

The Handlers and the Handled

Western Intelligence, Islamist Movements, and the Theological Architecture of Managed Chaos

I. The Question That Won't Go Away

There is a pattern in the modern history of the Middle East that defies the neat separation between state actors and non-state movements, between intelligence services and the ideological forces they claim to oppose. At nearly every critical juncture—the rise of the Muslim Brotherhood, the Iranian Revolution, the Lebanon War, the Iran-Contra affair—Western intelligence services appear not as bystanders but as active participants, facilitators, or at minimum knowing enablers of Islamist movements whose stated ideology is hostile to the West itself.

This article does not argue that these movements were “created” by Western intelligence. The evidence does not support that claim. What the evidence does support—abundantly and from multiple independent sources—is something that may be more troubling: a pattern of deliberate cooperation, facilitation, and instrumentalisation so extensive and so sustained that the distinction between creator and enabler becomes, at a certain point, operationally meaningless.

II. The Brotherhood and the Empire: Origins in the Canal Zone

The Muslim Brotherhood was founded in 1928 by Hassan al-Banna, a schoolteacher, in Ismailia—a city in the British-controlled Suez Canal Zone. Egypt was under British occupation. British intelligence maintained a pervasive presence in Egyptian political life and monitored virtually every significant political organisation. The idea that they were unaware of a rapidly growing mass movement in their own canal zone would be historically unprecedented.

What we know for certain is that prior to World War II, British Intelligence cultivated ties with the Brotherhood through agent Freya Stark, the British adventurer and writer. These covert connections were used to keep track of the growing German presence in North Africa. This means British intelligence was embedded with the Brotherhood from at least the late 1930s—within a decade of its founding.

The Brotherhood's wartime conduct was contradictory in ways that suggest multiple relationships simultaneously. From 1935 onward, the Brotherhood sent delegations to the Nazis' rallies in Nuremberg. In 1938, they distributed Arabic translations of selections from *Mein*

Kampf and the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* at the Parliamentary Conference for Arab and Muslim Countries in Cairo. Yet British intelligence maintained its contacts throughout.

After the war, the pivot was seamless. As former Muslim Nazi fighters began to work for the CIA in Munich, the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt also found a new home with the CIA. Said Ramadan, al-Banna's son-in-law and the Brotherhood's chief international organiser, met with President Dwight D. Eisenhower in the Oval Office in 1953.

According to CIA agent Miles Copeland, the Americans began looking for a "Muslim Billy Graham" around 1955. When finding or creating one proved elusive, the CIA began to cooperate with the Muslim Brotherhood directly.

When Nasser cracked down on the Brotherhood after 1954, MI6 and the CIA explored the possibility of using the group as a tool to undermine his government. British intelligence reportedly had contacts with exiled Brotherhood members and considered them a potential ally against the rise of Soviet-backed socialism in the Middle East.

Then, in the 1970s, the relationship scaled up dramatically. In 1972–1973, Sir James Craig of the Foreign Office, together with the British ambassador to Egypt, Sir Richard Beaumont, began an intense lobbying campaign aimed at harnessing the Muslim Brotherhood for use by the United Kingdom and the United States in the struggle against Marxists and nationalists—not only in Egypt, but throughout the Muslim world. This culminated in the Brzezinski strategy under Carter: using the Brotherhood's networks to wage jihad against the Soviets in Afghanistan—the same networks that would later produce al-Qaeda.

So: pre-war British contacts, wartime Nazi collaboration tolerated by the British, post-war CIA adoption, an Oval Office meeting with Eisenhower, MI6 operational use across the Middle East, and billions in Saudi-American funding for the Afghan jihad. Across five decades. Was the Brotherhood "created" by Western intelligence? There is no founding document. But was it enabled, amplified, internationalised, and weaponised by Western intelligence? Indisputably.

III. Khomeini in France: The Revolution Broadcast from a Parisian Suburb

In October 1978, at the height of the Iranian revolutionary crisis, Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini—expelled from Iraq under pressure from the Shah—arrived not in some remote exile but in a villa in Neauphle-le-Château, a quiet suburb forty kilometres west of Paris.

The Shah had wanted him far from Iran's borders. France seemed sufficiently distant. But Parisian exile actually made Khomeini's appeal for revolution far more effective and audible. He

and his disciples now had easy access to the international media and could direct-dial their supporters in Iran, carefully setting the cadence of escalation.

