

The ‘LaRouche Doctrine’ on Israel and the Holocaust

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

*[Published in **Executive Intelligence Review**, Volume 8, Number 20, May 19, 1981. View [PDF of original](#) at the LaRouche Library.]*

U.S. Democratic Party figure Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. responded directly to what he described as “the clearly implied, and vicious attack on President Reagan” contained in the “slanderous, obscene” attack on Chancellor Helmut Schmidt by Israel’s Menachem Begin.

“The time has come,” LaRouche noted, “to adopt a two-point policy concerning the future of Israel and the issues for today embedded in the lessons of the Nazi holocaust. I have good reason to believe the majority of citizens of both the United States and Israel will tend to concur with my proposals on both points.”

Concerning the implicit attack on President Reagan, LaRouche pointed to “the excellent and powerfully moving address” the President delivered on the subject of the Nazi concentration camps. “What clearly enraged Begin in that address was President Reagan’s reference to the case of the German villagers which Reagan’s military unit brought to witness the horrors of the concentration camp that unit had liberated.”

LaRouche added: “The reaction of German government spokesman Kurt Becker was directly to the point.” Becker noted that slander is apparently a feature of Israel’s election campaigns. Begin faces the prospect of defeat by Shimon Peres’s forces in the forthcoming elections in Israel.

“Begin’s only hope to stop Peres is to gain actual or virtual dictatorial powers. To accomplish this, the fanatically power-hungry Begin requires general chaos in the Middle East region, and also chaos in Western Europe.

“President Reagan has acted effectively to hold back the new Israel-Syria war—which both Begin and Syria’s Hafez Assad sought to launch. Chancellor Schmidt and President Giscard of France have acted to promote stability in that region. Begin is on a monstrous rampage against all three statesmen, and was clearly driven into a state of ideological frenzy by President Reagan’s accurate insights into the Nazi holocaust.

“The truth about this dangerous fanatic Begin must be brought into the open. It is not adequate merely to expose Begin for his *de facto* alliance with Libya’s Colonel Qaddafi. We

must state clearly a counter-policy on both the subjects of Israel and the policy-questions implicit for today in the Nazi holocaust.”

LaRouche followed those prefatory observations by submitting to public circulation the following policy declaration.

The 'LaRouche Doctrine': A Policy Statement

The only acceptable policy for the United States on matters including the subject of Israel is a policy consistent with the principles embedded in the establishment of the Constitution of the United States. These principles were and are, then and now, the common commitment of all men and women of goodwill throughout the world, and therefore constitute the only practicable basis in matters of decision pertaining to international law and policy of honorable nations and peoples.

Therefore, the policy of the United States and other nations concerning Israel and the lessons of the Nazi holocaust today must be proven to be consistent with those principles, as the history of the struggle for such principles demonstrates.

1. The Fundamental Foreign Policy of the United States

The United States of America was founded as a constitutional republic based on the inseparable principles of untainted sovereignty of nation-state republics, and technological progress as the indispensable precondition for the development and freedom of the individual personality.

The roots of that constitutional policy were transmitted to the shores of North America by the Commonwealth Party of England, the party of the poet, scholar, and statesman John Milton. Like the majority among the leading figures of the American Revolution, the English Commonwealth Party held these principles in common with the Commonwealth Party of France. The latter was the current, sometimes named *les politiques*, identified by such figures as Jean Bodin, Henri IV, Richelieu, Mazarin, and Jean-Baptiste Colbert. The same principles were those of the widespread networks established throughout most of Europe by a great protégé of Colbert, the scientist-statesman Wilhelm Gottfried Leibniz.

The establishment of the United States was accomplished under the leadership of the great scientist and statesman who emerged as a leading world figure of the period preceding and accompanying the American Revolution, Benjamin Franklin. Franklin, selected and groomed early in his adulthood to become the leader of the Commonwealth Party forces in America, made the United States possible by allying directly with such coconspirators as Joseph Priestly in Britain and the great Vergennes in France. These European fellow-

conspirators of Franklin's reached far beyond Britain and France, chiefly through networks earlier associated with Leibniz in Italy, Germany, Scandinavia, and Russia's St. Petersburg.

The relatively vast technological and military aid for the American cause from France, the creation of the League of Armed Neutrality against Britain which made the United States' victory possible, and the indispensable and substantial portion of European military figures in the Senior ranks of the Continental Army and Navy, attest to Franklin's greatness and to the common principles shared among the forces so represented.

