

# Apologists of Totalitarianism: From Communism to Islam, Part I

## ISLAM AS TOTALITARIANISM

by Ibn Warraq (Jan. 2009)

Charles Watson, and G.-H. Bousquet refer to Islam as a totalitarian system *tout court*, while Bertrand Russell, Jules Monnerot, and Czeslaw Milosz compare Islam to various aspects of communism, and finally, among others, Carl Jung, Karl Barth, Adolf Hitler, Said Amir Arjomand, Maxime Rodinson and Manfred Halpern note Islam's similarities to fascism or nazism (the latter two terms often used synonymously).

Charles Watson, a Christian missionary in Egypt, in 1937, described Islam as totalitarian by showing how, "by a million roots, penetrating every phase of life, all of them with religious significance, it is able to maintain its hold upon the life of Moslem peoples".<sup>[1]</sup> G.H. Bousquet, formerly Professor of Law at the University of Algiers, and later at the University of Bordeaux, one of the foremost authorities on Islamic Law, distinguishes two aspects of Islam which he considers totalitarian: Islamic Law, and the Islamic notion of Jihad which has for its ultimate aim the conquest of the entire world, in order to submit it to one single authority.<sup>[2]</sup>

Islamic Law has certainly aimed at, to quote another great scholar of Islamic Law, and longtime Professor of Arabic at the University of Leiden, Christiaan Snouck Hurgronje, "controlling the religious, social and political life of mankind in all its aspects, the life of its followers without qualification, and the life of those who follow tolerated religions to a degree that prevents their activities from hampering Islam in any way".<sup>[3]</sup> The all-embracing nature of Islamic Law can be seen from the fact that it does not distinguish between ritual, law (in the European sense of the word), ethics and good manners. In principle this legislation controls the entire life of the believer and the Islamic community, it intrudes into every nook and cranny: everything, to give a random sample, from the pilgrim tax, agricultural contracts, the board and lodging of slaves, the invitation to a wedding, the use of tooth-picks, the ritual fashion in which one's natural needs are to be accomplished, the prohibition for men to wear gold or silver rings to the proper treatment of animals is covered.

Islamic Law is a doctrine of duties, external duties, that is to say, those duties which, continues Hurgronje, "are susceptible to control by a human authority instituted by God. However, these duties are, without exception, duties towards God, and are founded on the inscrutable will of God Himself. All duties that men can envisage being carried out are dealt with; we find treated therein all the duties of man in any circumstance whatsoever, and in their connections with anyone whatsoever".<sup>[4]</sup>

Bertrand Russell in *The Practice and Theory of Bolshevism*, published in 1920 wrote,

"Bolshevism combines the characteristics of the French Revolution with those of the rise of Islam....Marx has taught that Communism is fatally predestined to come about; this produces a state of mind not unlike that of the early successors of Mahommet....Among religions, Bolshevism is to be reckoned with Mohammedanism rather than with Christianity and Buddhism. Christianity and Buddhism are primarily personal religions, with mystical doctrines and a love of contemplation. Mohammedanism and Bolshevism are practical, social, unspiritual, concerned to win the empire of this world". <sup>[5]</sup>

Jules Monnerot in his 1949 study, *Sociologie du Communisme*<sup>[6]</sup> called Communism the Twentieth-Century 'Islam'. Monnerot wrote that the ultimate aim of Soviet Communism was "the most absolute tyranny ever conceived by man; a tyranny that recognises no spatial limits (except for the time being those of the planet itself), no temporal limits (communist believers generally refuse to contemplate any post-communist ages), and no limits to its power over the individual: its will to power claims total possession over every man it wins, and allows no greater freedom in mental than in economic life. It is this claim that brings it into conflict with faiths, religions, and values, which are older than itself or developing independently; and then the battle is joined. We are the battle".

"Communism," continues Monnerot, "takes the field both as a *secular religion* and as a *universal State* <sup>[7]</sup>; it is therefore more comparable to Islam than to the Universal Religion which began by opposing the universal State in the Hellenistic and Roman worlds, and which can be said to have drawn men's hearts away from the State to itself....Soviet Russia...is not the first empire in which temporal and public power goes hand in hand with a shadowy power which works outside the imperial frontiers to undermine the social structure of neighbouring States. The Islamic East affords several examples of a like duality and duplicity. The Egyptian Fatimids, and later the Persian Safavids, were the animators and propagators, from the heart of their own States, of an active and organising legend, an historical myth, calculated to make fanatics and obtain their total devotion, designed to

create in neighbouring States an underworld of ruthless gangsters....This merging of religion and politics was a major characteristic of the Islamic world in its victorious period. It allowed the head of State to operate beyond his own frontiers in the capacity of *commander of the faithful* (Amir al-muminin); and in this way a Caliph was able to count upon docile instruments, or captive souls, wherever there were men who recognized his authority. The territorial frontiers which seemed to remove some of his subjects from his jurisdiction were nothing more than material obstacles; armed force might compel him to feign respect for the frontier, but propaganda and subterranean warfare could continue no less actively beyond it. Religions of this kind acknowledge no frontiers. Soviet Russia is merely the geographical center from which communist influence radiates; it is an "Islam" on the march, and it regards its frontiers at any given moment as purely provisional and temporary. Communism, like victorious Islam, makes no distinction between politics and religion, but this time the claim to be both universal State and universal truth applies not only within a civilization or world which co-exists with other different civilizations, other worlds, but to the entire terrestrial globe".[\[8\]](#)

In *The Captive Mind*, Czeslaw Milosz devoted a chapter to how people in totalitarian societies develop means to cope publically with all the contradictions of real life. One cannot admit to contradictions openly; officially they do not exist. Hence people learn to dissimulate their views, emotions and thoughts, never revealing their true beliefs publically. Milosz finds a striking analogy of the same phenomenon in Islamic civilization, where it bears the name *Kitman* or *Ketman* [Persian word for concealment].[\[9\]](#)

Islam has also been compared more precisely to Nazism or sometimes Fascism, usually used synonymously. For example, Carl Jung, the famous Swiss psychiatrist, was asked in the late 1930s in an interview if he had any views on what was likely to be the next step in religious development. He replied, referring to the rise of Nazism in Germany, "We do not know whether Hitler is going to found a new Islam. He is already on the way; he is like Muhammad. The emotion in Germany is Islamic; warlike and Islamic. They are all drunk with wild god. That can be the historic future."[\[10\]](#)

Karl Barth[\[11\]](#), also writing in the 1930s [\[12\]](#), reflected on the threat of Hitler, and his similarities to Muhammad:

"Participation in this life, according to it the only worthy and blessed life, is what National Socialism, as a political experiment, promises to those who will of their own accord share in this experiment. And now it becomes understandable why, at the point where it meets with resistance, it can only

crush and kill—with the might and right which belongs to Divinity! Islam of old as we know proceeded in this way. It is impossible to understand National Socialism unless we see it in fact as a *new Islam* [emphasis in original], its myth as a new Allah, and Hitler as this new Allah's Prophet.

"A prayer for the ruling National Socialism and for its further expansion and increase simply cannot be uttered—unless one wishes to strike his confession in the face and make nonsense of his prayer. But there is one prayer with regard to the ruling National Socialism which may be uttered and ought to be uttered. It may and has to be prayed, in all earnestness, by Christians in Germany and throughout the whole world. It is the prayer which was uttered right into the nineteenth century, according to the old Basel Liturgy: "Cast down the bulwarks of the false prophet Muhammad!" ...And there we have it—we stand today, all Europe, and the whole Christian Church in Europe, once again *in danger of the Turks* [emphasis in original]. And this time they have already taken Vienna and Prague as well. "Thy will be done!" "If I perish then I perish!" They really knew that at the time of the old Turkish menace. They knew it better, knew it with more resignation to the will of God and less querulousness than we today do."

Albert Speer, who was Hitler's Minister of Armaments and War Production, wrote a memoir of his World War II experiences while serving a 20-year prison sentence imposed by the Nuremberg tribunal. Speer's narrative includes this discussion which captures Hitler's racist views of Arabs on the one hand, and his effusive praise for Islam on the other: [13]

"Hitler had been much impressed by a scrap of history he had learned from a delegation of distinguished Arabs. When the Mohammedans attempted to penetrate beyond France into Central Europe during the eighth century, his visitors had told him, they had been driven back at the Battle of Tours. Had the Arabs won this battle, the world would be Mohammedan today. <sup>13</sup> *For theirs was a religion that believed in spreading the faith by the sword and subjugating all nations to that faith. Such a creed was perfectly suited to the Germanic temperament.* [emphasis added] Hitler said that the conquering Arabs, because of their racial inferiority, would in the long run have been unable to contend with the harsher climate and conditions of the country. They could not have kept down the more vigorous natives, so that *ultimately not Arabs but Islamized Germans could have stood at the head of this Mohammedan Empire.* [emphasis added] Hitler usually concluded this historical speculation by remarking, "You see, it's been our misfortune to have the wrong religion. Why didn't we have the religion of the Japanese, who regard sacrifice for the Fatherland as the highest good? The Mohammedan religion too would have been much more compatible to us

than Christianity. Why did it have to be Christianity with its meekness and flabbiness?"

Manfred Halpern, [1924-2001], was a politics professor at Princeton for nearly forty years. Born in Germany in 1924, Halpern and his parents fled the Nazis in 1937 for America. He joined the war against the Nazis as a battalion scout in the 28th Infantry Division, and saw action in Battle of the Bulge and elsewhere. After Germany's surrender, he worked in U.S. Counterintelligence, tracking down former Nazis. In 1948 he joined the State Department, where he worked on the Middle East, and in 1958 he came to Princeton, where he did the same. In 1963, Princeton published his *Politics of Social Change in the Middle East and North Africa*, an academic treatment of Islamism, which Halpern labeled "neo-Islamic totalitarianism":

"The neo-Islamic totalitarian movements are essentially fascist movements. They concentrate on mobilizing passion and violence to enlarge the power of their charismatic leader and the solidarity of the movement. They view material progress primarily as a means for accumulating strength for political expansion, and entirely deny individual and social freedom. They champion the values and emotions of a heroic past, but repress all free critical analysis of either past roots or present problems."

