

phasized that Israel is not “losing sleep over the relations with India” because “even if India were to upgrade its relations with Israel, we cannot expect this country to be an ally for various reasons.”

### Who is Isi Leibler?

Such arrogance is a stock-in-trade for Leibler, a figure who enjoys protection at high levels. An Australian, Leibler is chairman of the Australian Institute of Jewish Affairs, an institute that he set up in the 1980s under direction of Edgar Bronfman of the Seagrams liquor empire, to carry out a similar role to that which the ADL plays in the United States. The institute’s main interest area is China, but it is of late focusing on Asia as a whole. Leibler has said that he is getting a good response from Indian intellectuals. Among his objectives are the spreading of “sympathetic awareness in Japanese academic circles of Jews” and “expanded exchange with influential educational authorities in South Korea.”

But Leibler’s objective has run into rough weather lately. Like the Bronfmans, members of the Leibler family have been the subject of special investigations that point to the drug trade. This September, an Independent Member of the Australian Parliament, Denis Collins, gave evidence that the

Leiblers were linked to the international pornography and drug trade (see *EIR*, Dec. 20, 1991). Subsequently, the Parliament’s Public Accounts Committee announced that it would launch an extensive inquiry on the charges of offshore tax violation by some individuals. A member of that committee, Ken Adred, was particularly critical of the activities of Mark Leibler, brother of Isi Leibler, on this account.

Last April, Barbara Smith of the Phillip Institute of Technology charged that “there are extremely powerful and privileged people” who are protecting tax-avoiders. Smith was promptly labeled an “anti-Semite” by the Leibler crowd.

If such sleazy activities surprise the Indians, it is because of their sketchy understanding of the ADL. Former ADL chairman Kenneth Bialkin was the attorney for drug baron Robert Vesco, and Bialkin’s clients also include arms merchants like Shaul Eisenberg and international mafiosi such as Edmond Safra.

Another bright light in the ADL, Max Fisher of Detroit, has long been associated with sleaze. Fisher’s United Brands, formerly the United Fruit Co., was charged in 1978 by the U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration officials with responsibility for bringing in 20% of the cocaine that came from Ibero-America to the United States each year.

## Zionism: Britain’s racist tool

In the mid-19th century the British colonialists patronized modern Zionism as a means to seize control of the Middle East, then dominated by the Ottoman Turks. The idea was to transplant European Jews into Palestine to form a colonial, militarized enclave. During World War I, Lord Balfour proclaimed Britain’s intent to form a so-called Jewish state, eventually formed after World War II. Israel is an Anglo-American puppet state, as it was originally conceived. The Earl of Shaftesbury, a cousin of the Foreign Secretary Lord Palmerston and one of the most powerful figures in England, was one of the first to endorse this policy in 1840. “Syria and Palestine” are important for the British Empire, he said, adding, “capital and population, the Jews can give it both. . . . England has a special interest in promoting such restoration.”

Zionism’s founder Theodore Herzl in his book *Der Judenstat*, openly admitted that Zionism was imperial: “We should, there, form a portion of the rampart of Europe against Asia, an outpost of civilization as opposed to barbarism. We should, as a neutral state, remain in contact with all Europe, which would have to guarantee our existence.” Elsewhere, Herzl wrote that “the English” were

“the first to recognize the necessity of colonial expansion in the modern world . . . the Zionist idea, which is a colonial idea, must be understood in England easily and quickly.” Herzl, in a letter to Britain’s arch-imperialist in Africa, Cecil Rhodes, compared the Zionist project to the British seizure of Africa. “Had this [the creation of a Jewish state in Palestine] been on your path you would have done it yourself by now . . . because it is something colonial.”

As late as 1961, Dr. Hendrik Verwoerd, South Africa’s prime minister, reflected the same sentiments: “The Jews took Israel from the Arabs after the Arabs had lived there for a thousand years. In that I agree with them. Israel like South Africa is an apartheid state.”

Chaim Weizmann, who later became Israel’s first President, said in a 1914 letter to a sympathizer: “Should Palestine fall within the British sphere of influence, and should Britain encourage a Jewish settlement there, as a British dependency, we could have in 20 to 30 years a million Jews there—perhaps more; they would . . . form a very effective guard for the Suez Canal.” Winston Churchill, as Lord of the Admiralty during World War I, had the same view: “If, as it may well happen, there should be created in our own lifetime by the banks of the Jordan a Jewish state under the protection of the British crown . . . [it] would be especially in harmony with the truest interests of the British Empire.”