These international forces of republicanism, led by the great Franklin, rallied to the American cause, to establish in America the first model of a new form of sovereign republic, a republic to be a beginning for the successful spread of the same principles among the nations of the Old World.

Although those Founding Fathers and their allies have been wickedly defamed by subversive British agents and accomplices, such as the "revisionist" Charles A. Beard, the institutions set into motion by those forces which continued the principles of the founding of the constitutional republic have mediated the commitment to policies of sovereign republics and technological progress in the overwhelming majority of the citizens of the United States to the present date. This is true, even a decade and a half after the accelerated introduction of the policies of the enemy forces of neo-Malthusian world-federalism into elements of national government under Presidents Johnson and Carter and the Kissinger administrations.

These policies, and their bearing upon the foreign policy of the United States, were most emphatically reaffirmed in the form of the 1823 Monroe Doctrine.

The policy formulations shaping that doctrine were submitted successfully by Secretary of State John Quincy Adams, earlier the personal protégé of Benjamin Franklin. President Monroe accepted fully Adams's doctrine, and rightly so. That doctrine, properly understood, is a direct extension of the principles of the founding of the republic, and is a model for the proper foreign policy of the United States and of all other like-minded nations and peoples.

Secretary of State John Quincy Adams rightly argued that the United States could make no treaty of alliance with Britain, because the United States shared no *community of principle* with its continuing adversary, Britain. This was not only the general case, but applied most emphatically to the emerging new nations of Latin America at that time.

The hideous, murderous initiative of Lords Palmerston and John Russell, both in conspiring to destroy the United States, and in directing the imposition of the evil regime of the puppet Hapsburg Maximilian upon Mexico, provided the most abundant and conclusive demonstration of the wisdom and foresight of Secretary Adams.

The foreign policy of the United States is consistent with its own Constitution only to the extent that the applications of that policy conform to *the doctrine of community of principle*. The Constitution of the United States recognizes an implied community of principle only with those nations and peoples which share a commitment to inviolable principles of sovereignty of nation-state republics, and to the promotion of technological progress as the precondition for fostering the development and freedom of the individual personality.

The United States can rightly promote no policy contrary to that, and engages in strategical and tactical enterprises of contrary form only as unavoidable forms of "Machiavellian™" expedients which efficiently promote those objectives of community of principle.

Rightly understood, such policies persist today not only as the constitutional foreign policy precepts of the United States, but as the adopted policies of the United States' closest neighbor, the Republic of Mexico, and the precious ally of the Lafayette tradition, the Fifth Republic of France.

These are also principles to which all nations and peoples of good will aspire throughout the world.

All nations and peoples sharing such an implicit community of principle with the forces establishing the United States as a constitutional republic, have only one range of policy options respecting the state of Israel and respecting the implications for today of the Nazi holocaust itself.

2. The Principle of the Sovereign Nation-State

The principle of the modern sovereign nation-state republic was developed, beginning with the work of Dante Alighieri, by the forces which organized the Golden Renaissance of 15th-century Italy. Through aid of those forces in Italy, including the coconspirators Leonardo da Vinci and Niccolò Machiavelli, the first modern form of sovereign nation-state was established and consolidated in France during the late 15th century under Louis XI. Shortly afterward, forces allied with Erasmus of Rotterdam established the second of the modern sovereign nation-states in Tudor England under Henry VII.

Although it is arguable that the modern form of sovereign nation-state republic is therefore an innovation, it is no less a matter of durable *principle*.

The holocaust of the late 13th and 14th century was characterized by conditions analogous to the process of destruction of Iran under the theocratic obscenity ruling there today. Half of the parishes of Europe were destroyed by a combined economic devolution, and resulting famine, epidemic and homicidal conflicts raging over the period from the defeat of the Hohenstaufen in 1268 A.D. into the third quarter of the following, 14th, century. *The*

modern nation-state was a scientific discovery of principle, a discovery designed to prevent the future recurrence of such cruel degradation of humanity.

The central flaw in the preceding order of Europe, which fostered the “Black Guelph” success in causing the holocaust of the 14th century, was the use of the hieratic Latin language for matters of administration and cultural policy of society. This arrangement fostered the degeneration of the popular spoken languages into collections of local, brutish, illiterate dialects. The people generally lacked, therefore, the power to receive and communicate what the poet Shelley described as “profound and impassioned conceptions respecting man and nature.”

