

A dialogue on future Israeli policy: LaRouche, Begin, and Prof. Adelson

by Criton Zoakos, Editor-in-Chief

Events surrounding Defense Minister Ariel Sharon's public chastisement at the Aug. 12 cabinet meeting have set into motion a profound re-examination of issues so fundamental that they touch on the very future existence of the state of Israel. Involved in this matter in a unique and unprecedented way is the American statesman and economist Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. and the *Executive Intelligence Review*.

To summarize: The state of Israel, now involved in its Lebanon quagmire, must choose between two rival courses of action: 1) continue drifting from one artificial exigency to the next until the destruction of Israel itself, or 2) launch a ruthless war to exterminate every last British intelligence and diplomatic assets throughout the Middle East, Arab and Israeli.

In a personal letter to Prime Minister Begin, which was published as an open letter on Aug. 6, Mr. LaRouche, among other matters, proposed: "let us, at last, act as centuries of Jewish martyrs acted. Let us help to build, among other good things, an Islamic movement in the tradition of the great Ibn Sina. Let us join the great alliance of Jews with Caliph Haroun al-Rashid and Charlemagne, against that evil, Byzantine intelligence-service concoction, the Ummayyads.

"With whom shall we begin, you ask? With the Palestinian Arabs, naturally, including the Arabs who are already citizens of Israel itself. Instead of manufacturing enemies, whom we turn into Satanic, Asharite beast-men, let us create Arab allies."

The delivery of LaRouche's letter to the Prime Minister was surrounded by a drastic deterioration in Israel's strategic situation and by a series of other controversial developments. Israel has essentially realized that it has been entrapped into a situation in Lebanon from which it cannot extricate itself without major assistance from the United States. With Foreign Minister Shamir's last visit to Washington and with subsequent messages from the White House, culminating in the notorious Aug. 12 telephone messages, the Israeli government, to its horror, has realized that such United States assistance, despite earlier assurances, will not be forthcoming that easily. Having been manipulated into entering Le-

banon, Israel now faces mounting domestic dissension while it finds itself hostage, in Lebanon, to the exigencies of occupation in a disintegrated country and to the whim of super-powers. Looking beyond the immediate horizon, the Israeli leadership sees the swelling tidal wave of anti-Semitic terrorism and irrational rage among Arab populations. Israeli leaders have two questions tormenting them right now: 1) what went wrong? and 2) can Israel survive in these nightmarish circumstances?

After the Aug. 12 cabinet meeting, a spokesman for Prime Minister Begin told the press that "the negotiations over the future of Lebanon are so delicate that we cannot leave them in the hands of an elephant. Sharon's position became shaky yesterday. Ministers have realized how close he was to sinking the whole Habib mission, they know it is unsafe to rely on Sharon any more in the negotiations."

But the matter is much larger than this. Senior Israeli officials, apparently, realize that the strings of policy are not being pulled in Washington but rather in London. This became evident to the more reluctant analysts after Shamir's visit to Washington. This realization, however, ought to occasion a pause for the following reflection.

Mr. LaRouche and his collaborators, such as this review, have warned for years that certain aspects of Israeli and Jewish sensibilities and vulnerabilities are being manipulated by British interests, are being induced by British and Anglo-ophile interests to carry out certain unsavory types of business which Anglo gentlemen would rather not be caught doing. For this we have been viciously slandered as anti-Semitic, by means of slanders retailed by such organized-crime figures as mobster Roy Cohn and Max Fisher, but invariably ordered by Anglican leaders such as Bishop Paul Moore of the Cathedral of Saint John the Divine in New York (and of Morgan Guaranty Bank), and such intimates of Paul Moore as Cyrus Vance, et al.

Professor Adelson's letter

On Aug. 13, one day after the Israeli cabinet and Knesset rebuke Defense Minister Sharon, the prestigious *Jerusalem*

Post published, prominently in the dead center of its editorial page and in the form of a letter to the editor, a highly unethical attack against one of Sharon's outstanding critics, Gen. Mordechai Gur, Labour member of the Knesset who the previous day, together with 13 other parliamentarians had walked out of the chambers in protest against Ariel Sharon's testimony at the time. General Gur, as our readers will recall, had given an interview to the *Executive Intelligence Review* with comments critical of Mr. Sharon. The author of the letter to the *Jerusalem Post*, Prof. Howard L. Adelson, summarily brands Mr. LaRouche and the *EIR* as somehow self-evidently anti-Semitic and then launches into a vehement attack against General Gur for associating himself with anti-Semites.