Halpern continued, "Like fascism, neo-Islamic totalitarianism represents the institutionalization of struggle, tension, and violence. Unable to solve the basic public issues of modern life—intellectual and technological progress, the reconciliation of freedom and security, and peaceful relations among rival sovereignties—the movement is forced by its own logic and dynamics to pursue its vision through nihilistic terror, cunning, and passion. An efficient state administration is seen only as an additional powerful tool for controlling the community. The locus of power and the focus of devotion rest in the movement itself. Like fascist movements elsewhere, the movement is so organized as to make neo-Islamic totalitarianism the whole life of its members".<sup>[14]</sup>

As Martin Kramer said "his rigorous treatment of Islamism stands up well, and his equating it with fascism was a serious proposition, made by someone who had seen fascism up close".<sup>[15]</sup>

The comparison of Islamism with fascism was also put forward by Maxime Rodinson, [1915- 2004] the eminent French scholar of Islam, and by common consent one of three greatest scholars of Islam of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, who pioneered the application of sociological method to the Middle East. As a French Jew born in 1915, Rodinson also learned about fascism from direct experience; his parents perished in Auschwitz. Rodinson replied to Michel Foucault-to be discussed at length below- and Foucault's uncritical

endorsement of the Iranian Revolution. In a long front-page article in *Le Monde*, Rodinson targeted those who "come fresh to the problem in an idealistic frame of mind." Rodinson admitted that trends in Islamic movements such as the Muslim Brotherhood were "hard to ascertain....But the dominant trend is a certain type of archaic fascism (*type de fascisme archaïque*). By this I mean a wish to establish an authoritarian and totalitarian state whose political police would brutally enforce the moral and social order. It would at the same time impose conformity to religious tradition as interpreted in the most conservative light."<sup>[16]</sup>

In 1984, Said Amir Arjomand, an Iranian-American sociologist at SUNY-Stony Brook, also pointed to "some striking sociological similarities between the contemporary Islamic movements and the European fascism and the American radical right.... It is above all the strength of the monistic impulse and the pronounced political moralism of the Islamic traditionalist and fundamentalist movements which makes them akin to fascism and the radical right alike." <sup>[17]</sup>

---

<sup>[1]</sup> *The Muslim World*, January 1938 (Vol. 28 Issue 1 Page 1-107) , p.6.

<sup>[2]</sup> G.-H.Bousquet. [1900-1978]. *L'Ethique sexuelle de l'Islam*. Paris: Desclée de Brouwer. 1990 [1st edn.1966], p.10.

<sup>[3]</sup> C.Snouck Hurgronje [1857-1936]. *Selected Works*. Edd. G.-H.Bousquet & Joseph Schacht, Leiden: E.J.Brill, 1957, p.264.

<sup>[4]</sup> C.Snouck Hurgronje. *Selected Works*. Edd. G.-H.Bousquet & Joseph Schacht, Leiden: E.J.Brill, 1957, p.261.

<sup>[5]</sup> Bertrand Russell. *The Practice and Theory of Bolshevism*. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1920 pp.5,29,114.

<sup>[6]</sup> Jules Monnerot. *Sociologie du Communisme*, Paris: Gallimard, 1949. [English translation by Jane Degras and Richard Rees. *Sociology and Psychology of Communism*, Boston: Beacon Press, 1953]

<sup>[7]</sup> [Jules Monnerot's footnote and emphases: In intention but not in fact. The universal State is a sort of collective fantasy; the totalitarian State's image of itself projected into the future.]

<sup>[8]</sup> Jules Monnerot. *Sociologie du Communisme*, Paris: Gallimard, 1949. [English translation by Jane Degras and Richard Rees. *Sociology and Psychology of Communism*, Boston: Beacon Press, 1953] pp.18-22.

<sup>[9]</sup> Czeslaw Milosz. *The Captive Mind*. Translated from the Polish by Jane Zielonko. New York:Vintage Books, 1959, pp.51-77.

<sup>[10]</sup> Carl Jung. *The Collected Works Volume 18, The Symbolic Life*, 1939, Princeton, Princeton University Press p. 281.

<sup>[11]</sup> I owe the references to Karl Barth and Carl Jung to Dr. Andrew Bostom.

<sup>[12]</sup> Karl Barth. *The Church and the Political Problem of Our Day*, New York: Scribner, 1939, pp. 43; 64-65.

<sup>[13]</sup> Albert Speer. *Inside the Third Reich*. 1970, New York:The Macmillan Company, p. 96.

<sup>[14]</sup>Manfred Halpern. *Politics of Social Change in the Middle East and North Africa* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963, quoted at Martin Kramer's

Website: [http://www.geocities.com/martinkramerorg/2006\\_09\\_20.htm](http://www.geocities.com/martinkramerorg/2006_09_20.htm), Accessed October, 22, 2007.

<sup>[15]</sup> Martin Kramer's Website: [http://www.geocities.com/martinkramerorg/2006\\_09\\_20.htm](http://www.geocities.com/martinkramerorg/2006_09_20.htm), Accessed October, 22, 2007

<sup>[16]</sup> Maxime Rodinson. Islam Resurgent? *Le Monde*, December, 6-8, 1978, quoted in Janet Afary and Kevin B.Anderson. Foucault and the Iranian Revolution. Gender and the Seductions of Islamism. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2005, p233.

<sup>[17]</sup> Quoted in Martin Kramer's Website: [http://www.geocities.com/martinkramerorg/2006\\_09\\_20.htm](http://www.geocities.com/martinkramerorg/2006_09_20.htm), Accessed October, 22, 2007

# Apologists of Totalitarianism: From Communism to Islam, Part II

## Christian Apologists Of Islam

by Ibn Warraq (Feb. 2009)

The first modern apologists of Islam - even in its fundamentalist mode - were Christian scholars who perceived a common danger in certain economic, philosophical, and social developments in the West: the rise of rationalism, scepticism, atheism, secularism; the Industrial Revolution; the Russian Revolution and the rise of communism and materialism. Sir Hamilton Gibb writes of Islam as a Christian "engaged in a common spiritual enterprise".[\[1\]](#) But let us beware of skepticism: "Both Christianity and Islam suffer under the weight of worldly pressure, and the attack of scientific atheists and their like," laments Norman Daniel.[\[2\]](#)

Hence the tendency amongst Christian scholars to be rather uncritical; a tendency not to wish to offend Muslim friends and Muslim colleagues. Either there were explicit apologies if the writer felt there was something offensive to Muslim eyes, or to use various devices to avoid seeming to take sides, or to avoid judging whatever issue was under discussion.

Christian scholars such as William Montgomery Watt, who was curate of St. Mary Boltons, London, and Old St. Paul's, Edinburgh and ordained Episcopalian minister, and who was one of the most influential Islamic scholars in Britain of the last fifty years, and Sir Hamilton Gibb saw skepticism, atheism and communism as the common enemy of all true religion. They followed Carlyle in hoping for spiritual inspiration from the East. Here is Watt: "Islam - or perhaps one should rather say, the East - has tended to overemphasize Divine sovereignty, whereas in the West too much influence has been attributed to man's will, especially in recent times. Both have strayed from the true path, though in different directions. The West has probably something to learn of that aspect of truth which has been so clearly apprehended in the East"

Throughout his article *Religion and Anti-Religion*, Professor Watt can barely disguise his contempt for secularism. "The wave of secularism and materialism is receding," notes Watt with approval, "most serious minded men in the Middle East realize the gravity of the problems of the present

time, and are therefore aware of the need for a religion that will enable them to cope with the situations that arise from the impingement of these problems on their personal lives". Watt then goes on to discuss the work of Manfred Halpern, who "speaks of the Muslim Brethren in Egypt, Syria and elsewhere, together with movements like Fida'iyan - i Islam in Persia and Khaksars and Jama'at-i Islam in Pakistan, as neo-Islamic totalitarianism, and points out their resemblances to fascism, including the National Socialism of Germany under Adolf Hitler. From a purely political point of view this may be justified, and the resemblances certainly exist. Yet in a wider perspective this characterisation is misleading. It is true that these movements sometimes 'concentrate on mobilizing passion and violence to enlarge the power of their charismatic leader and the solidarity of the movement ... ', and that 'they champion the values and emotions of a heroic past, but repress all critical analysis of either past roots or present problems'. Yet political ineptitude and even failure do not outweigh their positive significance as marking a resurgence of religion ... The neo- Islamic mass movements, far from being tantamount to national socialism or fascism are likely to be an important barrier against such a development." [3]

Watt's wonderful euphemism for fascism is "political ineptitude"; and we are asked to overlook this fascism, and instead asked to admire it for its "positive significance as marking a resurgence of religion." Watt's support for, what Amir Taheri calls, Holy Terrorists is worth pondering. It must not be forgotten that the Muslim Brethren was a terrorist organisation whose founder made no secret of his admiration for Hitler and Mussolini. After the end of the Second World War, Hassan's Muslim Brethren launched a series of attacks at civilian targets; cinemas, hotels and restaurants were bombed or set on fire, women incorrectly dressed were attacked with knives. There were also a series of assassinations. Yes; we are asked to overlook this in the name of religious resurgence.