Just as ignorant, irrational, and superstitious masses of people were key instruments in the genocidal destruction of Kampuchea under Peking’s puppet Pol Pot, so the same lunacy, reminding us today of early-to-middle 14th-century Europe of the “New Dark Age,” permitted the evil usurers of Paul Volcker’s “Black Guelph” predecessors of Venice and Genoa to destroy civilization in Europe during the late 13th and 14th centuries.

The Golden Renaissance was designed by Dante Alighieri and his successors of the Augustinian tradition, a design centered around the transformation of brutish dialects into common sets of literate languages. This was the directed function of the classical literature, the classical revolutions in painting, sculpture, and technologies during the course of the 14th and 15th centuries.

The development of mankind as a whole required the establishment of sovereign nation-state republics based on the common use of one of the newly developed literate forms of language. People who shared both that literate language-culture and common moral purposes for self-government were defined on principle as the basis for sovereign nation-state republics.

For example, the United States, although sharing a common language with Britain, rightly separated from that nation because the Americans had a fundamental difference in morality within the ruling forces and government of Britain.

Two points of clarification flow directly from these summarized facts.

The principle of the sovereign nation-state republic has no efficient basis in notions of ancient religious, ethnical, or related hereditary distinctions among people. Nations are not defined as petty egoisms, each in a Hobbesian relationship to one another, of “each against all.” The purpose of the sovereign nation-state’s existence is to provide an indispensable instrument for the self-government and self-development of humanity as a whole.

Each sovereign nation-state committed to fostering development and freedom of the individual personality through preconditions of technological progress, is an individual

member-state of a community of principle. Each state, with all such states in concert, is dedicated to fostering the same principles for all humanity. That community of principle is the positive content of the foreign policy-making of all such states.

Therefore, our proper policy toward such a case as the state of Israel does not depend upon whether or not that state is *already* qualified, fully or otherwise, as a sovereign nation-state republic. Just as the forefathers of our community of principle created sovereign nation-states in the past, we serve that principle by not only maintaining, but continuing to create such forms of sovereign nation-state republics in the present. *We are committed to what the state of Israel must become.* That is the essence of our proper policy toward the state of Israel today.

3. General Policy Perceptions Concerning the State of Israel

Our proper policy toward the states of the Middle East is that *each shall be or become* a sovereign nation-state republic, including the state of Israel, and that all such states shall enjoy relations among one another consistent with a community of principle.

We are content if the internal order of such a state is either a constitutional monarchy, a presidential form of constitutional state such as France, Mexico, and the United States, or a parliamentary form of government. The question whether the state is of some different form, such as an authoritarian form, is essentially an internal affair of that nation.

We situate the question of forms within the topic of development of the peoples and institutions of nations. It is the process of development we are committed to foster, in collaboration with sovereign states, and it is that process, rather than the immediately existing form of internal constitutions, which is our principled concern.

The rights of the state of Israel are defined not by what it is, but by what is required to enable it to become a sovereign nation-state republic situated peacefully in a community of principle among its neighbors.

We consider it immoral, respecting principles of human rights, that political disabilities should exist in Israel or any other nation by means of discrimination involving ethnic-origin or sectarian religious tests.

The dogma of "Greater Israel" is an utter abomination before international morality. To the extent that any party or government of Israel may adhere to such a dogma, no action or policy flowing from such a dogma can be tolerated under international law.

Despite such actual and potential disqualifications of the state of Israel, *we are governed by commitment to what the state of Israel must become*, and treat such actual or potential disqualifications as secondary practical matters.

Except as this bears upon remedies to be provided to those who continue to suffer from consequences of that past history, the 1947–1967 developments establishing the present state of Israel are irreversible in principle.

Every modern nation came to occupy its present territories, with the present ethnic stocks represented, chiefly by force of arms and similar measures, including the territory of Greater Han China on the mainland of Asia today. These past migrations cannot be reversed. No good purpose can be served by the lunatic proposal to reassort the populations of the world, conceding to each the precise territory occupied at one time or another by its supposed ancestors.

The concentration of Jewish persons in the territory of Israel today is a minority of the world's Jewish population, a minority which came into embattled occupation of its present territory under extraordinary circumstances not chiefly of the making of that population or its immediate forebears.

