

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.