kicking Europeans out of Asia in his view actually led to very bad results. In a comment condemning the Bush family for inviting foreign dictators to Washington, Chomsky names several of the leaders of postwar Asia he despises: “[A gangster] they loved was [Indonesia’s] General Suharto. Another they adored was Marcos of the Philippines. In every single one of these cases, the people now in Washington supported them right through their worst atrocities. Are these the people you would ask to bring freedom to Iraqis?” Marcos was actually ousted by the United States. Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz, one of the planners of Operation Iraqi Freedom, was one of the architects of the new democracy in the Philippines created following Marcos’s exit.

Chomsky’s twisted history reflects the core belief of anti-American radicals that the United States can do no right. Assailing the

victims of Pearl Harbor, for example, is only a small part of Chomsky's distorted account of World War II. To establish a credible picture of American perfidy, he must deny the United States's role in the Allied victory over a global evil. Thus the *New Yorker* profile reports the following Chomsky comment to a college audience: "The United States and Britain fought the war, of course, but not primarily against Nazi Germany. The war against Nazi Germany was fought by the Russians. The German military forces were overwhelmingly on the Eastern Front."

As usual, Chomsky's claim relies on glaring omissions and distortions. To say that larger German military forces were committed on the Eastern front of World War II is correct; to say that "the war against Nazi Germany was fought by the Russians" is absurd. Without massive support from the United States it is doubtful that Russia would have survived at all. The fact that the United States defeated Germany's Axis partners—Italy and Japan—and that Britain vanquished Hitler's African legions was hardly incidental to the Allied victory. And to ignore the fact of the Normandy invasion, the defeat of Hitler's European armies, and the liberation of three-quarters of the German homeland by American arms is grossly dishonest.

Disturbed by the perverse implications of Chomsky's argument, a student in his college audience, objected, "But the world was better off [for America's actions]." Even this was a concession Chomsky was not willing to make. Instead he responded by blaming the Allies for Hitler's victims: "First of all, you have to ask yourself whether the best way of getting rid of Hitler was to kill tens of millions of Russians. Maybe a better way was not supporting him in the first place, as Britain and the United States did." In fact, Britain and the United States did not. American isolationism and British appeasement in the 1930s paled in comparison with the Stalin-Hitler



Pact, which actually launched the war in Poland and was obviously a more instrumental form of "supporting" Hitler than either.

But Chomsky is not content to merely insinuate that Britain and America were Hitler's sponsors and allies. He must make them responsible for the Holocaust as well. "By Stalingrad in 1942, the Russians had turned back the German offensive, and it was pretty clear that Germany wasn't going to win the war. Well, we've learned from the Russian archives that Britain and the U.S. then began supporting armies established by Hitler to hold back the Russian advance. Tens of thousands of Russian troops were killed. Suppose you're sitting in Auschwitz. Do you want the Russian troops to be held back?"

There is no evidence to support Chomsky's claim that America and Britain supported armies established by Hitler to hold back the Russian advance. Some academics puzzled by the bizarre nature of Chomsky's accusation have suggested that he was alluding to Stephan Bandera's Ukrainian nationalists, who had every reason to detest both Hitler and Stalin.<sup>80</sup> But there is no evidence to support Chomsky's contention of allied support for Bandera or any anti-Soviet military forces until 1948, which was during the Cold War and three years after the liberation of Auschwitz. Even the historical premise of Chomsky's claims is a falsification. However important Stalingrad was as a military victory, it was hardly equivalent to winning the war and no one but Chomsky thinks it was—not even the Russians who begged the Allies to open a "second front" to save them from defeat.

These are not mere intellectual lapses for Chomsky but keys to a worldview that is shaped by one overriding imperative—to demonize America as the fount of worldly evil. This agenda entails a revision of history even more ambitious than that of Holocaust deniers, with whom Chomsky has had an unsavory relationship.<sup>81</sup> In a little



volume called *What Uncle Sam Really Wants* that has sold over 160,000 copies, Chomsky claims that in postwar Greece—the first battleground of the Cold War—“the United States was picking up where the Nazis had left off.”<sup>82</sup> According to Chomsky, America’s operations behind the Iron Curtain included “a ‘secret army’ under U.S.-Nazi auspices that sought to provide agents and military supplies to armies that had been established by Hitler and which were still operating inside the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe through the early 1950s.”<sup>83</sup> According to Chomsky, in Latin America during the Cold War, U.S. support for legitimate governments against Communist subversion led to U.S. complicity under John F. Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson, in “the methods of Heinrich Himmler’s extermination squads.”<sup>84</sup>

Like other Chomsky charges, these claims depend on wildly distorted versions of the facts and in isolating the events from their historical context. Their purpose is not to understand the history in question but to portray America as the satanic principle in a Manichaeian world—the Hitler Germany of our times. Chomsky’s influence can be detected in the prevalence of this theme among anti-war protesters after 9/11 and during the conflict in Iraq.