The French government, under President Valéry Giscard d'Estaing, allowed Khomeini to operate freely. With fewer restrictions against freedom of speech in France, Khomeini had a better opportunity to communicate his message to people in Iran. Because of journalists and the press in France, and reportedly the approval of foreign policy advisers in the United Kingdom and the United States, Khomeini's speeches were published rapidly in global media.

One of Khomeini's main activities at the house was to record speeches condemning the Shah and calling for revolution, which were recorded on cassettes and secreted into Iran. For 120 days, a revolutionary cleric conducted a regime-change operation from French soil, with full access to international telecommunications and global media. The French government did not intervene. British and American foreign policy advisers reportedly approved. The Shah's requests to restrict Khomeini's activities were ignored.

On 1 February 1979, a chartered Air France flight from Paris touched down at Mehrabad International Airport near central Tehran, carrying Iran's most revered spiritual figure. He descended to the tarmac on the supporting arm of an Air France pilot.

The revolution that followed—which produced the Islamic Republic, Wilayat al-Faqih, Hezbollah, and four decades of anti-Western and anti-Israeli ideology—was, in its critical four months, facilitated from French territory, under the noses of French, British, and American intelligence. Whether this was incompetence, miscalculation, or something more deliberate remains one of the open questions of modern intelligence history. What is not debatable is that it happened.

IV. Iran-Contra: Selling Weapons to the Enemy

If the pattern of Western facilitation of Islamist movements seems confusing, the Iran-Contra affair makes it bewildering.

By the mid-1980s, the Islamic Republic of Iran was designated a State Sponsor of Terrorism. Its proxy Hezbollah was holding American hostages in Lebanon. Its official ideology called for the destruction of the United States (“the Great Satan”) and Israel (“the Little Satan”). Its war with Iraq was devouring hundreds of thousands of lives.

And the Reagan administration was secretly selling it weapons.

Israel would sell weapons from the U.S. to Iran, which had been designated a State Sponsor of Terrorism in 1984 and the subject of an arms embargo, in exchange for the release of American hostages held by Hezbollah, Iran's ally, in Lebanon. Oliver North and CIA Director William

Casey then doubled down, funnelling the profits from the arms sales into yet another illegal venture: a secret plan to support the Contras, the anti-Sandinista rebels in Nicaragua, in direct contravention of the Boland Amendments passed by Congress.

The scale was significant. By the time the sales were discovered, more than 1,500 missiles had been shipped to Iran. According to Ahmad Haidari, a prominent Iranian arms dealer, approximately 80% of the weapons received by Iran from foreign countries between 1981 and 1982 came from Israel.

The operation involved a cast of characters that connected multiple covert networks: Oliver North of the National Security Council, CIA Director William Casey, Israeli officials including David Kimche and Amiran Nir, Saudi arms dealer Adnan Khashoggi, and Iranian intermediary Manucher Ghorbanifar. Robert McFarlane, North, Nir, retired CIA official George Cave, and NSC staff member Howard Teicher flew to Tehran with Hawk spare parts. They carried, reportedly, a Bible signed by Reagan and a chocolate cake.

The Kerry Committee Report revealed that a major source of funding for the Contras came from Latin American cocaine traffickers in exchange for protection from law-enforcement activity. The same planes that flew shipments of arms from the United States to Nicaragua were used to import cocaine on their return flights.

The implications are extraordinary. The United States was simultaneously declaring Iran a terrorist state, arming it through Israeli intermediaries, using the profits to fund a guerrilla war in Central America, and covering the financial gaps with drug money. The same administration that publicly denounced negotiating with terrorists was privately trading weapons for hostages with the very regime whose ideology—imported from Sayyid Qutb via Khamenei's translations—called for America's destruction.

V. Arafat's Extraction: Saving the Enemy to Fight Another Day

In the summer of 1982, Israeli forces under Defence Minister Ariel Sharon invaded Lebanon and besieged West Beirut, where Yasser Arafat and approximately 14,000 PLO fighters were trapped. The siege involved massive aerial bombardment and artillery fire that devastated the city and killed thousands of civilians.

Israel's stated objective was the destruction of the PLO as a military and political force. Sharon had the PLO cornered. Arafat was hiding in different locations across Beirut, rarely sleeping in the same place each night. The military situation was terminal for the Palestinians.

Then the United States intervened—not on Israel's side, but to save Arafat.

