



**SOUTH
AFRICA**
and
ISRAEL

**Madison Area Committee on
Southern Africa (M.A.C.S.A.)
731 State Street
Madison, Wj. 53703**

Price: 30 cents

Published October 1971

This booklet was researched and written by members of the Madison Area Committee on Southern Africa, ~~901 1/2 Brooks Street~~ Madison, Wisconsin 53715 (phone ~~252-2334~~). It is the second edition, a mimeographed preliminary draft having appeared in 1970 under the title Israel and Southern Africa: A Comparison of the Roles of South Africa and Israel in the Third World.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
CONTEMPORARY LINKS BETWEEN SOUTH AFRICA AND ISRAEL	4
Growing economic ties	4
Politico-military ties maintained	8
HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF ISRAELI-SOUTH AFRICAN LINKS: THE CONTEXT OF WESTERN IMPERIALISM	18
Settler States & the Indigenous Peoples of South Africa and Palestine.	21
Land.	21
Second Class Citizenship	25
Tools of Repression.	29
Neocolonialism in Africa: Settler States and Independent Countries.	32
South Africa's Outward Thrust.	33
Israel and Independent Africa.	35
South Africa, Israel, and American Imperialism.	38
CONCLUSION	40
LIST OF REFERENCES	42

INTRODUCTION

The anti-Jewish record of the Nationalist Party which came to power in 1948 in South Africa and its sympathy for the Axis during the Second World War is comparatively well known. All of the Nationalist Party Prime Ministers - Malan, Strijdom, Verwoerd, and Vorster - have records of pro-Nazi sentiment. The present Prime Minister, Dr. Vorster, declared in 1942 that

we stand for Christian nationalism which is an ally of National Socialism ... in Italy it is called Fascism, in Germany, National Socialism, and in South Africa, Christian Nationalism.

(Hepple, South Africa: Workers Under Apartheid)

Given South Africa's relatively recent support for a nation whose policy included the calculated annihilation of the Jewish people, it would be expected that relations between the apartheid state of South Africa and the Zionist state of Israel would be characterized by unrelenting hostility. But in practice this is not the case. Israel has expressed occasional public censure of South Africa's legal racism. But these negative comments on the part of Israel belie a network of comfortable relationships of cooperation and friendship with the white minority regime at Africa's southern tip. Just as in the relationship of the United States with white southern African regimes, the actual substance of Israel's relations with South Africa has little to do with what one might expect on the basis of vague ideological affirmations

for self-determination, non-racialism, justice, and democratic rights.

Aspects of Israel's ties with South Africa can be easily documented, but it is not sufficient simply to outline the relationships without attempting to comprehend their basis. That basis may perhaps most succinctly be described in terms of the similar roles of both nations within the system of worldwide imperialism. Their thrusts to secure the dependence of developing African states are actions similar to those of a number of advanced capitalist nations. But the internal as well as the external policies of South Africa and Israel are fundamentally conditioned by the similar circumstances of origin of both nations during the colonial period.

It will be argued that the network of existing ties between South Africa and Israel is in large part a consequence of the similar historical and contemporary experiences of both states vis-a-vis both the Western Capitalist nations and the developing states of the African continent. Both South Africa and Israel may be characterized historically as settler states; both were formed within the period of general expansion of capitalism and outward movement of peoples that characterized European colonialism; both emerged into nationhood with governments representing the interests of immigrants and their descendants. And in the interests of survival of such minority-based governments, the internal dynamics of both nations have involved the continual supervision and frequent suppression of indigenous peoples.

The similar historical experiences of South Africa and Israel have led to a similarity of contemporary interests, and it is out of this similarity of interests that mutually benefiting bonds have been generated. The origin of each as a tenuous resolution of dynamics of capitalist expansion through colonialism has led to the circumstance whereby each is on one hand dependent on the economic assistance of highly industrialized states and on the other hand in collaboration with these states in the expansion of international imperialism. It is on the basis of similar imperatives for survival of the minority-based governments that one can understand the increasing economic ties of South Africa and Israel, their common strategic concerns, and their similar attempts to promote the development of moderate states in Africa and the Middle East which might serve to inhibit the efforts of those peoples still struggling against the direct imposition of settler rule and expansion.

In the following pages the existing networks of economic, diplomatic, and military ties between South Africa and Israel will be laid out. Subsequently the historical background to those ties will be discussed in greater detail and contemporary patterns of internal repression and external diplomatic outreach arising from the contradictions of settler rule will be dealt with.