Watt reveals even more disturbing qualities- a mistrust of the intellect and a rejection of the importance of historical objectivity and truth: "This emphasis on historicity, however, has as its complement a neglect of symbols; and it may be that ultimately 'symbolic truth ' is more important than 'historical truth'". [4]

In his "Introduction to the Quran," Watt seems to have a very tenuous grasp on the notion of truth- indeed objective truth is abandoned altogether in favour of total subjectivism "... the systems of of ideas followed by Jews, Christians, Muslims, Buddhists and others are all true in so far as they enable human beings to have a more or less satisfactory 'experience of life as a whole'. So far as observation can tell, none of the great systems is markedly inferior or superior to the others. Each is therefore true. In



particular the Quran is in this sense true. The fact that the Quranic conception of the unity of God appears to contradict the Christian conception of God does not imply that either system is false, nor even that either conception is false. Each conception is true in that it is part of a system which is true. In so far as some conception in a system seems to contradict the accepted teaching of science - or, that of history in so far as it is objective - that contradiction raises problems for the adherents of the system, but does not prove that the system as a whole is inferior to others. That is to say, the Quranic assertion that the Jews did not kill Jesus does not prove that the Quranic system as a whole is inferior to the Christian, even on the assumption that the crucifixion is an objective fact" .[\[5\]](#)

In this astonishing passage of intellectual dishonesty, Watt performs all sorts of mental gymnastics in an effort to please everyone, not to offend anyone. Leaving aside the problem of the vagueness of Watt's terminology - terms like "experience of life as a whole," "conception," "Quranic system," - we can now understand what we set out to understand at the beginning of this enquiry, namely, why British Islamicists have been so uncritical of Islam.

"The non-Muslim scholar," continues Watt, "is not concerned with any question of ultimate truth, since that, it has been suggested, cannot be attained by man. He *assumes the truth* [my emphasis, I.W.], in the relative sense just explained, of the Quranic system of ideas." Under such conditions, the scholar is not likely to be critical of anyone's "belief system" as long as it meets his or her "spiritual needs."

The above attitude, exemplified by Watt, was brilliantly exposed and attacked by Julien Benda in his classic "Betrayal of the Intellectuals." He wrote, "But the modern 'clerks' [intellectuals] have held up universal truth to the scorn of mankind, as well as universal morality. Here the 'clerks' have positively shown genius in their effort to serve the passions of the laymen. It is obvious that truth is a great impediment to those who wish to set themselves up as distinct; from the very moment when they accept truth, it condemns them to be conscious of themselves in a universal. What a joy for them to learn that this universal is a mere phantom, that there exist only particular truths, 'Lorrain truths, Provençal truths, Brittany truths, the harmony of which in the course of centuries constitutes what is beneficial, respectable, true in France.'[\[6\]](#) Watt would add "a Muslim truth, a Christian truth, and so on; or as he put in *Islamic Revelation*, "Each [great religion] is valid in a particular cultural region, but not beyond that".[\[7\]](#)

The sentimental ecumenical tradition established by scholars such as Watt and Gibb continues to this day. We can follow the gradual introduction of this tradition in the pages of the journal *The Muslim World*, which was

founded in 1911 [originally titled *The Moslem World*] to promote the work of Christian Missionaries in the Middle East. Since 1938 it has been edited by the Hartford Seminary. The first issues of the journal were highly critical of various aspects of Islam - I have already cited [Charles Watson's description of Islam](#) as totalitarian which appeared in its pages in 1937. Its first editor was a committed Christian and a considerable scholar, Samuel Zwemer [1867-1952]. In 1929 he was appointed Professor of Missions and Professor of the History of Religion at the Princeton Theological Seminary where he taught until 1951. He had an almost perfect command of Arabic and a thorough knowledge of the Koran, often referred to as "the lion-hearted missionary who tried to confound the Muslims out of their own scriptures using the Christian Bible."[\[8\]](#)

By the late 1940s, however, the journal began publishing articles very favorable to Islam, and by 1950s its pages were dominated by scholars such as Watt. It is now co-edited by a Muslim and a Christian - converting Muslims to Christianity is no longer considered respectable by Liberal Christians who instead bend over backwards to accommodate Muslims - as for example calling on all Christians to use the term "Allah" instead of God[\[9\]](#): generous gestures not reciprocated by the Muslims.

To bring the story to the present, one cannot leave out the case of John Esposito, a Catholic, and Professor of International Affairs and Islamic Studies at Georgetown University. He is also the director of Prince Alwaleed Bin Talal Center for Muslim-Christian Understanding at the same university. While studying for his doctorate at Temple University, Esposito came under the influence of the Islamist, Ismail R. Faruqi, "Palestinian pan-Islamist and theorist of the 'Islamization of knowledge', around whom had developed a personality cult."[\[10\]](#) Esposito tried to present Islam and Islamism in western categories thereby hoping to create a more favorable attitude to them in the West.

"Why not place Islamist movements in the political category of participation, or even democratization?"[\[11\]](#) Esposito then went on claim that Islamist movements were nothing other than movements of democratic reform! It was sheer "Orientalist" prejudice that prevented Westerners from seeing this. Esposito wrote that Americans would "have to transcend their narrow, ethnocentric conceptualization of democracy" to understand Islamic democracy that might create effective systems of popular participation, though unlike the Westminster model or the American system".[\[12\]](#)

Esposito, and his close collaborator, John Voll asserted with great confidence that every Islamist state or movement was either democratic or potentially democratic. John Voll appeared before a congressional committee in 1992

pleading on behalf of Sudan, which Kramer describes aptly as "a place without political parties, ruled by a military junta in league with an Islamist ideologue." For Voll the Sudanese regime was "an effort to create consensual rather than a conflict format for popular political participation," and in his opinion, "It is not possible, even using exclusively Western political experience as basis for definition, to state that if a system does not have two parties, it is not democratic."[\[13\]](#)

Martin Kramer sums up Voll's grotesque apology for Islamism thus: "And so American congressman were instructed by the president-elect of MESA [Middle East Studies Association] that a country with no political parties, presided over by a coup-plotting general, ridden by civil war, with a per capita gross domestic product of \$200, still might qualify somehow as democracy. This was not deliberate self-parody; it was merely Esposito's logic advanced *ad absurdum*."[\[14\]](#)

Just months *before* 9/11, Esposito wrote, "focusing on Usama bin Laden risks catapulting one of the many sources of terrorism to center stage, distorting both the diverse international sources and the relevance of one man." Still earlier he had predicted that the 1990s would "be a decade of new alliances and alignments in which the Islamic movements will challenge rather than threaten their societies and the West." In 1994, he claimed that Hamas, the Palestinian terrorist group, was only a community-focused group that engages in "honey, cheese-making, and home-based clothing manufacture." While he saw nothing sinister in Palestinian Authority Chairman Yasir Arafat's call for Jihad, it was in reality comparable to a "literacy campaign."

*After* 9/11, Esposito blamed America first. "September 11," he said, "has made everyone aware of the fact that not addressing the kinds of issues involved here, of tolerance and pluralism, have catastrophic repercussions."

Even more disgracefully, Esposito refuses to acknowledge that the application of the Shari'a, or Islamic law, inevitably leads to a totalitarian society as in former Taliban-ruled Afghanistan, present-day Iran, Saudi Arabia and the Sudan. Freedom House ranks these countries as the worst offenders of human rights in the world. Furthermore, each one of these countries has been linked to the export of international terrorism. And yet, Esposito writes that "contrary to what some have advised, the United States should not in principle object to implementation of Islamic law or involvement of Islamic activists in government."[\[15\]](#)

- 
- [1] H.A.R.Gibb. *Modern Trends in Islam*. Chicago:University of Chicago Press, 1947.
- [2] Norman Daniel. *Islam and the West*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1960, p.307.
- [3] William Montgomery Watt, Religion and Anti-Religion, in *Religion in the Middle East:Three Religions in Conflict and Concord*, ed. A.J.Arberry, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969, pp.625-627
- [4] William Montgomery Watt, *Islamic Revelation in the Modern World*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1969, p.116
- [5] William Montogomery Watt ,Introduction to the Quran Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press,1977 p.183.
- [6] Julien Benda *The Betrayal of the Intellectuals*, Boston: Beacon Press, 1955, pp.76-77.
- [7] William Montgomery Watt, *Islam and the Integration of Society*, London: Routledge, Kegan and Paul, 1961, p.278
- [8] Samuel Zwemer: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Samuel\\_Marinus\\_Zwemer](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Samuel_Marinus_Zwemer) : accessed 15 November, 2007.
- [9] In August, 2007,Bishop of Breda, Tiny Muskens: <http://www.worldnetdaily.com/staticarticles/article57178.html>, accessed 15 November, 2007.
- [10] Martin Kramer. *Ivory Towers on Sand. The Failure of Middle Eastern Studies in America*. Washington, D.C.: The Wsahington Institute for Near East Policy, 2001, p.49.
- [11] Ibid.,p.50
- [12] John Voll and John L.Esposito, "Islam's Democratic Essence", *Middle East Quarterly* 1, no.3 (September 1994) p.11, quoted in Martin Kramer. *Ivory Towers on Sand. The Failure of Middle Eastern Studies in America*. Washington, D.C.: The Wsahington Institute for Near East Policy, 2001, p.50
- [13] Quoted in Martin Kramer. *Ivory Towers on Sand. The Failure of Middle Eastern Studies in America*. Washington, D.C.: The Wsahington Institute for Near East Policy, 2001, p.50
- [14] Martin Kramer. *Ivory Towers on Sand. The Failure of Middle Eastern Studies in America*. Washington, D.C.: The Wsahington Institute for Near East Policy, 2001, pp.50-51
- [15] All the quotes in the last three paragraphs are from Campus Watch, *Esposito: Apologist for Militant Islam*, published by FrontPage Magazine, September 3 2002, accessed Nov.30, 2007

# Apologists of Totalitarianism: From Communism to Islam, Part III

Michel Foucault

by Ibn Warraq (Feb. 2009)

Michel Foucault's uncritical admiration of the Islamists in Iran, from 1978 onwards, revives memories of the great tradition of the intellectuals of the Left who, at first, denied Stalin's Reign of Terror, and then minimized the atrocities, and finally acknowledged them in private but refused to denounce them in public. Robert Conquest gives the example of Sartre, who thought the evidence for the Stalin's forced labor camps should be ignored or suppressed in order not to demoralize the French proletariat.[\[1\]](#)

Michel Foucault visited Iran twice in 1978, just a few months before the Ayatollah Khomeini's return to Tehran in triumph in February, 1979, and wrote about his impressions mainly in the Italian daily *Corriere della sera*, but also in the French daily *Le Monde*, and the weekly magazine, *Le Nouvel Observateur*.

