



## **The Red-Green Alliance** **How the West Is Being Dissolved from Within**

By J A Griffin

There are alliances born of shared vision. There are others born of shared enmity. The red-green alliance belongs to the second. It is not a coherent moral project or a genuine friendship. It is a tactical convergence of convenience between factions of the radical left and political Islam, sustained less by what they affirm than by what they seek to dismantle.

Both oppose the West as it actually exists: national borders, cultural inheritance, Israel, capitalism, ordered liberty, religious pluralism under civil law, assimilation, police authority, and the confidence of a host civilization to remain itself. On paper the alliance is grotesque. The radical left champions feminism, sexual liberation, secularism, gay rights, individual autonomy, and freedom from religious authority. Islamism is patriarchal, theocratic, anti-liberal, and openly hostile to the very social revolution the left treats as sacred.

And yet they meet.

They meet because both have come to regard the West itself as the central problem. They meet because anti-Western grievance now outweighs philosophical consistency. They meet because the modern left no longer evaluates political movements primarily by their record on women, dissidents, minorities, free speech, or religious liberty. It evaluates them by their place on the oppressor-oppressed map. Once that map is accepted, an Islamist movement hostile to liberal freedom is recast as “resistance,” while the civilization that made liberal freedom possible is condemned as the oppressor.

That is the moral inversion. The alliance is not built on shared values. It is built on a shared target.

The label is imperfect. “Red” denotes the revolutionary left — Marxist, socialist, anti-capitalist, anti-colonial, anti-Zionist, increasingly decolonial. “Green” refers not to environmentalism but to political Islam: those currents that seek public power organized around Islamic political identity rather than private religious practice. In France the related term “Islam-leftism,” associated with Pierre-André Taguieff, described the militant tactical partnership between Islamist groups and far-left organizations, particularly around anti-Zionist agitation and the Palestinian cause. The term can



be misused. It should not be applied to ordinary Muslims or to legitimate criticism of Western policy.

The argument here is narrower and more serious. Certain factions of the radical left and certain Islamist movements have converged tactically because both profit from weakening the legitimacy of the Western host culture. One supplies the language of grievance, decolonization, oppression, resistance, and liberation. The other supplies the sacred victim, communal mobilization, and civilizational resentment. Together they operate a political machine in which anti-liberal forces are laundered through liberal vocabulary.

This is the plastic world at work.

It dissolves an organic moral distinction — the difference between peaceful religious belief and political domination — into managed language. It tells the public that to question Islamism is to attack Muslims. It tells citizens that defending borders is hatred, demanding assimilation is bigotry, insisting on one civil law is intolerance, and preserving the host culture is extremism. Every distinction required for civic survival is softened, blurred, or rendered dangerous to name.

A serious society must be able to state plainly that Muslims are not the problem. Millions of Muslims live decently, work honestly, raise families, practice their faith, and seek peace under a stable civil order. They are entitled to religious liberty, equal treatment under law, and protection from hatred. A civilized society defends that without hesitation.

Islamism is different. It is not personal faith. It is a political project that seeks to organize public life around religious authority. It demands the protections of pluralism when weak and the authority of religious law when strong. A free society can accommodate Islam. It cannot accommodate Islamism as a rival legal and political order.

The red-green alliance depends on making that distinction unspeakable. That is its danger. Western institutions, conditioned by guilt, grievance, and fear of accusation, find themselves unable to defend their own civic order without first apologizing for the act of defending it.

History offers clear warnings. During the Iranian Revolution of 1978–79, a broad coalition of Islamists, secular leftists, nationalists, students, and intellectuals united against the Shah. Once the clerical regime consolidated power, its former left-wing and secular allies were sidelined, suppressed, or eliminated. The revolutionary coalition had served its purpose. The stronger religious-political force then imposed its own order.



The left repeatedly imagines it can harness more traditional or religious forces as instruments of pressure. History shows the reverse: the forces it excuses tolerate the left only until it is no longer useful.

The same pattern appears in other eras. During World War II, the former Mufti of Jerusalem, Hajj Amin al-Husayni, sought alliance with Nazi Germany and participated in Axis propaganda directed at Muslim audiences. Anti-Western and anti-Jewish politics can forge coalitions that make little moral sense but considerable tactical sense. Movements with incompatible ultimate visions still cooperate when they share an enemy.

The Palestinian cause has become the central meeting ground for the modern alliance. Legitimate concern for Palestinian civilians, criticism of Israeli policy, and opposition to unnecessary suffering are not the issue. Moral seriousness requires holding more than one truth at once. Civilian suffering is real. War is terrible. Governments can and should be criticized when criticism is warranted.

The red-green alliance does something different. It converts the Palestinian cause into a total indictment of the West, Israel, America, capitalism, colonialism, whiteness, and Western power itself. In that frame, Hamas ceases to be recognized primarily as an Islamist terrorist organization rooted in the Muslim Brotherhood. It becomes “resistance.” The murder of civilians becomes “decolonization.” The slaughter of Jews becomes a blow against “settler colonialism.” Language performs the laundering.

This selectivity is the confession. The modern left prides itself on exquisite sensitivity to power, oppression, trauma, and vulnerable bodies. It can detect micro-aggressions in a faculty email and elevate a pronoun dispute to a civil-rights crisis. Yet when Jews are massacred by an Islamist movement, parts of that same moral culture suddenly discover complexity, historical grievance, and the need for “root causes.”