Chomsky proffered his view of the 9/11 terrorist attacks the day after they occurred, elaborating it again a few days later. According to Chomsky, although the attacks were counterproductive from a public relations standpoint, they were actually—like Pearl Harbor—a good thing.<sup>85</sup> From a historical perspective, they represented a turning point in the war against American imperialism. “For the first time, the guns have been directed the other way. That is a dramatic change.”

As Chomsky observed, 9/11 was the first time the “national territory” had been attacked since the War of 1812. In those years, “the U.S. annihilated the indigenous population (millions of people),

conquered half of Mexico, intervened violently in the surrounding region, conquered Hawaii and the Philippines (killing hundreds of thousands of Filipinos), and in the past half century, particularly, extended its resort to force throughout much of the world. The number of victims is colossal.”<sup>86</sup>

Anyone accepting Chomsky's words at face value could almost feel the justice of al Qaeda's malignant death package, delivered without warning to the thousands of innocents in the World Trade Center. But this, of course, was their purpose. The premise of Chomsky's argument is that whatever evil is committed against America by others pales in comparison to the evil that America has committed against them. America is the “Great Satan,” the power responsible for the oppressions and injustices of the modern world.

But Chomsky's diatribe is no academic exercise. Its purpose is to incite believers to provide aid and comfort to the enemies of the United States. In the same post-9/11 talk Chomsky declared, “The people of the Third World need our sympathetic understanding and, much more than that, they need our help. We can provide them with a margin of survival by internal disruption in the United States. Whether they can succeed against the kind of brutality we impose on them depends in large part on what happens here.”

Chomsky revealed just how seriously he meant these words when America finally launched its military response to the 9/11 attacks. On October 18, eleven days after U.S. forces began strikes against the Taliban, Chomsky told an audience at MIT that America was the “greatest terrorist state” and was planning a “silent genocide” against the people of Afghanistan. “Looks like what's happening [in Afghanistan] is some sort of silent genocide” is what Chomsky said.<sup>87</sup> His speech at MIT to two thousand listeners was viewed and heard by millions via Chomsky's impressive media network, the Internet, and a C-SPAN broadcast of the address. His

remarks were published as a new Chomsky broadside in pamphlet form.

According to Chomsky, not only was America planning genocide in Afghanistan, but America's cultural elite knew it. And because the targets were Third World people, these privileged Americans were unconcerned. "It also gives a good deal of insight into the elite culture, the culture we are part of. It indicates that whatever, what will happen we don't know, but plans are being made and programs implemented on the assumption that they may lead to the death of several million people in the next few months very casually with no comment, no particular thought about it, that's just kind of normal, here and in a good part of Europe."

As usual, Chomsky's malignant charge was based on a small foundation of fact, a large area of uncertainty (since the future cannot be known), and a readiness to make the most far-fetched assumptions about American motives. It was indeed the case that in Afghanistan the food situation was dire, and that prior to America's intervention a famine was predicted for millions if no help was forthcoming from the West.

But thanks to the determination of the American government, help was already on the way, and the famine was soon averted as a direct result of the massive food transports provided by the American military. This rescue mission was, in fact, already part of the publicly announced White House war plan when Chomsky delivered his address. There was no comment—press or otherwise—on the planned genocide not because of the immoral indifference of Americans and Europeans, as Chomsky suggested, but because there was no factual basis for Chomsky's allegation. As Laura Rozen reported in the online magazine *Salon.com* on November 17, 2001, "Aid experts say that . . . alarms about the impact of the U.S. military campaign against the Taliban have ignored the fact that more food has

been reaching Afghanistan since the U.S. bombing began than was before—a lot more.”<sup>88</sup>

Given the military uncertainties when the fighting was just getting under way, however, Chomsky’s myth could still seem plausible to the uninformed. This was true in Cambridge where he made his initial false charges, and a month later in countries bordering Afghanistan, where he went to spread them to much larger Islamic audiences. He took his campaign of lies against his own country to Delhi and Islamabad, where he made headlines with claims that the United States was the world’s “greatest terrorist state” and was planning to conduct one of the largest genocides in history on a neighboring Muslim population.

In Islamabad, the situation was particularly volatile. Pakistan was an unstable “democracy” armed with nuclear weapons and ruled by a military dictatorship whose security forces had set up the Taliban. While the international press discussed the problematic future of the Islamabad regime, and tens of thousands of pro-terrorist demonstrators filled the streets of the capital, the prestigious MIT professor made front-page news in the local press with attacks on his own country as a genocidal threat to Muslims.<sup>89</sup> It was Chomsky’s personal effort to “turn the guns around.”