During the 19th century, a growing and evil spread of racialism occurred throughout Europe, influenced by the Anglo-Saxon racist obscurities, spreading from the Ossian hoax concocted by David Hume during the 18th century. This was spread through channels including the abominations of de Gobineau in France, Houston Chamberlain and his circles in Bavaria, and elsewhere, and leading into such expressions as pogroms in Russia, fascist anti-Semitic persecutions in pre-1939 Poland, and the emergence of the Nazi phenomenon out of Houston Chamberlain's circles in Bavaria.

This racialism, accelerating anti-Semitism and persecution of Jews in Europe, overlapped the activities of British Secret Intelligence Service during and following the Napoleonic Wars in the Middle East, including the settlement of a handful of Christian converts from among Jews in and around Jerusalem.

These circumstances were those conditions of background under which Zionism emerged as a militant minority among the Jews of Europe during the latter part of the 19th century, fed by circumstances of anti-Semitic outrages within Czarist Russia. The rise of Hitler to power in Germany accelerated the influence of Zionism among Jewish communities of many nations, winning many more to Zionism, and creating either sympathy or at least toleration for Zionism among numerous others, Jews and non-Jews.

However, it was not chiefly Zionism which caused the migration leading to the establishment of the state of Israel. It was chiefly the combined effect of two forces.

First, Jews driven from the horrid memories of Nazi-occupied Europe, and perceiving themselves wanted by no nation, had no visible prospect of relief from their profound fears

of new outrages of anti-Semitism but the prospect of a Jewish national homeland in Palestine.

Second, the continuing commitment by elements of British intelligence to exploit Jewish settlement in the Middle East as part of a continuation of the "Great Game" the British had been conducting in that region since the beginning of the 19th century. The British intended the Jews to be an added factor of destabilization in the region, and British forces played Jews against British intelligence's Arab Bureau networks in the region, to orchestrate the conditions of conflict which have become institutionalized in that region as the Israeli-Arab conflict of today.

The object of the proper foreign policy of the United States and its allies is to bring to an end both the British "Great Game" in that region and the bloody irrationalities which have become institutionalized in consequence of that "Great Game."

It is our proper object to establish the region including Turkey, below the Soviet Union's borders into India, as a zone of great-power neutrality, a zone of development of sovereign nation-state republics, of nation-states coming increasingly into a condition of mutually advantageous economic cooperation with one another.

It is our particular proper object to aid Israel in utilizing its relatively special competence to assimilate and mediate technology to promote both its own internal prosperity and peaceful cooperation with its neighbors.

4. Failures in Policy toward Israel

Repeatedly, from within Israel, there has emerged to a leading position some political faction determined to change the situation, to move developments into directions consistent with the policy we have outlined.

Each time, Arab leaders who should have encouraged this have bent to pressures, and have failed to make the public response required to foster this effort from within Israel. More significantly, the great powers, including the British-influenced United States, have failed to provide the credible, required, open support for such ephemeral Israeli initiatives.

In practice, Israel has been left to maneuver by extreme Machiavellian expedients within the circumstances defined by the continuing, bloody heritage of British intelligence's "Great Game" in the region. This is best understood in examining the history of the tiny nation of Israel under the leadership of David Ben-Gurion. Lacking credible outside support for peace-oriented policy initiatives from among its own political forces, Israel's policy has been chiefly one of expedient strategic maneuver within the terms of the "Great Game" rigged chiefly, in turn, by the cupidity or other form of folly of the great powers. Israel has existed

predominantly by functioning as a virtual “multiple agent” of the principal factions of the great powers in that region, playing off the follies of one or another patron (including the Soviet Union) against those of others.

There can be no effective, proper foreign policy toward the Middle East unless this pattern of behavior by the great and lesser powers toward the Middle East is changed.

Essentially, the principal powers must give credible forms of support to those political initiatives from within Israel's leading political circles which strengthen them, by reinforcing the impulses within Israel, toward the objectives we have broadly identified above. When a Begin attempts to follow courses of action to destabilize the Middle East situation, credible and efficient deterrents must be quickly applied to the included effect of discrediting that impulse within Israel. Contrary to the record of past great-power performance generally, whenever political initiatives from within Israel are even tentatively *in the direction* needed to effect genuine solutions, the electorate of the tiny nation of Israel must have credible evidence that such initiatives from Israel will have full and efficient support.

In this, we must be blind to all arguments on behalf of Zionism, but fixed on the objective of the forms of *Israeli nationalism*, which are consistent with the principles of the sovereign nation-state.