The alliance exposes the deeper weakness of modern secular progressivism. Identity politics replaced the individual with the group and the citizen with the category. Moral judgment no longer turns primarily on truth, conduct, law, or consequence. It turns on position within the hierarchy of grievance. The same act can be condemned or excused, the same words labeled hate or resistance, the same violence called terrorism or liberation — depending on who performs it and where they sit on the ideological map.

This is how the plastic world destroys judgment. It substitutes administrative sorting for moral reality.



In a sane civic order, religious freedom is protected, terrorism is condemned, citizenship is equal, law is common, and assimilation is expected. In the plastic world those distinctions are disassembled. Islamism becomes a victim identity. National self-defense becomes xenophobia. Jewish self-defense becomes colonialism. Western continuity becomes supremacy. The civilization that restrains itself is condemned as oppressive while movements that refuse restraint are defended as oppressed.

The alliance also exploits Western guilt. A civilization taught to view itself principally through colonialism, slavery, racism, imperialism, and oppression becomes vulnerable to anyone fluent in the language of accusation. Facing sins is necessary; treating guilt as a permanent instrument of disarmament is fatal. The host culture is placed perpetually on trial — its borders, police, history, symbols, schools, and expectations of newcomers all suspect — while opposing forces are explained, contextualized, or excused.

No civilization survives that moral asymmetry for long.

The red-green alliance operates through institutions as much as through the street. It travels through universities, activist networks, NGOs, media language, protest infrastructure, donor systems, and professional-class guilt. Its power lies in the ease with which its frame — decolonization, anti-racism, liberation, resistance, Islamophobia, settler colonialism — moves through systems already primed to receive it. Roles are assigned before argument begins. The West is the oppressor. Israel is the colonial outpost. The Islamist is the resisting subject. The migrant is the sacred victim. The border is violence. Assimilation is erasure.

This is not pluralism. It is managed inversion.

A serious civilization would respond with clarity. It would protect peaceful Muslims while opposing Islamism without apology. It would defend Jewish citizens without requiring them to apologize for Israel's existence. It would permit criticism of Israel while rejecting the laundering of antisemitism through revolutionary vocabulary. It would defend borders as a normal feature of national life, expect assimilation as the humane path to membership, and insist that one civil law governs everyone — including religious communities. It would distinguish compassion from capitulation.

The modern West struggles to do so because it has been trained to fear its own firmness. Every necessary boundary is placed under suspicion. Every act of self-preservation is made to sound morally dangerous. The host culture is asked to justify itself endlessly while those who reject it are treated as proof of its failure to be inclusive enough.



This is how organic culture is weakened and artificial reality installed in its place. The organic thing is a nation with memory, borders, law, language, inherited standards, and the confidence to absorb newcomers into a common civic order. The artificial replacement is a managed population defined by categories instead of citizenship, accommodation instead of assimilation, narrative instead of judgment, and guilt instead of continuity.

A nation becomes plastic when it can no longer distinguish between welcoming the stranger and dissolving the home.

The red-green alliance is not an isolated political curiosity. It is a symptom of a civilization that has lost confidence in the legitimacy of its own survival. It flourishes where the West has grown uncertain, apologetic, bureaucratic, and morally disarmed. It thrives where institutions are quicker to condemn the host culture than to defend the civic order that makes dissent possible.

Organic culture would do the opposite. It would begin with reality. Religious liberty is good; religious supremacy is not. Immigration can strengthen a nation, but only when the nation remains confident enough to assimilate newcomers. Criticism of Israel is legitimate; hatred of Jews disguised as anti-Zionism is not. Compassion for Palestinians does not require moral blindness toward Hamas. Above all, organic culture would recover the courage to distinguish.

The red-green alliance is unnatural, but it is not mysterious. It is what happens when revolutionary resentment meets civilizational guilt. It is what happens when the left abandons universalism for grievance and political Islam learns to speak the language of victimhood inside Western institutions. It is what happens when the host culture is no longer permitted to defend itself in its own moral vocabulary.

They do not agree on the world they want to build.

They agree on the world they want to weaken.

And that is enough.

A civilization does not have to hate anyone in order to defend itself. It does not have to persecute Muslims in order to resist Islamism. It does not have to silence criticism of Israel in order to oppose antisemitism. It does not have to abandon compassion in order to recover judgment.

But it does have to decide whether it still believes it has the right to remain itself.



The red-green alliance will not be defeated by hatred. It will be defeated by clarity.

And clarity begins with one simple refusal:

***The West does not have to apologize for wanting to survive.***

---

*J A Griffin is the author of the A Plastic World trilogy, and writes on culture, power, and the organic world that survives both — at cultural.ist*

---

#### **Endnotes**

1. Pierre-André Taguieff described “Islamism” as a militant alliance between Islamist groups and far-left groups around anti-Zionist protest politics.
2. Britannica notes that Iranian opposition to the Shah included secular-left and religious forces, and that clerical elements later excluded former left-wing, nationalist, and intellectual allies.
3. The U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum documents Hajj Amin al-Husayni’s alliance-seeking with Axis powers and his propaganda role during World War II.
4. U.S. intelligence material identifies Hamas as an Islamist terrorist group, and the 1988 Hamas covenant is available through Yale’s Avalon Project.
5. ADL and the circulated National SJP toolkit are useful source leads for the post-October 7 campus-activism section.