The turning point was a telephone call between President Ronald Reagan and Israeli Prime Minister Menachem Begin. Reagan said that his administration was unwilling to tolerate the extent of the Israeli bombing campaign and called for an immediate ceasefire. At Reagan's command, the ceasefire went into effect twenty minutes later.

US Special Envoy Philip Habib negotiated Arafat's safe exit. Under the agreement, more than 14,000 PLO fighters were evacuated from Beirut between 21 August and 1 September 1982, departing under the protection of a multinational force of American, French, and Italian soldiers. Arafat and his top leadership relocated to Tunis, Tunisia, where the PLO established a new base. Israel guaranteed not to kill or arrest any of the PLO's top leaders—not even Arafat himself.

The man who would later negotiate the Oslo Accords, who would be received at the White House, who would share a Nobel Peace Prize—was extracted from military annihilation by the same Western powers that officially designated his organisation as terrorist.

VI. The Soviet Dimension: KGB, Stasi, and the PLO

The Western facilitation documented above did not occur in isolation. A parallel—and in some ways more extensive—operation was being conducted simultaneously by the Soviet bloc.

Arafat and the KGB

According to the Mitrokhin Archive—the vast collection of notes smuggled out of KGB headquarters by archivist Vasili Mitrokhin—and corroborated by testimony from Ion Mihai Pacepa, the highest-ranking Soviet-bloc intelligence officer ever to defect to the West, the KGB's involvement with the PLO was not peripheral. It was structural.

The KGB maintained codenames for each PLO faction: Fatah was “Kabinet”; the PFLP was “Khutor”; the DFLP was “Shkola.” Arafat himself received the codename “Aref.” According to Pacepa, who served as Romania's intelligence chief and was Arafat's handler, the KGB provided Arafat with monthly payments of \$200,000 and introduced him to Romanian dictator Nicolae Ceaușescu, who mentored him in propaganda strategy. Ceaușescu's advice, reinforced by North Vietnamese General Vo Nguyen Giap, was precise: “Stop talking about annihilating Israel and instead turn your terror war into a struggle for human rights. Then you will have the American people eating out of your hand.”

The KGB's involvement extended to Arafat's successor. An internal KGB report noted: “Krotov is an agent of the KGB.” “Krotov” was the codename for Mahmoud Abbas—the current President of the Palestinian Authority. According to the KGB's own definition, an “agent” is one who “consistently, systematically and covertly carries out intelligence assignments, while

maintaining secret contact with an official in the agency.” Abbas later attended the Patrice Lumumba University in Moscow, a KGB-controlled institution, where he wrote a doctoral dissertation promoting Holocaust-denial themes.

The Soviets did not merely fund and direct the PLO. They helped construct the narrative framework that persists to this day. In 1969, the KGB instructed Arafat to declare war on American “imperial-Zionism”—a term Arafat later claimed to have invented, but which was in fact a Moscow creation, adapted from the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*. The Soviets sponsored and voted for UN General Assembly Resolution 3379 in 1975, which declared that “Zionism is a form of racism”—a resolution that, although repealed in 1991, permanently shaped international discourse.

The Stasi and the PLO: A Formal Alliance

East Germany’s Ministry of State Security—the Stasi—operated as the KGB’s most capable satellite service and maintained its own extensive relationship with the PLO.

In June 1979, the Stasi signed a formal agreement of cooperation with the PLO intelligence services. A Stasi memo of 8 May 1979 stated the purpose explicitly: the goal was for “the GDR as its ally, to enhance the PLO’s ability to carry out actions that it describes as ‘acts of war’ against anti-Palestinian, Zionist centres as well as against the traitorous Sadat regime.”

The Stasi trained and armed PLO operatives, providing thousands of Kalashnikov assault rifles, hand grenades, and ammunition. Stasi officers recruited and trained at least 1,000 military officers from Iraq, Libya, Syria, and the PLO, teaching them techniques including aircraft hijacking and hostage-taking. The Stasi also maintained operational contact with the PFLP’s Wadi Haddad, the operational mastermind behind the wave of aircraft hijackings that defined 1970s terrorism.

The Stasi’s port operations in South Yemen ensured a steady flow of weapons to the PLO. Its cooperation with the PLO was designed to prevent terrorist attacks in Western Europe—where such attacks would embarrass East Germany’s diplomatic aspirations—while actively facilitating attacks against Israel and the Sadat government. Terrorism was not opposed as a method; it was managed geographically.