Many admirers of the French Intellectual tried to pass his Iranian writings off as temporary aberrations, variously described as "misreadings," "errors," "folly," "miscalculation", or "a fumble". But Mitchell Cohen asked, "Was Foucault's fumble just that, a fumble? Or was it, as postmodernists like to say, a symptom? I suggest that it was the latter. It was and remains a symptom of something troubling in the kind of left-wing thinking that mixes postmodernism, simplistic third worldism, and illiberal inclinations."[\[2\]](#)

Moreover, far from being aberrations, Foucault's prophesies, analyses, and endorsement of the Iranian Revolution were in total harmony with and related to his general philosophical positions and theoretical writings on the discourses of power and critiques of modernity.

Michel Foucault remained profoundly ignorant of Islam - its theology, its history, its Holy Book, the Quran, Shi'ism and its particular history in Iran; the slightest acquaintance with any of the latter would have saved him and his reputation from his blunders, naive pronouncements and illusions. He considered Khomeini an "Old Saint," and wrote "there will not be a Khomeini Party; there will not be a Khomeini government." He insisted, "One thing

must be clear. By "Islamic government", nobody in Iran means a political regime in which the clerics would have a role of supervision or control. To me, the phrase "Islamic government" seemed to point to two order of things.

"A utopia', some told me without any pejorative implication. 'An ideal,' most of them said to me. At any rate, it is something very old and also very far into the future, a notion of coming back to what Islam was at the time of the Prophet, but also of advancing toward a luminous and distant point where it would be possible to renew fidelity rather than maintain obedience. In pursuit of this ideal, the distrust of legalism seemed to me to be essential, along with a faith in the creativity of Islam.

"A religious authority explained to me that it would require long work by civil and religious experts, scholars, and believers, in order to shed light on all the problems to which the Quran never claimed to give a precise response. But one can find some general directions here: Islam values work; no one can be deprived of the fruits of his labour; what must belong to all (water, the subsoil) shall not be appropriated by anyone. With respect to liberties, they will be respected to the extent that their exercise will not harm others; minorities will be protected and free to live as they please on the condition that they do not injure the majority; between men and women there will not be inequality with respect to rights, but difference, since there is a natural difference. With respect to politics, decisions should be made by the majority, the leaders should be responsible to the people, and each person, as it is laid out in the Quran, should be able to stand up and hold accountable he who governs." [\[3\]](#)

Even a cursory glance at Khomeini's book *Islamic Government*, published a few years before he came to power, where he noted "all of Islam is politics," would surely have sobered Foucault up. Even in October, 1978 Khomeini did not disguise his hatred of non-Muslims, and it was clear his intention was to establish an authoritarian state based on Islam and the Koran. Thus it is hardly surprising if practically every prophesy in the above statement turned out to be gruesomely false. All the non-Muslim minorities - Zoroastrians, Jews, Christians, and Baha'is - suffered persecution, destruction of their places of worship, harassment, accusations of blasphemy, forced conversions, and summary executions. Space and time forbids more than a brief glance at just one of the beleaguered minorities, the Baha'is. More than 200 Baha'is have been killed since 1978, thousands more imprisoned. They are regarded as apostates and "unprotected infidels," have no legal rights, and are not permitted to elect leaders of their community. They are denied jobs, and rights to inherit property. More than 10,000 Baha'is have been dismissed from government posts since 1979. All Baha'i cemeteries, holy

places and community properties were seized soon after the 1979 revolution, and none have been returned; while many sites of historical significance to Baha'is have been destroyed, and so the sorry, sad, and tragic saga continues to this day.

Women are always the first ones to suffer whenever Islamic Laws are promulgated and enforced. Foucault dismissed feminists' warnings as to the direction the revolution was heading, describing the feminists as westernised and hence inauthentic, regarding such criticisms of Islam - as "Orientalist" in the pejorative sense. He seemed to be indisposed and incapable of grasping the nature of Islamic Law especially as it related to the rights of women. The limitations of their rights are enshrined in the constitution of the Islamic Republic of Iran, which explicitly reduces women to second-class citizens. A segregated health care system means that many women receive inadequate attention as there are not enough well-trained women doctors and nurses. A raped woman is liable to be executed or stoned to death for fornication.

I apologize for all these details but they are necessary in order underline how horribly Foucault and other Western Leftists got it wrong, and show that while it was all an amusing intellectual game for irresponsible intellectuals intoxicated with their own theories, words and power, it was devastatingly serious for the victims of what Foucault enthusiastically called "political spirituality."

Liberals of the Cold War era and the Postmodern Left of 21<sup>st</sup> Century, exemplified by Foucault, have many points in common. First, both disdain the very idea of objective truth, and thus are committed to the doctrine of relativism. James Burnham in his "Suicide of the West" quoted the prominent American philosopher Thomas V. Smith (1890-1964) who was Professor of Philosophy at the University of Chicago, Illinois State Senator (1936-1938), and also Congressional Representative, (1938-1940). T. V. Smith wrote, "this inability finally to distinguish [truth from falsity, good from evil, beauty from ugliness] is the propaedeutic for promotion from animal impetuosity to civilized forbearance. It marks the firmest foundation for the tolerance which is characteristic of democracy alone." T. V. Smith cites Justice Holmes as a major source of the influence of this doctrine of relativism, "As Holmes put it, we lack a knowledge of the 'truth' of 'truth.'" Professor Smith attacks all classical theories of objective truth, and declares: "No one of these theories can adequately test itself, much less anything else."

The idea of objective truth is only the rationalization of private, subjective "feelings of certitude...; and certitude is not enough. It more easily marks the beginning of coercion than the end of demonstration...." And, Burnham

remarks, since final truth cannot be known, we must keep the dialogue eternally going.[\[4\]](#)

Foucault, like many postmodernist philosophers, also favors relativism and like T. V. Smith, finds the Enlightenment notions of rationality and objective truth "coercive."

In an interview that he gave in late 1978, Foucault underlined the "otherness" of the Iranian people, since they are not Westerners, the Iranians "don't have the same regime of truth as ours...".[\[5\]](#)

"When the Western liberal's feeling of guilt," wrote Burnham, "and his associated feeling of moral vulnerability before the sorrows and demands of the wretched become obsessive, he often develops a generalized hatred of Western civilization and his own country as a part of the West"[\[6\]](#). Foucault was exultant at the prospects for an Iranian Revolution precisely because he saw the Islamist movement as an "irreducible form of resistance to Western hegemony"[\[7\]](#), and as a rejection of a European form of modernity. When he was attacked for his article quoted at length above, Foucault claimed in self-defense that he had also written that some of the pronouncements of the Islamists were "not too reassuring".[\[8\]](#) But if examine closely what his doubts were, we uncover Foucault's utter dishonesty. Foucault wrote, "the definitions of an Islamic government ...seemed to me to have a familiar but, I must say, not too reassuring clarity. 'These are basic formulas for democracy, whether bourgeois or revolutionary', I said. 'Since the eighteenth century now, we have not ceased to repeat them, and you know where they have led' ".[\[9\]](#) So what Michel Foucault was warning us and the Islamists themselves against was not the dangers of clerical authoritarianism, but the dangers of a liberal democracy! Michel Foucault's postmodernist and post-structuralist attacks on the West inexorably lead to an uncritical admiration of Islamism, despite, and in some cases because of, the latter's rejection of liberal democracy, women's rights, and human rights in general. He called the industrial capitalism of the West as "the harshest, most savage, most selfish, most dishonest, oppressive society one could possibly imagine".[\[10\]](#)

When confronted with Iranians who were less religious than the Islamists, more leftist, or otherwise "western," Foucault always dismissed them as less authentically Iranian.[\[11\]](#) He refused to acknowledge that there were staunch secularists among the opposition to the Shah, and even brushed aside the reservations of Ayatollah Shariatmadari for an Islamic Republic. The Iranian Revolution as it was unfolding under his very eyes was, for Foucault, an expression of an undifferentiated collective will. [\[12\]](#)

Along with an uncritical admiration of Islamism, Foucault indulged in what



his fervent disciple, Edward Said, would accuse others of, that is, Orientalism in the pejorative sense. Foucault idealised, exoticized, romanticized the East. Foucault constantly privileges what he calls the premodern social order, assumed to exist in the Middle East, Africa and Asia, over the modern, rational, Western one. "Rationality" is a pejorative word for Foucault who condescendingly implies that Orientals were superior precisely because they were incapable of rational thought, with its destructive tendencies. [\[13\]](#)

---

[\[1\]](#) Robert Conquest. *The Great Terror*. London, 1968.pp.678-679.

[\[2\]](#) Mitchell Cohen. An Empire of Cant. Hardt, Negri, and Postmodern Political Theory in *Dissent*, Summer 2002, p.17.

[\[3\]](#) Quoted in Janet Afary and Kevin B.Anderson. *Foucault and the Iranian Revolution. Gender and the Seductions of Islamism*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2005,p.206

[\[4\]](#) James Burnham. *Suicide of the West. An Essay on the Meaning and Destiny of Liberalism*. Chicago: Regnery Books, 1985 [1st edn. 1964] pp.75-76

[\[5\]](#) Quoted in Janet Afary and Kevin B.Anderson. *Foucault and the Iranian Revolution. Gender and the Seductions of Islamism*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2005,p.259

[\[6\]](#) James Burnham. *Suicide of the West. An Essay on the Meaning and Destiny of Liberalism*. Chicago: Regnery Books, 1985 [1st edn. 1964] p.201

[\[7\]](#) Janet Afary and Kevin B.Anderson. *Foucault and the Iranian Revolution. Gender and the Seductions of Islamism*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2005,p.15

[\[8\]](#) Quoted in Janet Afary and Kevin B.Anderson. *Foucault and the Iranian Revolution. Gender and the Seductions of Islamism*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2005,p.210.