CONTEMPORARY LINKS
BETWEEN
SOUTH AFRICA AND ISRAEL

Growing economic ties.

On November 6, 1962, the General Assembly of the United Nations, by a vote of 67 to 16, with 23 abstentions, adopted resolution 1761 (XVII), which called on member states to break relations with South Africa, including "boycotting all South African goods and refraining from exporting goods, including all arms and amunition to South Africa." The Israeli delegate cast his vote, with the Third World countries, for the resolution. Similar resolutions have been reaffirmed by the General Assembly in succeeding years.

In spite of this vote Israeli trade with South Africa has not diminished in recent years, but rather has increased rapidly. According to the American Jewish Yearbook (1969:454),

a strong South African delegation attended the Jerusalem economic conference called by Israel Premier Levi Eshkol in April (1968). On their return, the delegates set up an Israel-South Africa Trade Association with Morris Lubner as chairman, to promote trade between the two countries.

Citing evidence of improvement in relations between the two countries, the American Jewish Yearbook the following year (1970: 535) noted

the success of 'Israel Week' trade promotion in South Africa in August (1969), with four leading department stores displaying Israeli products in their branches throughout the country. ... Adin Talber, deputy director

of Israel's Ministry of Trade and Industry who, together with South Africa's deputy minister for economic affairs, attended the opening in Johannesburg, stressed the scope that existed for the promotion of reciprocal trade.

Figures published by the Israel-South Africa Trade Association showed an increase in South African exports to Israel from \$3 million in 1967 to \$7 million in 1969; Israeli exports to South Africa rose from \$3.2 million in 1967 to \$9.1 million in 1969. It is difficult to say how reliable these figures are, as other reports give somewhat different amounts. Table 1 shows the amounts reported by Israel and South Africa respectively to the International Monetary Fund:

Table 1
Israel-South Africa Trade

	<u>Trade from Israel to South Africa*</u>	<u>Trade from South Africa to Israel*</u>
As reported by Israel		
1965	2.70	4.30
1966	2.30	4.50
1967	4.00	3.40
1968	5.70	5.20
1969	8.18	5.79
As reported by South Africa		
1965	2.80	3.60
1966	2.70	3.60
1967	3.30	3.00
1968	5.30	4.10
1969	6.77	4.82

* in million U.S. \$

(Direction of Trade, March, 1970)

In all of the different sets of figures, however, it is clear that there has been a substantial increase in trade in recent years.

According to figures from the Israel Foreign Trade Statistics, that increase continued in 1970, with \$10.7 million of exports to South Africa and \$10.2 million of imports from South Africa.

For both South Africa and Israel, the most important trading partners are the prosperous countries of Western Europe and North America. In the African context, despite Israel's policy of wooing black Africa, her largest trading partner is South Africa. That nation buys approximately one fourth of Israel's exports to Africa while supplying approximately one third of her imports from Africa.

Table 2
Israel's Trade with Africa, 1970

	<u>Exports*</u>	<u>Imports*</u>
South Africa	10.7	10.2
Uganda	5.6	2.1
Ethiopia	4.4	2.0
Nigeria	3.6	0.04
Kenya	3.6	1.2
All other Africa	13.7	14.56
Total Africa	41.6	30.1

* in million U.S. \$

(Israel Foreign Trade Statistics, 1971)

But these figures actually underestimate the importance of the economic ties between the two countries. For example, a 1966 figure giving the value of the South African trade to Israel, printed in the South African Financial Mail (July 21, 1967) does not include the diamond trade. While the Oppenheimer interests and de Beers Consolidated Mines control some 80% of the world production of raw diamonds, it is Israel which is second only to

Belgium in the world export of polished diamonds (Time, August 17, 1970).

While these diamonds are obtained by Israel in uncut form through various sources, it is purchases from the South African dominated Central Selling Organization which loom particularly large in the import column. In 1968, Israel obtained 52% of its supply from the Central Selling Organization, a figure which is representative of the range for the decade (40-60%). Total diamond imports in 1969 were worth \$219 million. (Statistical Abstract of Israel, 1970).

The polishing of these diamonds is Israel's largest export industry. In 1969 exports of semi-precious and precious stones (mainly diamonds) accounted for 41.8% of Israel's total non-agricultural exports, and some 35% of Israel's total exports. (Statistical Abstract of Israel, 1970). In each year since 1949, diamonds have accounted for between one-third and one-half of Israel's total export of industrial products. The largest markets are in the United States and other Western countries.