A highly unusual procedure in trying to silence the opposition. According to Adelson, Gen. Mordechai Gur, the former Chief of Staff, must either admit guilt by association with anti-Semites or he must admit guilt for "insufficient attention to detail and poor grasp of circumstances," i.e., the Professor's spelling of the charge of incompetence. Let us, however, ignore the Professor's "only two alternatives" and do the traditional and proper thing and select the obvious third: Where is Professor Adelson coming from and why is he raising the anti-Semitism slander against LaRouche just as the debate over Israel's very future is raging in the councils of the state? Does the publication of his letter in any way relate to the fact that the Prime Minister received a communication from Mr. LaRouche only four days earlier, or to the

fact that Ariel Sharon, General Gur's target, had his wings clipped at the cabinet only one day earlier?

In New York City Professor Adelson, who professes a long-standing friendship with Prime Minister Begin, appears to be politically close to certain circles known by the name "East Side Conservative Club." These circles include a motley variety such as columnist William Safire, society homosexual William F. Buckley, underworld homosexual Roy M. Cohn, CIA Director William Casey, and the little-known Arthur Ross, a private banker of some rank in British Intelligence. Professor Adelson's political philosophy, as expounded regularly in New York's *Jewish Week*, appears close to the philosophical preferences of the above crew. His "anti-Semitism" slander is definitely borrowed from that notorious *fegele*, Roy M. Cohn. One therefore would not be presuming much if one presumed that the Professor, in writing his filth to the Editor of the *Jerusalem Post*, was doing so in the behalf of New York's East Side Conservative Club.

Now this would make the subject of British intelligence tampering with Israel a very interesting matter. For those who have followed Mr. LaRouche's activities over the years, it is known that the "anti-Semitism" slanders appeared suddenly one fine day under very specific circumstances involving Middle East politics. Beginning in the spring of 1975, Mr. LaRouche developed a systematic approach to solving the Middle East problem based on a set of proposals for inducing Arabs and Israelis to cooperate for a far-ranging

Knesset member: 'Begin should fire Sharon'

The following is an interview with Mordechai Virshubsky, one of the two members of the Israeli Knesset from the opposition Shinui Party. Virshubsky, an outspoken critic of Defense Minister Ariel Sharon's invasion of Lebanon, recently sent Prime Minister Begin a series of cables urging him to fire Sharon. Virshubsky's interview with EIR was conducted by European correspondent Mark Burdman on Aug. 16.

Burdman: Can you comment on your initiative to have Sharon dismissed by Prime Minister Begin?

Virshubsky: There have been three cables. I cabled Begin on Friday [Aug. 13]; he sent an answer that was published; and I have sent another cable. I requested him to demand the resignation of Sharon because he does not any-

more have the full confidence of his colleagues in the cabinet. He has been heavily attacked by most of the ministers. It is unacceptable in a time of war that a Minister of Defense does not have confidence and that his words are not believed.

Today I received an answer from Begin, saying that *he*, Sharon, had the full confidence of the Prime Minister, and that Sharon was a good Minister of Defense, and that the situation is now resolved. He said that according to our system, the Prime Minister is responsible for the actions of the Defense Minister, and he said that I could always introduce a motion of no confidence against the government if I so desired.

What I wrote back, in the third cable, is that according to Israeli law, the Prime Minister has the right to fire a minister if he is displeased by that minister. This is something new in our law; this was changed in 1981. I told Begin he should apply this new section. Admittedly, the whole government is responsible, but a *material* question is involved when the security of Israel is involved, and a Defense Minister cannot perform with the confidence of his Prime Minister. I repeated my call for his dismissal.

There is also the question of relations with America. According to stories today, Sharon has been declared persona

industrial, agricultural and technological development of the region as a whole, combining the best of Israeli technological know-how and industrial leadership with Arab natural resources and manpower. The proposal was circulated widely among American businessmen, intelligence and policy circles, and Israeli and Arab diplomats and politicians. A number of conferences were held, and a certain momentum started building up.