[\[9\]](#) Michel Foucault. What Are the Iranians Dreaming About , *Le Nouvel Observateur*, October 16-22, 1978, quoted in Janet Afary and Kevin B.Anderson. *Foucault and the Iranian Revolution. Gender and the Seductions of Islamism*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2005, p.206.

[\[10\]](#) Dialogue between Michel Foucault and Baqir Parham, reprinted in Janet Afary and Kevin B.Anderson. *Foucault and the Iranian Revolution. Gender and the Seductions of Islamism*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2005, p.185.

[\[11\]](#) Janet Afary and Kevin B.Anderson. *Foucault and the Iranian Revolution. Gender and the Seductions of Islamism*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2005,p82.

[\[12\]](#) Janet Afary and Kevin B.Anderson. *Foucault and the Iranian Revolution. Gender and the Seductions of Islamism*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2005,p.83

[\[13\]](#) Janet Afary and Kevin B.Anderson. *Foucault and the Iranian Revolution. Gender and the Seductions of Islamism*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2005,pp.105,129.

# Apologists of Totalitarianism: From Communism to Islam, Part IV

## The Assassination Of President John F. Kennedy, 9/11 And The Apologists Of Islamic Terrorism by Ibn Warraq (March 2009)

### IV.1. LEE HARVEY OSWALD, COMMUNIST

I shouted out, 'Who killed the Kennedys?' When after all, it was you and me."

--- The Rolling Stones, *Sympathy for the Devil*, 1968.

The kind of attitudes revealed by Western, particularly leftist, intellectuals after the attacks on the World Trade Center in September 2001, were prefigured in the responses to the assassination of President Kennedy in 1963. James Piereson<sup>[1]</sup> has argued persuasively that the Liberal Left, unable to accept psychologically the, essentially simple, facts of the assassination suffered cognitive dissonance, when they tried to reconcile deeply held beliefs with evidence that clearly contradicted those beliefs. In order to eliminate this psychological tension (or dissonance) the Left denied or ignored key facts or re-interpreted the facts in such a way as to make them consistent with deeply held convictions.<sup>[2]</sup> Liberals dismissed as irrelevant the fact that President Kennedy was shot by a communist- for them threats to the nation could only come from the irrational conduct of the radical right. Thus Kennedy must be a victim of "intolerance and bigotry" ; the nation itself was to blame. <sup>[3]</sup>

"The cultural and political understanding of the assassination had become detached from the details of the event itself. It appeared that the liberal leadership of the country-*The New York Times* editorial board, James Reston, Earl Warren [chief justice of the Supreme Court], Mike Mansfield [Democrat Senator from Montana], President Johnson, religious leaders, the president of Columbia University, and even Mrs. [Jacqueline] Kennedy- had come together in a campaign to blame the assassination of the president on hatred and intolerance which (they said) had engulfed the country. It was but a short step from this to the conclusion that the nation itself had to bear the guilt for the president's death."<sup>[4]</sup>

James Reston wrote in *The New York Times* that "America wept tonight, not

alone for its dead young president, but for itself. The grief was general, for somehow the worst in the nation had prevailed over the best. The indictment extended beyond the assassin, for something in the nation itself, some strain of madness and violence, had destroyed the highest symbol of law and order". While a pastor in Washington delivered a sermon implicating all Americans in the assassination, "We have been present at a new crucifixion. All of us had a part in the slaying of the President. It was the good people who crucified our Lord, not merely those who acted as executioners. By our silence; by our inaction; by our readiness to allow evil to be called good and good evil; by our toleration of ancient injustices, we have all had a part in the assassination". Earl Warren, chief justice of the Supreme Court, observed in a written statement that, "A great and good President has suffered martyrdom as a result of the hatred and bitterness that has been injected into the life of our nation by bigots". A little later, he said that such acts "are commonly stimulated by forces of hatred and violence such as today are eating their way into the bloodstream of American life". The Reverend Adam Clayton Powell, Congressman from Harlem, wrote: "Weep not for Jack Kennedy, but weep for America...". A New York Rabbi claimed that the murder was a result of an "insane hatred that poisoned the hearts of otherwise decent and respectable citizens."

But, as Piereson justly remarks, "the decent and respectable had nothing to do with the assassination. Neither had the radical right, nor conservatives, nor bigots, nor anti-communists....".[\[5\]](#)

Here is Oswald in his own words, "I could not be happy living under capitalism...I affirm my allegiance to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. I am a Marxist".[\[6\]](#) But Marxism was more than an abstract theory, it was, as Piereson says, "a weapon for attacking ideological foes. His powerful sense of resentment coupled with his devotion to communist ideology made for a highly charged political personality. Far from being a confused loner in search of meaning, Oswald was politicized to a lethal degree and certainly politically advanced for a man of his tender age."

In the months before the assassination of the President, Oswald had worked on behalf of the Castro government in New Orleans, had gone to Mexico City to apply for a visa for Cuba, and had even tried to assassinate General Walker, anticommunist, and anti-Castro spokesman and head of the John Birch Society chapter in Dallas, Texas, with the same rifle that he later used to murder Kennedy.

It was clear as the noonday sun, that Oswald assassinated President Kennedy to put an end to his administration's efforts to assassinate Castro and overthrow his communist government in Cuba. But the Warren

Commission and a host of intellectuals refused to accept that Oswald was a committed ideologue, instead saw him as a confused loner, whose motives were not entirely clear. In reality, President Kennedy had been killed for his advocacy of liberty in the face of communist tyranny in Cuba and elsewhere. "Few suggested that there may have been a connection between the assassination and the tense confrontation the year before over nuclear missiles in Cuba. [Evidence suggested] that Kennedy's assassination was more a consequence of the Cold War than of the civil rights crusade". [\[7\]](#)

Leftists ideologues and even the general public, having dismissed the idea that Oswald acted alone, and having refused to accept that he was a committed ideologue, or that political beliefs can lead to such violent behaviour, began searching for the "real cause"; just as after 9/11, intellectuals and other pundits began searching for the "root cause" of Islamic terrorism.

Once they began looking for the "real cause", it did not take them long to come up with a conspiracy theory, a plot at the highest levels of government, involving an agency of the government such as the CIA or FBI. If James Reston and others were right, then it was the nation itself that was responsible for the assassination." The intensifying anti-Americanism of the liberal left in the 1960s seemed to require an explanation of this kind. Charges of conspiracies and plots were shortly circulating in books and articles written by liberals and leftists." [\[8\]](#)

For the liberal intellectuals and media, not only was the nation itself guilty, it deserved punishment; Piereson calls this Punitive Liberalism. Punitive Liberalism assumed that the United States was responsible for terrible crimes, from genocide, slavery, imperialism to economic rapacity, and deserved everything it got. Piereson cites the playwright Arthur Miller who condemned the US for a climate of violence but who also said that acts of violence were deserved because the nation tolerated injustice and poverty. [\[9\]](#)

Dennis Wrong [Commentary, November, 1970] pointed out that by the late 1960s many prominent intellectuals had begun to adopt in their writings "a tone of extravagant, querulous, self-righteous anti-Americanism". [\[10\]](#)

Denial of reality is very much a liberal trait, as James Burnham and, now, James Piereson, note. For liberals claimed that a communist could not have killed the president, just as earlier they had claimed that "the United States started the Cold War, Alger Hiss could not have been a Soviet spy, Whittaker Chambers lied in saying so, the Rosenbergs were innocent, and Castro was an idealistic reformer." [\[11\]](#) Of course, there would not have been any search

for "real causes" if the suspect had been a Christian fundamentalist, just as there would not have been a search for the "root causes" of the attacks on the World Trade Center in September, 2001 had been Christians.

The murder of the President by a communist, one would have thought, should have led to some kind of revulsion against Marxism, Communism, and Third World dictators, just as the events of 9/11 should have led to a revulsion against Islam. But in both cases, the opposite happened. In the former case, left wing ideas enjoyed an unprecedented success, with Marx, Lenin, Mao, and Castro adulated as heroes, just as in the latter case, Islam came to be seen as "a great world religion of peace and tolerance," far superior to Christianity which was tainted with the genocide of Indians during the conquest of South and Central America, the Inquisition and the Crusades.

#### IV.2. ISLAMIC TERRORISM AND ITS APOLOGISTS

Christians in a fog of ecumenical sentimentality deny that the "real" Islam has anything to do with so-called "Islamic Terrorism," or that Islam as practised in Iran was not the real Islam,[\[12\]](#) rather like the Communist fellow travellers of the 1930s, who claimed either that Marxism had nothing to do with Soviet Communism, or that the communism as practised in Russia was not the real communism. Instead everything is blamed on the West, Imperialism, Crusades, Poverty, U.S. Foreign Policy, and Israel. The Left is hardly more rational or realistic.