The recent expansion of trade thus comes in addition to the ties already established in the international diamond trade. Israel's Trade Commissioner to South Africa, Amitay Ben-Joseph, described in 1968 his hopes for the trade:

Israel needs wool, asbestos, industrial diamonds and metals. ...Israel will be able to supply South Africa with textiles, clothing, chemicals, and pharmaceuticals. (News from South Africa, July 3, 1968)

More recently, South Africa has relaxed investment controls,

permitting South African companies to invest up to \$14 million in Israel. This followed a \$14.9 million line of credit from the South African Industrial Development Corporation in July, 1970, to boost South African exports to Israel. (Christian Science Monitor, June 5, 1971).

The above analysis suggests that Israel's economic practices do not accord with her stated political principles where South Africa is concerned. The same is true of the United States. Representative Ogden Reid (NY) noted early this year (Amsterdam News, March 27, 1971), that "the continued official promotion of United States sales and investment in South Africa disregards our government's stated policies on human freedom in that country." In one case, as in the other, the image created for world opinion is accompanied by actions designed to increase rather than diminish the links with white-dominated South Africa.

Politico-Military Ties maintained.

C.L. Sulzberger, writing from South Africa for the New York Times of April 30, 1971, commented on the close though concealed partnership between South Africa and Israel, a partnership with ramifications extending into political, economic and military affairs, yet played down in public for diplomatic reasons. He notes that for South Africa especially the relationship

has psychological importance. Among foreign critics of South African policy there are many Jewish voices, especially in the United States and Britain. South Africa therefore feels that if Israel is sympathetic this will help its own international standing.

Analysing the military links, Sulzberger indicates that South

Africa manufactures the Israeli-invented Uzi submachine gun under a license granted through Belgium. He was told unofficially that a South African Mission flew to Israel during the Six Day War in 1967 to study tactics and use of weapons. Therefore, it is of great interest that this is one of the two battles given major attention in South Africa's manoever schools. He heard further unconfirmed reports that after the Israelis secured plans of the French Mirage fighter engine, blueprints of their improved version were made available to South Africa.

Sulzberger concludes:

The basic truth remains that this country, which has few friends abroad, regards Israel as one of them. For some time Israel's policy of cultivating black African nations was resented. Now this has been forgotten in the belief that Israel's stand against Russia and Russian proxies at this continent's extreme north helps prepare a position for a similar stand, if need be, when the day for such comes to the extreme south.

(New York Times, April 30, 1971)

Relationships between Israel and South Africa have been particularly close since the 1967 Six Day War. Vorster's government not only permitted South African volunteers to work in civilian and para-military capacities in Israel, but allowed more than \$28 million to be transferred to Israel by South African Zionist groups. The journal of the South Africa Foundation (Perspective, August, 1967) commented:

The recent war in the Middle East aroused fevered interest and passionate concern in many parts of the world, but in few so deep a sense of personal involvement as in South Africa. Sympathy for Israel was not confined to the Jewish community, however. White South Africans generally identified themselves personally with the plight of the Israelis ... All were aware of the analogy between the situation of Israel, surrounded

by hostile neighbors, and the situation of South Africa ... In the circumstances, it seemed only natural that white South Africans generally should view the Israelis as comrades-in-peril, and seek to succour and assist them accordingly.

(quoted in Sechaba, April, 1970)

Vorster himself was quoted by Sulzberger as saying, "We view Israel's position and problems with understanding and sympathy. Like us they have to deal with terrorist infiltration across the border; and like us they have enemies bent on their destruction." (New York Times, April 30, 1971)

The South Africa Foundation quoted above is an organization funded by big business interests in South Africa (including American companies) to present South Africa to the world in a favourable light. In 1967 this organization founded an Israeli-South Africa Committee in an effort to improve relations between the two countries.