After German reunification in 1990, the Stasi archives revealed the full scope of this cooperation, including the Stasi’s involvement in the 1986 La Belle discotheque bombing in West Berlin, which killed an American serviceman and a Turkish woman. The fact that a German intelligence service—operating from the soil of a state that proclaimed itself the “anti-fascist” successor to the Third Reich—was actively arming and training organisations dedicated to the destruction of the Jewish state constitutes one of the Cold War’s most bitter ironies.

VII. The UN Platform: A Former Nazi Officer Legitimises a KGB Agent

The convergence of these threads produced one of the twentieth century's most consequential acts of political theatre: Yasser Arafat's address to the United Nations General Assembly on 13 November 1974.

The man who presided over this event as Secretary-General was Kurt Waldheim—an Austrian diplomat who had served as an intelligence officer in Nazi Germany's Wehrmacht during World War II. Waldheim's name appeared on the Wehrmacht's "honour list" for a militarily successful operation in the Balkans. He received the Medal of the Crown of King Zvonimir from the Nazi puppet state of Croatia. In 1944, he reviewed and approved a packet of antisemitic propaganda leaflets to be dropped behind Soviet lines, one of which concluded: "Enough of the Jewish war, kill the Jews, come over."

Waldheim concealed this wartime record for decades, claiming in his autobiography that he had been discharged after a wound on the Eastern Front in 1941 and spent the rest of the war as a civilian law student. The full truth did not emerge publicly until 1986, when the World Jewish Congress exposed his Wehrmacht service—but by then he had already served two terms as UN Secretary-General (1972–1981) and was running for President of Austria, an office he won despite the revelations.

It was under Waldheim's stewardship that Arafat—a man whose organisation was trained and funded by the KGB, whose ideology derived from the Nazi-influenced Muslim Brotherhood, and whose codename in Soviet intelligence files was "Aref"—was invited to address the General Assembly. Arafat appeared with a holstered pistol on his hip, delivered his "olive branch and gun" speech, and received a standing ovation. In his speech, Arafat personally thanked "Mr. Kurt Waldheim, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, for the great efforts he has made."

A year later, under the same Secretary-General, the General Assembly passed Resolution 3379—declaring that "Zionism is a form of racism"—a resolution engineered by the KGB and pushed through by the Soviet bloc and the Non-Aligned Movement.

The scene deserves to be stated plainly: a former Nazi intelligence officer, serving as the world's most senior diplomat, provided a global platform to a KGB-linked terrorist leader, whose ideology was rooted in a movement that had sent delegations to Nazi rallies in Nuremberg, distributed the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* across the Arab world, and whose anti-Jewish theology drew directly on wartime Nazi propaganda—all under the auspices of an organisation dedicated to international peace.

This was not a failure of the system. It was the system functioning precisely as the convergence of interests required.

VIII. The Pattern: Facilitation, Not Creation

Taken individually, each of these episodes can be explained by specific geopolitical calculations: the Brotherhood was useful against Nasser and the Soviets; Khomeini was tolerated because the Shah was losing credibility; Iran-Contra was a misguided hostage negotiation; Arafat's extraction was humanitarian pragmatism; Soviet support for the PLO was standard Cold War proxy warfare.

But taken together, the pattern tells a different story. Three rival intelligence ecosystems—Western (MI6, CIA, French intelligence), Soviet (KGB, Stasi, Romanian Securitate), and the remnants of Nazi networks—all converged on the same functional outcome: the enablement of movements whose ideology denies Jewish sovereignty and Jewish covenantal continuity.

The Muslim Brotherhood—with its Qutbian theology of cosmic antisemitism—was enabled by MI6 and the CIA for decades. The PLO—led by a KGB agent, trained by the Stasi, armed by the Soviet bloc—was given a global platform by a UN Secretary-General who had served as a Nazi intelligence officer. Khomeini—whose revolution produced the Islamic Republic's anti-Zionist theocracy—conducted his revolution from French soil with Western acquiescence. The Islamic Republic—built on Khamenei's translations of Qutb—received over 1,500 American missiles through Israeli intermediaries. Arafat—a KGB-linked leader whose PLO charter called for Israel's destruction—was saved from military defeat by American intervention.