The keystone of efficient policy toward Israel today is the interrelated matter of Israel's foreign debt and internal inflation. The key to strengthening Israel's capacity to become a sovereign nation-state republic in outlook, is to aid it in achieving the *internal conditions of life* consistent with a sovereign nation-state dedicated to technological progress. The debt must be reorganized, a “heavy currency” reform instituted as part of that package, and sufficient credits for technology provided to enable Israel to export needed categories of technology for the economic development of those among its neighbors which desire improved technologies in water, nuclear, and other categories.

That sort of assistance to *a political leadership seeking to change the patterns of Middle East relations* will provide indirect benefits of inestimable great value to the nations which act in concert to bring peace to the Middle East on this basis.

That assistance, if combined with action to terminate at last the old British “Great Game” in the region, is the concrete policy we must seek the opportunities to implement.

5. The Lessons of the Nazi Holocaust

During the Nazi period, especially the 1943–1945 period, two categories of Jewish persons were murdered systematically. The first category, perhaps 1,500,000 persons, was simply killed outright under policies such as Hermann Göring's “Green File” operation, or the mass

extinction of Hungarian-Romanian populations made prominent by the Eichmann and Kastner cases. The second category includes countless persons who died under Nazi classification as "Jews" at the immediate direction of Albert Speer, as discarded salvage from the slave-labor processes. This was a mass of persons classified as "Jews," murdered in relative or absolute anonymity, together with millions of (predominantly) Slavic populations of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union.

Although the mass murder of Jews has special prominence in this evil process, recent history demonstrates that it is a dangerous error to isolate the Jewish victims of this mass murder from the more numerous Slavs and others of non-Jewish classifications. Today, the same policies of depopulation which created the Nazi slave-labor system are afoot, under such rubrics as the Club of Rome, World Wildlife Fund, and the Global 2000 doctrine issued by the Carter administration. Tens of millions of persons are presently dying because of the influence of such population doctrines in Africa alone. The policies of genocide conducted under direction of Peking planners, by the Pol Pot regime in Kampuchea, are another instance of far more ambitious Nuremberg classification "crimes against humanity" than were accomplished by the Nazi administration.

Even elements of the U.S. executive branch, and institutions within the U.S. Congress, are presently contaminated by Johnson administration, Kissinger administration, and Carter administration holdovers within important, influential nooks and crannies of the U.S. government. The Office of Population Affairs of the U.S. State Department and the Ad Hoc Population Group of the National Security Council are exemplary of such Johnson-Kissinger-Carter holdovers. There are institutional elements of the United Nations Organization also functioning to catalyze genocide on such or larger scales over the course of the remaining decades of this century.

Insofar as references to the Nazi holocaust do not fix primary emphasis on the need to crush the policies of co-thinkers of the Club of Rome today, the lament for the dead of the past becomes a monstrously evil form of hypocrisy.

The lesson of the past Nazi holocaust, is that such policies must be, so to speak, crushed in the cradle, before the mass murder becomes institutionalized. Those who have not learned from that past experience to correct the error of the 1930s, and to crush the promotion of genocide now, when it has already become almost adolescent in its development as an institutionalized force, are the meanest and lowest of hypocrites, if they profess to reflect on the Jews killed by the Nazis. If that experience does not efficiently inspire one to crush the influence of the evil Club of Rome and like-minded agencies, then one's concern for the memory of the Nazi holocaust is indeed the meanest, lowest form of hypocrisy.

This applies in a corresponding degree to those political forces which are not consciously promoting genocidal doctrines such as the Global 2000 obscenity, but who promote the policies by which genocide is being made a reality in many parts of the world already.

Among those unwitting accomplices of modern Nazism are those who:

- 1) Oppose the development and proliferation of the agricultural and other modern technology needed to provide at least 2,000 to 2,400 calories of balanced diet or better per person to those who face genocide through famine, epidemics and regional warfare in various parts of the world.
- 2) Oppose the thousands of gigawatts of nuclear energy production, without which it would not be possible to produce the technology needed by developing nations, or, to use the technology, once it were delivered to those nations.
- 3) Condone the spread of the rock-drug counterculture, now transforming cities such as New York into not only "crime capitals" of the world, but transforming whole nations, such as Italy, and perhaps the Federal Republic of Germany next, into parodies of the British nightmare-film "Clockwork Orange."
- 4) Propose and implement those monetarist policies of austerity, with aid of usurious interest rates, which create, directly and indirectly, the conditions of genocide, in developing regions of the world.

The monetary policy aspect of this is crucial for policy deliberation today.