All of a sudden, two highly unusual events were noticed. A certain Arthur Ross approached the LaRouche organization, quietly inquiring about our political perspectives in general and about our Middle East peace proposals in particular. He was coming from the East Side Conservative Club. Secondly, at approximately that time, Edgar Bronfman, Max Fisher, and the Anglican gentlemen at the Aspen Institute started promoting an alternate plan for a Middle East peace between Arabs and Jews, which for a period went by the name "Middle East Treaty Organization." Promptly, afterward, Arthur Ross proclaimed that LaRouche was "anti-Semitic." Organized crime-connected individuals from the Meyer Lansky tradition, such as Roy Cohn and Max Fisher, picked up and started disseminating the slander systematically. Thus the Big Lie myth was attempted, in standard Goebbels style. The inspiration had been supplied by British Intelligence. Prime Minister Begin, because of his life's experience, is probably best equipped to understand this sort of British problem.

Now Professor Adelson resurfaces the matter on the pages of the *Jerusalem Post*. The surrounding political circumstances are unique and invite reflection. The Israeli government, in the middle of conducting war, discovers itself to be entrapped in a quagmire which it had previously thought it would be able to handle with a certain assistance from Washington. Suddenly, Jerusalem realizes that Washington will not deliver on its part of the bargain. Some Israeli officials begin to catch up to the fact that the strings of Middle East policy are being pulled not from Washington but from London. Then this LaRouche communication to the Prime Minister enters the picture. Our Professor, the professed friend of the Prime Minister, rushes to explain that his friends believe LaRouche to be an anti-Semite.

British intelligence's role

However, Mr. LaRouche's long-standing analysis on the matter, one which has earned him so many venomous slanders, not only stands correct and vindicated, but also is the only one available upon which Israel could build a policy to ensure its long-term survival. Not Washington but London is pulling the strings in the current Middle East crisis. This involves Henry Kissinger, Lord Carrington, Kissinger's stable of "bright young boys" still at the State Department. Philip Habib also belongs to the same anglophiliac stable. He was deployed to the Middle East not to serve on behalf of President Reagan but on behalf of the Ditchley Foundation.

non grata in the United States. While the Defense Ministry denies this, I think there is more than a grain of truth in it. He is not accepted by the American government, and our ties with the American government are important, so this is key.

Burdman: Do you see support in Israel for your call for Sharon to be dismissed?

Virshubsky: There are many people who are very dissatisfied with the activities of Sharon, because of the heavy attacks on Beirut. His actions are not regarded in most parties, even in his own, as satisfactory. There is great criticism of Sharon in this respect. Some people say it's a matter of the whole government, but what I say is that the situation vis-à-vis this war is more complex. It was *his* planning that ran the war; *he* got out of hand; *he* did *not* act in accordance with the cabinet; and he has been very harmful to the state of Israel. He enjoys no strong support now in political circles.

Begin is defending Sharon, but this doesn't discourage me. Sharon is harming Israel in Lebanon, and vis-à-vis the free world. This point has to be stressed. Even if the PLO leaves Beirut, this is only the beginning, the problems will only *start* at that point, and men like Ariel Sharon won't be helpful at that point. He uses the idea of power too easily.

The idea that he has to go will become more and more acceptable in Israel. A big struggle over the leadership of the Likud [Israel's ruling party—ed.] is in the offing, and many people don't want him as the leader. And in the National Religious Party, which is usually hawkish, there is a lot of criticism of Sharon.

There is a possibility that he may be stopped. He is a capable general, but we need capable statesmen and capable politicians.

Burdman: How exactly do you see the harm that Sharon has done to Israel?

Virshubsky: Much of the critical approach to Israel now is because of his very tough policy. In West Beirut, there are a few hundred thousand people with nothing to do with the PLO. This creates a very bad impression in the world. Relations with the United States are very strained. How could this be corrected?

This country doesn't have to wage battles when they are not necessary. There were many steps done in Beirut that had a very bad moral influence on Israelis, in the army and outside the army. Much of the dissidence in Israel, which never happened before, is very harmful.

Israeli Intelligence surely knows where Philip Habib was on the week of June 5, while President Reagan was visiting Europe, conveniently as the Israeli move into Lebanon was commencing. Israeli intelligence should inform the Prime Minister of Habib's Ditchley Foundation antecedents. It should also pull out the old files which contain the information that the Ditchley Foundation is an arm of the Morgan and Schroeder's banking interests, the same banks which put Hitler in power in 1933. Then the Prime Minister and any Israeli or Jew who cares will realize that "clever" Israel has been had by British Intelligence.