No single document proves that Western intelligence services set out to create these movements. But the cumulative record demonstrates something that may matter more: they consistently chose to sustain them, at critical moments when those movements could have been contained, weakened, or destroyed.

IX. Cui Bono?

The deepest question this pattern raises is not operational but structural: who benefits from sustained, managed conflict in the Middle East?

Not ordinary Israelis, who have lived under rocket fire for decades. Not ordinary Palestinians, who have been displaced, besieged, and killed in successive wars. Not ordinary Iranians, who have suffered under theocratic rule since 1979. Not ordinary Lebanese, whose country was destroyed by the forces the US extracted in 1982, only to see Hezbollah—funded by the Iran the US was simultaneously arming—fill the vacuum.

The beneficiaries of managed chaos are those who profit from arms sales, energy price instability, and the perpetual justification of military expenditure and intelligence budgets. The beneficiaries are institutional, not national.

This does not require a conspiracy theory. It requires only the recognition that intelligence services, arms dealers, and geopolitical strategists operate on a different calculus from the populations they claim to serve—and that the ideologies they instrumentalise have consequences that outlast any single operation.

X. The Bridge: From Intelligence Operations to Theological Architecture

The preceding sections documented a pattern of Western facilitation of Islamist movements across five decades. But this pattern does not exist in isolation. It connects to a far older structure—one that predates the CIA, MI6, and the modern state system by over a millennium.

The companion articles in this series—*The Theology That Lost Its Timeline* and *The Guardian Who Contradicts His Own Book*—demonstrated that anti-Jewish theology is not incidental to European institutional authority. It is foundational. The doctrine of supersessionism—the claim that the Church replaced Israel as God’s covenantal community—provided the theological scaffolding upon which the authority of the Catholic Church, the divine right of European monarchies, and the sacral coronation rites of the British Crown were constructed.

The logic chain, as established in those articles, is precise:

Israel’s covenant is revoked → The Church inherits it → The Church becomes the vehicle of divine authority → Monarchs rule by sanction of the Church → Therefore, monarchs rule by God’s will.

This chain underpinned not only the Church of Rome but every European monarchy that derived its legitimacy from ecclesiastical sanction. And those monarchies are not historical relics. They are living institutions.

XI. The Houses That Supersessionism Built: One Dynasty, Multiple Thrones

The European monarchies that derived their sacral legitimacy from supersessionist theology are not independent institutions that happened to draw from the same source. They are, in significant part, the same family—branches of an interconnected dynastic network that collectively built its metaphysical authority on a single theological premise.

The Saxe-Coburg and Gotha Dynasty: Two Thrones, One House

The House of Windsor is the House of Saxe-Coburg and Gotha, renamed by King George V in 1917 because the original German name was politically untenable while Britain was at war with Germany. The dynasty traces to Prince Albert, consort of Queen Victoria, from the ducal house

of Saxe-Coburg and Gotha in Thuringia. Albert's uncle, Leopold I, had already been installed as the first King of the Belgians in 1831—making the British and Belgian monarchies branches of the same German ducal line.

Belgium kept the name. Britain changed it. The underlying dynasty is identical.

The British branch rules as Supreme Governor of the Church of England, crowned at Westminster Abbey in a rite that models itself on the anointing of Israel's kings. The Belgian branch rules a state constituted as a Catholic kingdom, with the monarch swearing an oath before God and the constitution. Both derive sacral authority from the same theological chain: the Church inherits Israel's covenant; rulers sanctioned by the Church inherit divine authority.

That the same family sits on both thrones—one Protestant, one Catholic—while drawing from the same supersessionist well demonstrates that the theological architecture transcends confessional divisions. It is not a Catholic doctrine or an Anglican doctrine. It is the shared metaphysical infrastructure of European monarchy as such.

The Bourbon Dynasty: “Their Most Catholic Majesties”

The House of Bourbon, which holds the Spanish throne, is connected to the Saxe-Coburg and Gotha network through the dense intermarriage that characterised European royalty for centuries. The Spanish Crown carries perhaps the most explicit supersessionist legacy of any European monarchy. The title “Their Most Catholic Majesties” (*Sus Majestades Católicas*) was conferred by Pope Alexander VI on Ferdinand and Isabella in 1496—four years after they expelled the Jews from Spain and launched the Inquisition. The Reconquista, the expulsion, and the Inquisition were direct expressions of the supersessionist conviction that Jewish presence in a Christian kingdom was theologically intolerable. The modern Spanish monarchy retains its constitutional relationship with the Catholic Church, and the coronation of Spanish kings includes religious elements that trace directly back to this theological architecture.