One of the most prominent Israeli members of the committee at the outset was Dr. Shlomo Peer, an economist who settled in South Africa two years previously. He was a founder member of Ben Gurion's Rafi Party, and a member of its national council. A second Israeli on the committee was Colonel Ephraim Shurer, who left Israel's Defense force to become manager of the South African branch of the Israeli El Al Airline. (Sechaba, April, 1970)

The committee has been active in promoting high level contact between South Africa and Israel. According to Sechaba of April, 1970

One of the first things it did was to arrange a meeting between the South African Minister of Defense, Mr. P.W. Botha, and Mr. Shimon Peres, secretary general of the ruling Israeli Labour Party and member of the key Foreign

Affairs and Security Committee ... In September 1967 General Mordechai Hod, commander of the Israeli Air Force, visited South Africa and addressed a selected group of officers at the Air Force College near Pretoria ... In December 1967 a group of Israeli government officials, businessmen and aviation experts, including the deputy director general and the chief engineer of Israel Aircraft Industries, toured South Africa. The Israelis visited the Atlas Aircraft Industries plant near Johannesburg and said they hoped to bring an Israeli-manufactured short-take-off-and-landing aircraft to South Africa for a series of demonstrations.

On the extreme right wing, Israeli legislators Shmuel Tamir and Eliezer Shostak, of Israel's Free Center party, visited South Africa in June, 1968, on behalf of the Israel-South Africa Friendship League, which they founded in Israel. Their farewell statement said that their "efforts to promote better understanding and closer relations between Israel and South Africa" found universal welcome and evinced keen interest. (American Jewish Yearbook, 1969, p. 455).

The South African Financial Mail (July 21, 1967) commented that "South Africans living in Israel form an influential, if small, group." And on January 3, 1969, the Tel Aviv correspondent of the Johannesburg Star reported that "Israel will try in future to maintain much closer and fuller contacts with South Africa. ... The pro-South Africa faction has, so it seems, won the day."

Military cooperation between the two countries apparently works both ways. According to a Jewish Telegraphic Agency report of January 20, 1970:

The South African Government has begun to organize the export of tanks to Israel marking a 'new stage of their cooperation.' The South African tank is a sixty-five ton giant 'armed with a heavy gun and designed according to

the model of the British new tank'. This is an apparent reference to Britain's new Chieftain tank which Israel has been trying to buy from Great Britain.

While both countries are currently tied primarily to Western countries for their supply of weapons, they are rapidly developing their own capacities for independent military production. Given the harmonious relations between these two countries, it is to be expected that there will be occasional exchange of military technology or hardware. Of even greater importance (to be dealt with later in this pamphlet) are their military roles with respect to independent African states.

Political relationships between these two countries are further complicated by two other factors: Israel's attempt to win friends among the independent African states, and the role of the Jewish community within South Africa itself. The paradox of their continuing close ties, while voicing public disagreement, can only be understood in terms of these complicating factors.

Prior to 1961, relations with black Africa were not a significant factor. The year 1948 was a decisive one, which saw both the victory of the Nationalist Party in South Africa, and the establishment of the state of Israel. Notwithstanding its legacy of virulent anti-Semitism, it was clear that by 1948 the Nationalist Party had modified its stance towards the Jewish community. The Afrikaans press supported Zionist opposition to the British policies in Palestine, relating it to their own determination to ultimately break ties with Britain. (Stevens, Phylon, vol. 32, no. 2 (1971))

Immediately after the election of May 26, the newly elected Nationalist Government of South Africa extended de jure recognition to Israel. This step was succeeded by other ploys designed to gain Jewish support. Dr. Malan declared that both he and his government were firmly committed to a policy of non-discrimination against any section of the White population and looked forward to the day when there would no longer be any talk of the Jewish question in the country. For him, these words were not idle political platitudes; he not only permitted Jewish reserve officers to serve in Israel, a procedure contrary to law, but also he became the first Prime Minister of the British Commonwealth to pay a courtesy visit to the new state. When Dr. Malan retired from official life in 1954, South African Jewry paid him its highest honor by inscribing his name in its Golden Book as recognition of his 'contribution to better racial understanding in South Africa.' (Stevens, Phylon, vol. 32, no. 2, 1971)

Since 1948, the official representatives of the Jewish community in South Africa have reaffirmed repeatedly not only their Zionist convictions, but also their loyalty to the white regime of South Africa. Furthermore, Jewish Affairs, the monthly magazine of the S. African Jewish Board of Deputies, ceased to express its views on issues of color and discrimination. The Board of Deputies affirmed that it was a non-political body which refrained from taking any position on party political issues. Neither was it prepared to express views on the various race policies being advocated in South Africa. When South Africa became a Republic in 1961 the Board specifically affirmed

that "as loyal citizens the South African Jewish community will continue to play their part in the well-being and progress of the State."