As Christopher Hitchens wrote:

"Only one faction in American politics has found itself able to make excuses for the kind of religious fanaticism that immediately menaces us in the here and now. And that faction, I am sorry and furious to say, is the Left. From the first day of the immolation of the WTC, right down to the present moment [2004], a gallery of pseudo-intellectuals has been willing to represent the worst face of Islam as the voice of the oppressed. How can these people bear to reread their own propaganda? Suicide murderers in Palestine- disowned and denounced by the new leader of the PLO- described as the victims of 'despair'. The forces of al-Qaeda and the Taliban represented as misguided spokespeople for anti-globalization. The blood-maddened thugs in Iraq, who would rather bring down the roof on a suffering people than allow them to vote, pictured prettily as 'insurgents' or even, by Michael Moore, as the moral equivalent of our Founding Fathers"[\[13\]](#)

The editor of the British Leftist weekly, New Statesman wrote, what Nick Cohen called, "its most notorious leader since the white-washing of Stalin in

the Thirties. Mohammad Atta [one of the perpetrators of 9/11] didn't bother to blame the workers in the WTC for their own deaths, but the Statesman like many other journals of the left was prepared to find incriminating evidence on his behalf." Here is the New Statesman's notorious editorial:

"American bond traders, you may say, are as innocent and as undeserving of terror as Vitenamese or Iraqi peasants...Well, yes and no, because Americans, unlike Iraqis and many others in poor countries, at least have the privileges of democracy and freedom that allow them to vote and speak in favour of a different order. If America seems a greedy and overweening power, that is partly because its people have willed it. They preferred George Bush to both Al Gore and Ralph Nader. These are harsh judgments but we live in harsh times." [\[14\]](#)

Mary Beard, [\[15\]](#)a Cambridge Classics don, began with the obligatory, and insincere dismay at the horror of it all, "the horror of the tragedy was enormously intensified by the ringside seats we were offered through telephone answering machines and text-messages" and then continued, "but", yes, as Nick Cohen put it there was always a but, "but when the shock had faded more hard-headed reaction set in. This wasn't just the feeling that, however, tactfully you dress it up, the United States had it coming. But there is also the feeling that all the 'civilized world' (a phrase which Western leaders seem able to use without a trace of irony) is paying the price for its glib definitions of 'terrorism' and its refusal to listen what the 'terrorists' have to say."

The words terrorists, terrorism, and civilized world are in scare quotes, already an indication that she does not think "they" are terrorists or that "we" are civilized. The irony was that intellectuals like Mary Beard were precisely incapable of listening to what the terrorists *were* saying. It was clear from the writings of the Islamists that they were planning to replace liberal democracy, and impose a totalitarian ideology on the whole world. But the Left refused to accept reality, instead, one after another, descended into the "root cause fallacy". It was an extraordinary failure of the Liberal imagination, which was unable to fathom the motives of death cult. As Francis Wheen put it, "Like generals who fight the last war instead of the present one, socialists and squishy progressives were so accustomed to regarding American imperialism as the only source of evil in the world that they couldn't imagine any other enemy".[\[16\]](#)

Here is what Bin Laden did say about the WTC atrocity of 2001, had Ms Beard but listened: "The values of this Western civilization under the leadership of America have been destroyed. Those awesome symbolic towers that speak of liberty, human rights and humanity have been

destroyed, They have gone up in smoke." He did not say that the towers were a symbol of capitalism but of "liberty, human rights and humanity."  
[\[17\]](#)

Most politicians, journalists and academics soon after 9/11 argued that the root cause of terrorism was poverty. For example, James D. Wolfensohn, president of the World Bank, claimed that the war on terrorism "will not be won until we have come to grips with the problem of poverty and thus the sources of discontent." George W. Bush concurred, "We fight against poverty, because hope is an answer to terror. ... We will challenge the poverty and hopelessness and lack of education and failed governments that too often allow conditions that terrorists can seize." Al Gore, at the Council on Foreign Relations, put forward the argument that it was anger that fueled terrorism in the Islamic world, and it was due to "the continued failure to thrive, as rates of economic growth stagnate, while the cohort of unemployed young men under 20 continues to increase."[\[18\]](#)

Poverty is not the root cause of Islamic fundamentalism.[\[19\]](#). [\[20\]](#) The research of sociologists like such as the Egyptian, Saad Eddin Ibrahim, and the economist Galal A.Amin, the observations of journalists like the Palestinian Arab Kahild M.Amayreh, and the Algerian Berber political leader Saad Saadi all lead to the same conclusion that modern Islamists are made up of young men from the middle or lower middle class, highly motivated, upwardly mobile, and well-educated, often with science or engineering degrees

Equally, those who back militant Islamic organizations are also the well off. They are more often the urban rich rather than the poor from the countryside. Neither wealth nor a flourishing economy is a guarantee against the rise of militant Islam. Kuwaitis enjoy high incomes but Islamists usually win the largest bloc of seats in parliament. Many modern militant Islamic movements increased their influence in the 1970s, just as oil-exporting states enjoyed very strong growth rates.

In general, Westerners attribute too many of the Arab world's problems, observes David Wurmser of the American Enterprise Institute, "to specific material issues" such as land and wealth.[\[21\]](#) Islamists themselves rarely talk about poverty. As Ayatollah Khomeini put it, "We did not create a revolution to lower the price of melon." Islamists need the money to buy weapons, and to fund propaganda. Wealth is merely a means, not an end.

Poverty as an explanation for all creeds has always been proffered by the liberals, as James Burnham noted in *Suicide of the West*, "Communism, dictatorship, Mau Mau[\[22\]](#) and other political badnesses are explained as the

results of hunger and poverty. Foreign aid plus democratic reforms ... will bring a rise in the standard of living, which will in turn do away with the tendencies toward tyranny, aggression and war.... The yearly programs of Americans for Democratic Action are at pains to protest that our real "enemies" are not wicked people or nations or creeds, and certainly not the Soviet Union or communism, but hunger and racial discrimination; the real war is the "war against want." " [\[23\]](#) As Burnham also said, "Of course men do not act rationally, generally speaking. They don't even consider food the matter of highest priority, whatever ideologues may imagine." [\[24\]](#)

Nor is the existence of Israel the cause of Islamic terrorism. As Benjamin Netanyahu put it "The soldiers of militant Islam do not hate the West because of Israel, they hate Israel because of the West." [\[25\]](#) As early as 1995, Netanyahu had warned, "[i]t is impossible to understand just how inimical-and how deadly - to the United States and to Europe this rising tide of militant Islam is without taking a look at the roots of Arab-Islamic hatred of the West. Because of the media's fascination with Israel, many today are under the impression that the intense hostility prevalent in the Arab and Islamic world toward the United States is a contemporary phenomenon, the result of Western support for the Jewish state, and that such hostility would end if an Arab-Israeli peace deal was eventually reached. But nothing could be more removed from the truth. The enmity toward the West goes back many centuries, remaining to this day a driving force at the core of militant Arab-Islamic political culture. And this would be the case even if Israel had never been born."[\[26\]](#)

Or as Wagdi Ghuniem, a militant Islamic cleric from Egypt said "suppose the Jews said 'Palestine - you [Muslims] can take it.' Would it then be ok? What would we tell them? No! The problem is belief, it is not a problem of land."[\[27\]](#) Christopher Hitchens[\[28\]](#), wrote: "Does anyone suppose that an Israeli withdrawal from Gaza would have forestalled the slaughter in Manhattan? It would take a moral cretin to suggest anything of the sort; the cadres of the new jihad make it very apparent that their quarrel is with Judaism and secularism on principle, not with (or not just with) Zionism."

More recently Bernard Lewis is reported to have said "the only real solution to defeating radical Islam is to bring freedom to the Middle East. Either 'we free them or they destroy us'."[\[29\]](#) But what of the born-free Muslims in the West who are Islamists, such as the four 7/7 bombers in London? Freedom did nothing for them.[\[30\]](#)

Nor is American foreign policy the cause. United States foreign policy toward the Arab and the Muslim world has been one of accommodation rather than antagonism. During the Cold War, the US always supported Muslims against



communists. Recent United States military action in the Middle East has been on behalf of Muslims, rather than against them. The US protected Saudi Arabia and Kuwait from Iraq, Afghanistan from the Soviets, Bosnia and Kosovo from Yugoslavia, and Somalia from warlord Muhammad Farah Aidid. United States foreign policy has nothing to do with the deaths of 150 000 Algerians at the hands of Islamist fanatics.

The root cause of Islamic fundamentalism is Islam. American foreign policy has nothing to do with the stoning to death of a woman for adultery in Nigeria. It has every thing to do with Islam, and Islamic Law. The theory and practice of Jihad - Bin Laden's foreign policy -was not concocted in the Pentagon, it is directly derived from the Koran and Hadith, Islamic Tradition. But Western Liberals and Humanists find it hard to admit or accept or believe this. They simply lack the imagination to do so. Liberalism, with its good intentions, can too readily become dogmatic. The trouble with Western Liberals and all humanists is that they are nice; they are pathologically, terminally nice. They think everyone thinks like them, they think all people including the Islamic fundamentalists desire the same things, have the same goals in life. For liberals, the terrorists are but frustrated angels forever thwarted by the Great Anarch, the USA. Humanists are so nice that they even invite terrorists to their conferences. At the Mexico Humanist Conference, in 1996, several speakers represented the Iranian group called the Mujahaddin. Last year, this group was put on President Bush's list of terrorists groups. In February, 2003 they offered themselves as the personal bodyguards of Saddam Hussein. At the humanist conference in Holland in July 2002, one of the keynote speakers, who had already been honoured with a humanist award, was a smooth talking charmer, Abdullah an Naim. His real goal could not be hidden for long: Sharia.