The Dynastic Web

Victoria and Albert's descendants occupied or married into virtually every throne in Europe. The Romanovs of Russia (until 1917), the Hohenzollerns of Germany (until 1918), the Greek royal family, the Romanian royal family, the Norwegian royal house—all were connected by blood to the Saxe-Coburg and Gotha line. The Scandinavian monarchies (Denmark, Norway, Sweden), the House of Orange-Nassau in the Netherlands, and the now-abolished monarchies of Austria-Hungary and Italy all participated in the same dynastic-theological system. These were not parallel structures. They were nodes in a single network.

This means that the supersessionist theological claim—Israel replaced, covenant transferred, Church supreme, monarch divinely sanctioned—was not adopted independently by separate

nations. It was the shared ideological operating system of a single, interconnected dynastic class that governed Europe for centuries and continues, in attenuated form, to occupy constitutional positions in over a dozen states.

The Catholic Church as Sovereign Entity

Above and behind the monarchies stands the institution that sanctioned them all. The Church of Rome is not merely a religious body. It is a sovereign political entity—the Holy See—with diplomatic relations with 183 states, permanent observer status at the United Nations, a legal system (Canon Law) governing over a billion adherents, and a head of state (the Pope) who claims spiritual authority over the entire Christian world. Its institutional authority rests on the apostolic succession from St. Peter, but its *civilisational* authority—its claim to be the moral arbiter of Christendom and the mediator of divine will on earth—rests on supersessionism. The Church’s claim to universal jurisdiction presupposes that it inherited Israel’s covenantal role. Without that premise, it remains a major religious institution, but its metaphysical claim to be the definitive vehicle of God’s purposes in history becomes one interpretation among many rather than an exclusive divine mandate.

The Reformation broke the Catholic Church’s monopoly on this claim but did not abandon the underlying theology. Protestant monarchies—including the Saxe-Coburg and Gotha dynasty on the British throne—simply internalised the supersessionist premise within national churches, cutting out the papal middleman while retaining the theological scaffolding. The monarch became the head of the national church, but the sacral authority still derived from the same source: the Church (now the national church) as the “New Israel,” and the monarch as the inheritor of biblical kingship.

The Implication

When we speak of the House of Windsor, the Belgian monarchy, the Spanish Bourbons, and the Catholic Church as separate institutions with separate legitimacy claims, we obscure a structural reality. They are components of a single system—dynastic, theological, and political—that was built on one foundational premise: that the Jewish covenant was revoked and its authority transferred.

That premise is now contradicted by the existence of the State of Israel, the return of the exiles, and the plain text of the Hebrew Bible that predicted both. The Quran, for its part, affirms the same land grant to the Children of Israel that the Tanakh describes. And the intelligence services operating under the authority of these very institutions have, for decades, facilitated the movements whose ideology reinforces the denial that makes the entire architecture cohere.

It is not many houses built on many foundations. It is one house, with many wings, built on one foundation. And the foundation is cracked.

XII. The Structural Convergence

Now the two threads of analysis converge.

The companion articles demonstrated that supersessionism—the denial of Jewish covenantal continuity—is structurally necessary for the legitimacy claims of the Church of Rome and European monarchies. If Israel’s covenant is acknowledged as unrevoked, the downstream theological architecture weakens.

The present article has demonstrated that Western intelligence services—operating under the authority of governments headed by these same monarchies and shaped by these same theological traditions—have repeatedly facilitated Islamist movements whose core ideology includes its own form of supersessionism (*tahrif*) and whose political programme centres on the denial of Jewish sovereignty.

The convergence is not accidental. It is structural.

Christian supersessionism says: Israel’s covenant was transferred to the Church. Therefore, Jewish sovereignty is theologically illegitimate.

Islamic supersessionism says: Earlier scriptures were corrupted. Islam is the final revelation. Therefore, Jewish sovereignty is theologically illegitimate.

Both frameworks deny the same thing: the persistence of the Jewish covenant and the legitimacy of Jewish national restoration.

And both frameworks serve institutional interests: the Church’s claim to universal spiritual authority, European monarchies’ claim to sacral legitimacy, and the Islamic Republic’s claim to clerical governance under Wilayat al-Faqih.