The Nazi regime had two principal features.

The essential feature was a monetary policy conduited into Germany from Montagu Norman of the Bank of England and the Genoa-sponsored Swiss Bank for International Settlements. As the late Jacques Rueff documented the matter, it was this built-in monetary policy feature of the Nazi regime—analogue to the doctrines to the Mont Pelerin Society and the Fabian Society's Heritage Foundation today—which turned the inherent inflation of the Nazi system "inward against the economy and population," leading to the condition under which the value of the Nazi mark was based—as Hitler himself emphasized—on the slave-labor system of genocidal mass murder.

The second feature of the Nazi regime was the Nazi movement. The essence of the ideology of Nazism is that documented by the official Nazi cult doctrinaire, Alfred Rosenberg, and otherwise expressed by the superstitious cultisms of General Professor Karl Haushofer, Rudolf Hess, and Hitler himself. The essence of Nazi ideology is *irrationalism*, a subspecies of existentialism. It is the proposed "triumph of the irrational will" or the anarchist-existentialist over the opposing forces, viewed by existentialists as representing the "tyranny of reason."

It was not inconsistent that Italy's fascism was a product of the Socialist Party of Italy, and led by the leader of that party's anarchosindicalist left, Benito Mussolini. Hitler's Nazis had a similar social origin, largely the youth counterculture movement of 1920s Weimar Germany.

Today, it is the forces of anti-nuclear rabbles, of pro-drug and pro-drug-legalization ferment, pivoted on the spread of the increasingly homosexual youth rock-drug counterculture, which is proving itself to be the new fascist social battering ram in Italy, in Germany, in France, and in the United States.

Are we entirely lacking in the capacity to learn anything of importance from World War II? Are we fools, that we profess to lament over the murder of the Nazis' victims, and yet permit the State Department of Alexander Haig to openly promote Socialist Party leader Bettino Craxi as the new Mussolini of Italy today? Is it not ironic that the pressures on Italy's leaders in support of Craxi as the new "Il Capo" of Italy are identical with those coming through the channels of the Soviet KGB?

Let us continue to denounce the Nazi holocaust? Absolutely. Let us not forget the victims? Absolutely. But, let us not degrade such reflections to those of mean, debased hypocrisy. Let us learn the lessons from that experience. Let us crush the recurrence of proposals for genocide, the re-emergence of new fascist-irrationalist social battering rams, now, before it is too late to do so.

That must be our policy concerning the lessons for today of the Nazi holocaust of the past.

Begin's Alliance with Qaddafi

According to the widest variety of highest-level sources in several European nations, the largest single portion of funds to support Bettino Craxi in Italy and François Mitterrand in France is conduited, chiefly through Socialist International channels, from the Venetian puppet ruler of Libya, Colonel Qaddafi.

Each for reasons of his own, the forces of British intelligence, the Socialist International, the Muslim Brotherhood, Qaddafi, and Soviet KGB, and Prime Minister Menachem Begin, are dedicated to bringing down Schmidt in Germany, Giscard in France, destroying the credibility of President Reagan, and bringing the self-styled new "Il Capo" of Italy, Bettino Craxi, to power. These enterprises are supported in significant aspects by circles of Robert Moss and Arnaud de Borchgrave, and predominantly by the State Department of Alexander Haig.

Menachem Begin may not like Colonel Qaddafi personally, but Begin is of a sort whose closest associations are already Hobbesian in essence. Like paranoids generally, they are

essentially asocial, irrational, fixed upon narrow personal goals, and therefore easily manipulated by those varieties of Tavistock psychological warfare specialists who otherwise have developed the technology for transforming disturbed potential homicidal psychopaths into “programmed” Manchurian Candidate assassins. Begin is wittingly collaborating with his putative adversary, Hafez Assad of Syria, and the forces of Colonel Qaddafi.

That is simple fact. They may argue, each of them, that they are “using” the others, but the co-deployment against common adversaries remains nonetheless a fact, whatever explanations they might offer for the existing arrangements.

From the standpoint of U.S. policy, the time for Alexander Haig to return to private life—preferably in disgrace—has come and passed. It is urgent that the White House replace the wretched saboteur of its policies, Haig’s crew, by a secretary and undersecretaries qualified to clean out the next of Kissinger and Carter holdovers from key positions. On that basis, the United States and its allies would be better able to implement competent, effective policies concerning both Israel and the lessons of the Nazi holocaust.