Washington for the time being is the proverbial "dumb giant" at the mercy of London's manipulations. Israel has enough brains and experience to reach the conclusion that its principal, ultimate enemy is the British, and specifically Lord Carrington's plan for a "third force" and a "new Yalta." British diplomacy and intelligence capabilities throughout the Middle East are coordinating to cause a collapse of United States influence throughout the area, thereby causing a vacuum to be filled by British influence. The prize will be British control over continental European energy supplies, enabling Britain to dictate terms to Europe and thus shape a "third force," bargaining equidistantly between the two "super-powers." The British have rigged America's situation from within by means of alliances with old patrician anglophile families and such crude agents as Henry Kissinger.

To cut through this British game in terms of Middle Eastern realities, the state of Israel has enough experience in such matters to know that there is a difference between the just aspirations of the Palestinian people as represented, for instance, by the Sartawi current within the PLO, and the pathological anti-Semitism of the controllers of such agents provocateurs as Abu Nidal, for example. Competent Israeli authorities possess enough information to verify that the streak of fanatical anti-Semitism among certain Arab circles can be found to originate in the still intact British Intelligence controls over certain aspects of Arab life going back to the time when British Intelligence laundered such Arab Bureau assets as the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem to the Nazi Abwehr, or when they laundered Arab Bureau officer and triple agent Kim Philby, now a KGB general, to the Soviets. Philby's so-called defection to Moscow was too nicely timed to coordinate with the emergence to power (or close to power), of certain old British-Abwehr assets in certain Arab countries under the guise of ostensibly "pro-Soviet" regimes. Those who know of this matter, know what we are talking about.

Israel's existence in the Middle East was exploited by the British, and, in a different but equally cynical way, by the Soviets, to maintain a certain grip and influence over the Arabs. If Israel attempts to build up Arab allies in the way that Mr. LaRouche prescribes in his letter to Prime Minister Begin, the first to object will be the British and their in-place agents of influence among Arabs, in Washington or in Moscow (or within Israel itself). For Israel to develop a national grand strategy which will ensure its long-term viability, it

must commit every one of its resources in courage, intellect and hard work to eradicate all British Intelligence and other influence from all of the Middle East, Arab and Israeli. Given the depth of the present national crisis, given the alternatives available to Israel, its leadership may well do just that. For many years, many Zionist leaders lived and fought conscious of the fact that their purposes and their successes were useful to British grand strategy. The present situation has placed the state of Israel in a position of either destroying itself or becoming the most formidable—and perhaps the first truly successful—adversary of British interests.

The approach which Mr. LaRouche has recommended to Prime Minister Begin might produce such a result. This is why the low life at New York's East Side Conservative Club are so restless. But is Professor Adelson, to whom we shall give the benefit of the doubt, aware of who is pulling his string?

What follows are excerpts from a lengthy letter to the editor by Prof. Howard Adelson of the City University of New York, writing from Jerusalem, which appeared in the Aug. 13 issue of the Jerusalem Post.

It was most disturbing to see the report in the *Jerusalem Post* of Aug. 3 that Labour Knesset member and former Chief of Staff Mordechai Gur gave an interview attacking government policy to the "Executive Intelligence Review." In its report, the *Jerusalem Post* merely noted that the "Executive Intelligence Review" is an "anti-Israeli right-wing American magazine." In fact, it is a principal organ of the self-proclaimed socialist Lyndon LaRouche, Jr. . . . unquestionably one of the leading purveyors of anti-Semitism in the United States. . . . The Jewish leadership in the United States, however, has recognized the danger of giving an unwarranted patina of respectability to a demonstrable, anti-Semitic rabblouser.

Under the circumstances, it should be proper to ask why Labour M.K. [Knesset member] Gur chose to lend credence to the claims of respectability made by an avowed anti-Semite. . . . The fact that some Jews are involved in the activities of Lyndon LaRouche, Jr. in no way mitigates the deed. . . . Gur must have given his interview in ignorance of the real function of the "Executive Intelligence Review." . . . Gur's own colleagues should take him to task for consorting with recognized anti-Semites. . . .

Mr. LaRouche's letter of response to the Jerusalem Post:

There is a certain "logic" in the lying charge that I am an "anti-Semite," in a letter published in the *Post*.

The great musicologist, Heinrich Schenker, suffered the suppression of his work by the Nazis, and his widow died, under the categorical name of "Sarah," at Auschwitz. The same gentlemen who planted the accusation of anti-Semitism against me in your newspaper, to this day accuse Schenker of being a Nazi.