When Western intelligence services facilitated the Muslim Brotherhood, enabled Khomeini’s revolution from French soil, armed the Islamic Republic through Israeli intermediaries, and extracted Arafat from military defeat—they were not acting against their own civilisational interests in any simple sense. They were acting within a deeper logic: a logic in which the denial of Jewish sovereignty serves multiple overlapping institutional interests, theological and political, Christian and Islamic, monarchic and clerical.

XIII. The Tanakh’s Answer

Against all of this—the patristic Fathers, Augustine’s “witness people” doctrine, the coronation rites of Westminster Abbey, the *tahrif* doctrine of Islamic theology, Qutb’s cosmic antisemitism, Khomeini’s revolutionary messianism, and five decades of Western intelligence facilitation—the Hebrew Bible offers a single, unqualified response.

Jeremiah 31:35–36: If the sun, moon, and stars depart from their ordinances, then—and only then—shall Israel cease from being a nation.

Leviticus 26:44: Even in exile, even in the land of their enemies, the covenant holds.

Deuteronomy 30:3–5: The scattered will be gathered. The exiled will return. The land will be repossessed.

Ezekiel 36:24: “I will take you from among the nations, and gather you out of all countries, and will bring you into your own land.”

Isaiah 11:11–12: A second ingathering, from the four corners of the earth.

The sun and moon have not departed. The State of Israel exists. Hebrew is spoken. The exiles have returned. The prophecies—dismissed by the Church Fathers, neutralised by Augustine, declared corrupted by Islamic theology, and operationally undermined by Western intelligence—have been fulfilled in the plain, physical, geographic sense that the texts describe.

XIV. Conclusion: The Architecture and Its Foundations

The argument across this series of articles can now be stated in full.

A theological claim—supersessionism—was constructed in the early centuries of Christianity. It held that Israel’s covenant had been revoked and transferred to the Church. This claim became the foundation of European ecclesiastical authority and, through the doctrine of divine right, the metaphysical basis for European monarchy—not as separate institutions, but as branches of a single dynastic-theological system, centred on the House of Saxe-Coburg and Gotha and sanctioned by the Church of Rome.

A parallel theological claim—*tahrif* and Islamic supersessionism—was constructed within Islam. It held that earlier scriptures had been corrupted and that Islam was the final, uncorrupted revelation. This claim became the foundation of Islamic clerical authority and, through Wilayat al-Faqih, the basis for theocratic governance in Iran—built on an ideology imported from the Muslim Brotherhood via Qutb’s writings, translated into Persian by the current Supreme Leader.

Both claims require the denial of Jewish covenantal continuity. Both claims are challenged by the modern restoration of Jewish sovereignty. Both claims serve the institutional interests of their respective power structures.

And both claims have been, at critical historical moments, facilitated by the intelligence services of Western states whose own legitimacy narratives rest on the older, Christian version of the same supersessionist premise.

The Muslim Brotherhood was enabled by MI6 and the CIA. The PLO was armed and directed by the KGB and trained by the Stasi. Khomeini's revolution was broadcast from French soil. The Islamic Republic was armed by American missiles through Israeli intermediaries. Arafat—a KGB-linked operative—was extracted from military defeat by American, French, and Italian forces. And the global platform that legitimised the PLO was provided by a United Nations led by a former Nazi intelligence officer, who presided over a General Assembly resolution—engineered by the KGB—that declared Zionism to be racism. At every stage, the movements and leaders whose ideology denies Jewish sovereignty were sustained by states whose own theological traditions deny the same thing.

This is not a conspiracy. It is a convergence of institutional interests, operating across different civilisational frameworks but sharing a common structural requirement: the delegitimisation of Jewish covenantal claims. The Church of Rome needs it for its claim to be the “New Israel.” The House of Saxe-Coburg and Gotha—whether called Windsor in London or by its original name in Brussels—needs it for its sacral coronation. The House of Bourbon needs it for its title as “Most Catholic Majesty.” The Islamic Republic needs it for Wilayat al-Faqih. The Soviet Union needed it for its Cold War proxy strategy. And Western intelligence services, operating within and on behalf of these institutional frameworks, acted accordingly—not necessarily by design, but by structural logic—while their Soviet counterparts did the same from the opposite side of the Iron Curtain, and a former Nazi officer provided the international platform from which the entire convergence was consecrated.