Western Liberals are used to searching for *external* explanations for behaviour that they cannot comprehend; Hitler's behaviour cannot be explained as a reaction to the Treaty of Versailles [\[31\]](#) or the economic situation in the twenties or thirties. Evil is its own excuse. The Islamic fundamentalists are utopic visionaries who wish to replace Western style - liberal democracies with an Islamic theocracy, a fascist system of thought that aims to control every act of every individual. Joseph Conrad described such people as: "Visionaries work everlasting evil on earth. Their Utopias inspire in the mass of mediocre minds a disgust of reality and a contempt for the secular logic of human development." [\[32\]](#) French philosopher Christian Godin recently pointed out that Islamic totalitarianism is potentially far more dangerous than either the Nazi or Communist variety, since the latter, despite their exterminating follies, presupposed their own preservation. For the Nazi, the inferior race does not deserve to exist; for the Stalinist, the

enemy of the people does not merit to continue living; for the Islamist, it is the world itself that does not deserve to exist. [\[33\]](#)

The number of people who have written about 11 September, 2001 without once mentioning Islam is extraordinary. We must take seriously what the Islamists say to understand their motivations, to understand 11 September. The four greatest influences on the modern rise of Militant Islam have been the Egyptian Hasan al- Banna, the founder of Muslim Brethren, Sayyid Qutb, and the Indo-Pakistani, Maududi, and the Iranian Ayatollah Khomeini. They all repeat the same message, derived from classical writers like Ibn Taymiyyah, and ultimately from the Koran and Hadith, namely, it is the divinely ordained duty of all Muslims to fight non-Muslims in the literal sense until man-made law has been replaced by God's Law, the Sharia, and Islam has conquered the entire world. Here is Maududi in his own words:

"In reality Islam is a revolutionary ideology and programme which seeks to alter the social order of the whole world and rebuild it in conformity with its own tenets and ideals. 'Muslim' is the title of that International Revolutionary Party organized by Islam to carry into effect its revolutionary programme. And 'Jihad' refers to that revolutionary struggle and utmost exertion which the Islamic Party brings into play to achieve this objective." [\[34\]](#)

Maududi again:

"Islam wishes to destroy all States and Governments anywhere on the face of the earth which are opposed to the ideology and programme of Islam regardless of the country or the Nation which rules it. The purpose of Islam is to set up a State on the basis of its own ideology and programme, regardless of which Nation assumes the role of the standard bearer of Islam or the rule of which nation is undermined in the process of the establishment of an ideological Islamic State." [\[35\]](#)

One survivor of the Holocaust was asked what lesson he had learned from his experience of the 1940s in Germany replied, "If someone tells you that he intends to kill you, believe him." [\[36\]](#) Unfortunately, many liberals, leftists, and humanists, even after September 11 have yet to learn this lesson. One may note here that many leftists are not just self-critical they are inverted nationalists. They identify with their nations' enemies just as Whig radicals empathized with Napoleon, Kim Philby and his cohorts made the Soviet Union their adopted homeland, and the hard left Israeli academic Ilan Pappé identifies with Hezbollah.

It is instructive to note what the two groups of apologists of Islam I have

singled out for discussion, the Christians and Western Leftists, have in common. Both have recourse to cultural relativism to justify their inaction, both share an unwillingness to confront reality or even to deny it, and a willingness to blame Western civilization, institutions and values.

As James Burnham wrote, "For Western civilization in the present condition of the world, the most important practical consequence of the guilt encysted in the liberal ideology and psyche is this: that the liberal, and the group, nation or civilization infected by liberal doctrines and values, are morally disarmed before those whom the liberal regards as less well off than himself". [\[37\]](#)

On the world stage, this attitude leads to selective indignation. Burnham was talking about the period leading up to 1964, but little has changed. The Left refuses to criticize the murders committed by Islamists in Algeria where more than a hundred thousand Algerians have been killed by other Algerians, or the massacres of Christians and African Muslims by the Arab Muslim forces of the Islamic government of the Sudan, and of course, the never-ending killings in Iran.

"The guilt of the liberal is insatiable. He *deserves*, by his own judgement, to be kicked, slapped and spat on for his infinite crimes," wrote Burnham in 1964. [\[38\]](#) Instead of moral outrage at the atrocities of the Islamic terrorists in September, 2001, we have the attitude well-summed up by Nick Cohen as "Kill Us, We Deserve It", the title of a chapter in his book, *What's Left. How Liberals Lost their Way*, published in 2007.

## CONCLUSION

"My feelings about *Das Kapital* are the same as my feelings about the *Koran*. I know that it is historically important and I know that many people, not all of whom are idiots, find it a sort of Rock of Ages and containing inspiration. Yet when I look into it, it is to me inexplicable that it can have this effect. Its dreary, out-of-date, academic controversialising seems so extraordinarily unsuitable as material for the purpose ... How could either of these books carry fire and sword round half the world? It beats me." [\[39\]](#)

---John Maynard Keynes, *Letter to George Bernard Shaw*, 2 December, 1934.

A whole host of writers have remarked that what drew so many intellectuals to revolutionary Marxism was that "what once had appealed in the name of God crossed over to the banner of History....Marxism was a secular religion". [\[40\]](#) Given the similar mindset of a Marxist and a religious believer - and Keynes' remark above seems particularly apt in this context, the *Koran*

and *Das Kapital* seem to attract the same sort of people - it should come as no surprise if a reverse phenomenon occurs. Mary Ann Weaver observed, "A number of my former professors from the American University of Cairo were Marxists 20 years ago: fairly adamant, fairly doctrinaire Marxists. They are now equally adamant, equally doctrinaire Islamists."[\[41\]](#)

Could these observations go some way towards explaining the otherwise bizarre spectacle of the European Left, the American Liberals, and Latin American Marxists and Communists, most of whom are atheists, forging an alliance with Islamic fundamentalism in general, and Islamist Iran in particular? Both the Western Left and Islamism share a hatred of America. But there are a number of other common features between the apologists of Communism of the 1930s and 1940s and the modern apologists of Islamic fundamentalism.

### Moral Equivalence or Meaculpism

Anti-Americanism is inexorably linked to the theory of moral equivalence that is usually thought to have developed during the Cold War. But it could be argued that perhaps the theory of moral equivalence was there at the dawn of Western civilization when many Westerners found "the Other" the equal of, if not superior to, Occidentals. At any rate, in modern times, it has been traced to the period immediately after the First World War. Étienne Mantoux, in his posthumously published work, *The Carthaginian Peace, or the Economic Consequences of Mr Keynes*[\[42\]](#) argued that the Western democracies of the Thirties suffered from a 'guilt-complex'. Georges Clemenceau had said, "We do not have to beg pardon for our victory," but after Keynes that is exactly what the West felt it had to do. Keynes influenced Britain and France into thinking that the Treaty of Versailles, following the First World War defeat of Germany, to be a 'breach of engagements and international morality' that was *equally* as bad as Germany's invasion of Belgium.[\[43\]](#)

As Andrew Roberts explains further, "Mantoux also blamed Keynes for the way that Versailles was held to prove to Americans that Europeans were each as bad as one another, 'that they were all equally revengeful, equally Machiavellian, equally imperialistic; that the entry of America in the last war had been a ghastly mistake; and that the issue of any new one would be to her a matter of indifference, for an Allied Victory would probably be no better than Versailles and a German victory could certainly be no worse'."[\[44\]](#)

During the Cold War, "it was argued that in fundamental moral respects the democracies and communist states were already much alike, a position that simultaneously denies the virtues of the democracies and the vices of the

totalitarian systems of the East". [45] The Guardian, a London daily, wrote in October, 1983, "There are plenty around who are already prepared to see the U.S. as no better than the Soviet Union in the standards of its international behaviour. There are many more, however, who still expect superior standards of the U.S., who are shocked and bewildered at the spectacle of Americans engaging in an act of aggression quite as blatant as the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, which was deplored in such fine-sounding words." The same official of the U. S. Government who wrote the article "Doctrine of Moral Equivalence" also cites a British "political leader" as saying, "There is an almost miserable equity of threat."

After 9/11, intellectuals, like Noam Chomsky, and buffoons, such as Michael Moore, and journalists such as Robert Fisk, and Liberal politicians, such as Edward Kennedy, again employed the "moral equivalence" argument. The sottisier of Western intellectuals on 9/11 is long. Here are some examples:

Norman Mailer noted, "The WTC was not just an architectural monstrosity, but also terrible for people who didn't work there, for it said to all those people: 'If you can't work up here, boy, you're out of it.' That's why I'm sure that if those towers had been destroyed without loss of life a lot of people would have cheered. Everything wrong with America led to the point where the country built that tower of Babel, which consequently had to be destroyed....And then came the next shock. We had to realize that the people that did this were brilliant. It showed that the ego we could hold up until September 10 was inadequate....Americans can't admit that you need courage to do such a thing. For that might be misunderstood. The key thing is that we in America are convinced that it was blind, mad fanatics who didn't know what they were doing. But what if those perpetrators were right and we were not? We have long ago lost the capability to take a calm look at the enormity of our enemy's position." [46]

Gore Vidal told Reuters : "I've listed in this little book about four hundred strikes that the government has made on other countries. War, undeclared. Generally with the excuse that they were harboring communists. You keep attacking people for such a long time, one of them is going to get you back." [47]

And here is Vidal on the possibility of a conspiracy: "We still don't know by whom we were struck that infamous Tuesday, or for what true purpose.... The behaviour of President Bush on 11 September certainly gives rise to not unnatural suspicions.... But it is fairly plain to many civil libertarians that 9/11 put paid not only to much of our fragile Bill of Rights but also to our once-envied system of government which had taken a mortal blow the previous year when the Supreme Court did a little dance in 5/4 time and

replaced a popularly elected President with the oil and gas Bush-Cheney junta.'[48]

Here is Susan Sontag's moral equivalence following 9/11, "The unanimously applauded, self-congratulatory bromides of a Soviet Party Congress seemed contemptible. The unanimity of the sanctimonious, reality-concealing rhetoric spouted by American officials and media commentators in recent days seems, well, unworthy of a mature democracy." [49]

Senator Kennedy, commented on Abu Ghraib in the Senate, "Shamefully, we now learn that Saddam's torture chambers reopened under new management: U.S. management." Saddam, who killed hundreds of thousands of his own people, and tortured thousands of others, is apparently the equivalent of a handful of soldiers humiliating a handful of Iraqi prisoners. Amnesty International described the detention facility at Guantanamo Bay as "the gulag of our times." As Brandon Crocker put it, "I wonder what that makes North Korea. At Amnesty International they still can't resist comparing the United States to the Soviet Union and in ways as ludicrous as ever. Amnesty International would have us believe that there is no difference between Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn and an al-Qaeda fighter; no difference between sleep deprivation in order to get information from terrorists and hard labor, exposure to the deadly Siberian winters, and malnutrition to "reeducate" political dissidents". [50]

The doctrine of Moral Equivalence extends to every aspect of Western civilization. Thus "Christianity is no better than Radical Islam"- note, already, that no one will write "Islam" *tout court* though the Meaculpists are quite happy to write Christianity as opposed to "Christian fundamentalism." Then the familiar litany of the putative crimes of Christianity: the Crusades, though they were a belated response to several centuries of Islamic Jihad; the Spanish Inquisition, though historians such as Henry Kamen (*The Spanish Inquisition* (1965)) established that the Inquisition was not nearly as cruel or as powerful as commonly believed, and the number of heretics actually killed was comparatively low, and the equivalent Islamic Inquisition, the Minha is scarcely known let alone talked about. The fact is Christianity has absorbed many principles of the Enlightenment, and Islam has not. Then there are the crimes of Western imperialism - some undoubtedly true and a disgrace to Western ideals, but which must be seen in comparison to Islamic Imperialism to put it all in perspective. Islamic Imperialism virtually destroyed several cultures - Eastern Christianity and the culture of Pre-Islamic Iran.