The Tanakh said the covenant would hold. The Church Fathers said it would not. The Quran—Islam's own scripture—assigned the Holy Land to the Children of Israel, but Islamic theology overrode its own text. European monarchies built their sacral authority on the assumption that Israel's story was finished. Western intelligence services facilitated movements that reinforced that assumption.

And then history intervened. The State of Israel was established. The exiles returned. The language was revived. The covenant, by every empirical measure available, held.

The question that now confronts every institution built on supersessionist foundations—from the Vatican to Westminster Abbey, from the Élysée Palace to the Supreme Leader’s office in Tehran—is the same one the Tanakh posed three thousand years ago:

“If those ordinances depart from before Me, saith the Lord, then the seed of Israel also shall cease from being a nation before Me for ever.” — Jeremiah 31:36

The ordinances have not departed. And Israel has not ceased.

Everything built on the assumption that it would must now reckon with the fact that it did not.

This article is the fourth in a series. The preceding articles are: (1) “The Theology That Lost Its Timeline: Supersessionism, Covenant, and the Crisis of Legitimacy in European Political Tradition”; (2) “The Guardian Who Contradicts His Own Book: Islamic Supersessionism, Wilayat al-Faqih, and the Quranic Case Against Shia Clerical Authority”; (3) “The Cairo–Qom Pipeline: How the Muslim Brotherhood’s Antisemitism Became the Theology of the Islamic Republic of Iran.”

Sources Consulted

- Calvert, John. *Sayyid Qutb and the Origins of Radical Islamism*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2010.
- Dreyfuss, Robert. *Devil's Game: How the United States Helped Unleash Fundamentalist Islam*. New York: Metropolitan Books, 2005.
- Herf, Jeffrey. *Nazi Propaganda for the Arab World*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.
- Herf, Jeffrey, ed. *Antisemitism and Anti-Zionism in Historical Perspective*. New York: Routledge, 2007.
- Khalidi, Rashid. *Under Siege: PLO Decision-Making during the 1982 War*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1985.
- Küntzel, Matthias. *Jihad and Jew-Hatred: Islamism, Nazism and the Roots of 9/11*. New York: Telos Press, 2007.
- Küntzel, Matthias. *Nazis, Islamic Antisemitism and the Middle East*. London: Routledge, 2024.
- Meysan, Thierry. *Right Before Our Eyes*. Paris: Voltaire Network, 2019. [Treat with appropriate critical caution.]
- Andrew, Christopher, and Vasili Mitrokhin. *The World Was Going Our Way: The KGB and the Battle for the Third World*. New York: Basic Books, 2005.
- Herf, Jeffrey. "East Germany's Assault on Israel." *Commentary*, July/August 2017.
- Herf, Jeffrey. *Undeclared Wars with Israel: East Germany and the West German Far Left, 1967–1989*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- Nettler, Ronald L. *Past Trials and Present Tribulations: A Muslim Fundamentalist's View of the Jews*. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1987.
- Pacepa, Ion Mihai. *Red Horizons: The True Story of Nicolae and Elena Ceausescus' Crimes, Lifestyle, and Corruption*. Washington, DC: Regnery Gateway, 1987.
- Rosenbaum, Eli. *Betrayal: The Untold Story of the Kurt Waldheim Investigation and Cover-Up*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1993.
- Taheri, Amir. *The Spirit of Allah: Khomeini and the Islamic Revolution*. Bethesda, MD: Adler & Adler, 1985.
- Tower Commission Report. Washington, DC: 1987.
- Ünal, Yusuf. "Sayyid Qutb in Iran: Translating the Islamist Ideologue in the Islamic Republic." *Journal of Islamic and Muslim Studies* 1, no. 2 (November 2016): 35–50.
- Walsh, Lawrence E. *Iran-Contra: The Final Report of the Independent Counsel*. Washington, DC: 1993.
- Wilson Center. "East Germany's Eurocentric Definition of Counterterrorism." Blog post, June 2017.
- Yedioth Ahronoth / Ynetnews. "The KGB's Middle East Files: Palestinians in the Service of Mother Russia." November 2016.
- Al Majalla archival series on the 1982 Beirut evacuation. 2024.
- PLO Withdrawal from Lebanon. Wikipedia and primary sources cited therein.
- Iran–Contra affair. Brown University Understanding the Iran-Contra Affairs project.
- Kerry Committee Report on Contra drug connections. United States Senate, 1989.