The doctrine of Moral Equivalence comes easily to a culture already infected with moral and cultural relativism. Other common characteristics of the

apologists of totalitarianism include, denial of the evidence, of reality: leading to search for "real causes," or "root causes," which is bound to lead to conspiracy theories; contempt for Western institutions, but a willingness to exploit them for their own use; being ideologues they are immune to criticism, and contrary evidence, which they are able to explain away; masochism, since they are lacerated with feelings of guilt, ready to blame everything automatically on the West, take blame for all the ills of the world, and as a consequence wish to see the West punished, humiliated, denigrated, vilified and calumniated, the West deserves to be punished, we deserve to be punished, I deserve to be punished; exaggerations of the virtues of the Other, and the crimes of the West, denial the Other could be racist, imperialist, or colonialist, in short, evil; arrogance of the intellectuals who cannot be bothered to learn the facts, do the hard research in archives, and primary sources.

---

[1] James Piereson. *Camelot and the Cultural Revolution. How the Assassination of John F.Kennedy Shattered American Liberalism*. New York: Encounter Books, 2007.

[2] Ibid.,pp.103-104.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid.,p.96.

[5] All the quotes from James Piereson. *Camelot and the Cultural Revolution. How the Assassination of John F.Kennedy Shattered American Liberalism*. New York: Encounter Books, 2007,pp.89-96

[6] Quoted in Piereson, op.cit., pp.144-145

[7] Piereson, pp.104-105

[8] Piereson, p.110

[9] Piereson, p.177.

[10] Piereson, p.202.

[11] Piereson, p.205.

[12] See the exchange between the liberal television host Alan Colmes and Steven Emerson, expert on terrorism: Alan Colmes: But Steve, aren't you demonizing Islam? Aren't you – when you use words like Islamo-fascism it conflates an entire religion with fascism, and that's demonization and it offends an entire religion.

Emerson: Alan, what term would you use?

Colmes: Uh, I would call it fascism, but I wouldn't link it to a religion as you choose to do.

(Crosstalk)

Emerson: So what makes it different than Italian fascism or German fascism?

Colmes: Well, you're indicting an entire religion. It doesn't represent the entire religion, as opposed to a government.

at : <http://www.familysecuritymatters.org/index.php?id=1384989> . Accessed 15 November, 2007.

[13] Christopher Hitchens: *Slate*, 9 November, 2004.

[14] [14] Nick Cohen. *What's Left? How Liberals Lost their Way*, London: Fourth Estate,2007, p.273.

[15] Nick Cohen, *ibid.*, p.274

- [16] Francis Wheen. *How Mumbo Jumbo Conquered the World: A Short History of Modern Delusions*, New York: Public Affairs, 2005, p.274
- [17] Nick Cohen. *What's Left? How Liberals Lost their Way*, London: Fourth Estate, 2007. p.261
- [18] All three quoted in Alan B. Krueger & Jitka Maleckova. Seeking the Roots of Terrorism, in *Chronicle of Higher Education*: June 6, 2003.
- [19] The whole section on Poverty and Militant Islam leans heavily on the article by Daniel Pipes, *God and Mammon: Does Poverty Cause Militant Islam*, National Interest Winter 2002, available at: <http://www.danielpipes.org/article/104>.
- [20] Knight Ridder Newspapers summarized the findings of Marc Sageman, a psychiatrist at the University of Pennsylvania about Arab terrorists being mostly "well-educated, married men from middle- or upper-class families, in their mid-20s and psychologically stable." At Daniel Pipes' website: <http://www.danielpipes.org/article/104>.
- [21] This usually means a tendency "to belittle belief and strict adherence to principle as genuine and dismiss it as a cynical exploitation of the masses by politicians. As such, Western observers see material issues and leaders, not the spiritual state of the Arab world, as the heart of the problem. Quoted by Pipes *God and Mammon: Does Poverty Cause Militant Islam*, National Interest Winter 2002.
- [22] The Mau Mau Uprising [1952-1960]: an insurgency by Kenyan rebels against the British colonial administration.
- [23] James Burnham. *Suicide of the West. An Essay on the Meaning and Destiny of Liberalism*. New York: The John Day Company. 1964, pp.70-71
- [24] *Ibid.*, p.115.
- [25] B. Netanyahu, "Today, We Are all Americans," in New York Post, 21 September, 2001.
- [26] Benjamin Netanyahu, *Fighting Terrorism: How Democracies Can Defeat Domestic and International Terrorism*, New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1995, p.82, quoted in Douglas Murray, *Neoconservatism: Why We Need It*. New York: Encounter Books, 2006, pp.118-119.
- [27] Steven Emerson, International Terrorism and Immigration Policy *January 25, 2000 United States House of Representatives Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims*. House Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims Hearing on International Terrorism and Immigration Policy.
- [28] Christopher Hitchens. The Nation September 2001.
- [29] Daniel Freedman, *Bernard Lewis: U.S. May Lose War on Terror*, New York Sun, September 13, 2006.
- [30] At Daniel Pipes' weblog, <http://www.danielpipes.org/>
- [31] See Niall Ferguson. *The Pity of War*, Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd., New Edn. 2006.
- [32] J. Conrad, *Under Western Eyes*, Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1957, p.85.
- [33] Christian Godin. *La Fin de l'Humanité*, Seyssel (France): Éditions Champ Vallon, 2003. p.71.
- [34] Sayeed Abdul A'la Maududi, *Jihad in Islam*. 7th Edition December 2001, Lahore, Pakistan. p8
- [35] Sayeed Abdul A'la Maududi, *Jihad in Islam* p9
- [36] Quoted by Eliot A. Cohen, *World War IV. Let's Call This Conflict What It Is*. Tuesday, Nov.20,2001. Opinion Journal ([www.opinionjournal.com](http://www.opinionjournal.com)).
- [37] James Burnham. *Suicide of the West. An Essay on the Meaning and Destiny of Liberalism*. Chicago: Regnery Books, 1985 [1st edn. 1964] p.197.
- [38] James Burnham. *Suicide of the West. An Essay on the Meaning and Destiny of Liberalism*. Chicago: Regnery Books, 1985 [1st edn. 1964] p.200.
- [39] Quoted in Robert Skidelsky. *John Maynard Keynes. The Economist as Savior. A Biography. 1920-1937*. Vol.2. Harmondsworth, U.K: Penguin Books, 1995 [1st edn. 1992] p.520.
- [40] Daniel Bell, "The Fight for the 20<sup>th</sup> Century: Raymond Aron Versus Jean-Paul Sartre," *New York Times Book Review*, February 18, 1990, p.1., quoted in Paul Hollander. *The End of Commitment. Intellectuals, Revolutionaries, and Political Morality*. Chicago: Ivan Dee, 2006, p.3.
- [41] Mary Ann Weaver, author of *A Portrait of Egypt. A Journey Through the World of Militant Islam*. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 2001, in an interview at [www.theatlantic.com/unbound/bookauth/ba990217.htm](http://www.theatlantic.com/unbound/bookauth/ba990217.htm).
- [42] Étienne Mantoux. *The Carthaginian Peace or the Economic Consequences of Mr Keynes*, London, Oxford University Press, 1946.
- [43] Andrew Roberts. *A History of the English-Speaking Peoples Since 1900*, New York: HarperCollins, p.161. Emphasis added.
- [44] Andrew Roberts, *op.cit.*, p162. Roberts is quoting Mantoux, *op.cit.*, p.11.



[45] Anon. "Doctrine of Moral Equivalence - Address before the Royal Institute for International Studies - transcript". US Department of State Bulletin. Sept 1984. Accessed. 02 Dec. 2007 at: [http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\\_m1079/is\\_v84/ai\\_3369220](http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m1079/is_v84/ai_3369220).

[46] As quoted at: <http://www.tnr.com/112601/notebook112601.html>, accessed December 3, 2007

[47] Quoted at <http://www.mrc.org/cyberalerts/2001/cyb20011126.asp#3>, accessed December 3, 2007.

[48] Sunder Katwala. "Gore Vidal claims 'Bush junta' complicit in 9/11

America's most controversial novelist calls for an investigation into whether the Bush administration deliberately allowed the terrorist attacks to happen", in *The Observer*, Sunday October 27, 2002.

[49] Quoted at [www.american-pictures.com/english/jacob/Sontag.htm](http://www.american-pictures.com/english/jacob/Sontag.htm), accessed December 3, 2007.

[50] Brandon Crocker "Moral Equivalence Rides Again", *The American Spectator*, 6/14/2005 at [http://www.spectator.org/dsp\\_article.asp?art\\_id=8297](http://www.spectator.org/dsp_article.asp?art_id=8297), accessed 2 December, 2007.