In sum, the South African regime has muted its anti-Semitic past, opened the Nationalist Party to Jewish membership, allowed transfer of funds to Israel, and appointed Jews to important governmental posts. Dr. Percy Yutar, president of the Johannesburg United Hebrew Congregation, became Deputy Attorney-General of the Transvaal in 1960, and acted as prosecutor in the Rivonia trial of African nationalists in the mid 1960s. In 1968 he became Attorney General of the Orange Free State. In return, the small Jewish community in South Africa has refrained from criticizing apartheid. Most recently, the New York Times reports (July 5, 1971):

Mr. Saron, of the Jewish Board of Deputies, who is a historian, said that the board did not advocate political neutrality but 'collective nonintervention.' In an interview, he said that, unlike some Christian church leaders here, the South African rabbinate had not spoken out publicly on apartheid because the issue 'just hasn't come their way'.

To maintain such a position, however, does occasionally require delicacy. Anti-Semitism emerges from the political shadows of South Africa whenever Israel makes gestures towards independent Africa, as it has since 1961, or when attention is given to the presence of individual Jews among those few white South Africans who support African liberation or at least oppose the apartheid system. When several Jews were among the associates of Nelson Mandela in 1963-5 on trial at Rivonia for acts against apartheid, talk of "dual allegiance" and identification of Jewry and "Communism" flared up in South Africa.

Tension also developed when, in 1961, a visit of the President of Upper Volta to Israel was accompanied by an anti-apartheid statement by the Israeli government. In November, 1961, Israel supported the General Assembly resolution condemning apartheid. In a private letter leaked to the Sunday Press, South Africa's Prime Minister Verwoerd said Israel's actions were a tragedy for Jews in South Africa, but noted at the same time that the pro-South African reaction of the Jewish press in South Africa had somewhat relieved the situation. He went on to draw attention to Israel's inconsistency:

People are beginning to ask why, if Israel and its Rabbis feel impelled to attack the policy of separate development here, the policy of separate development in Israel is not wrong in their eyes as well ... it may be said that they wish to differentiate in separate states because of religious and not racial differences, but if differentiation is wrong on one score it is also wrong on another ... we believed in the separate state of Israel but now begin to wonder whether that support should be withdrawn if, according to their own convictions, the ideal of separate development is fundamentally wrong.

(Cited by Henry Katzew in Midstream (December, 1962))

The South African government also rescinded the special privileges in foreign currency transactions which Jewish organizations had received. But relationships were soon smooth again, and at Verwoerd's death he was eulogized by Chief Rabbi Professor Abrahams of Cape Town as "a man of sincerity and of deep integrity ... a moral conscience underlay his policies: he was the first man to give apartheid a moral ground." (Rand Daily Mail, September 12, 1966)

Again in October, 1967, Israeli delegate Joel Barromi's speech in the United Nations criticizing apartheid provoked a similar reaction, as did a speech in 1968 by Ambassador Tekoah on the South

West Africa issue. The Chairman of the South African Jewish Board of Deputies, Maurice Porter, said that "although he understood Israel's special problems in the United Nations, he deplored any statement or expression tending to impede the restoration of harmonious relations between South Africa and Israel."

(American Jewish Yearbook, 1969) The South African reaction also seemed milder and more understanding, as Foreign Minister Hilgard Muller explained in Parliament that

South Africa had diplomatic relations with Israel; that the possibility of exchanging diplomats was constantly receiving the government's attention. Israel, which had many interests in South Africa, maintained a mission in the Republic, although there was no South African mission in Israel.

(American Jewish Yearbook, 1969)

Occasional Israeli criticism of apartheid is likely to continue. It is seen by many African states as part of the quest for African support on United Nations votes dealing with the Middle East. (Israel's role in Africa is discussed later in this pamphlet). The most recent example is the Israeli offer of \$2,850 to the Organization of African Unity for liberation movements (later withdrawn after representatives of black liberation movements suggested it might more appropriately go to Arab guerrilla groups). The offer came shortly before the OAU meeting in Addis Ababa, but failed to stop the unanimous passage of a resolution "deploring" the non-evacuation by Israel of occupied Arab territories. In South Africa the matter is still the subject of controversy. A few days before the Israeli offer to the OAU South Africa had taken steps to encourage increased investment in Israel by relaxing investment controls on

South African companies but when the offer was made Prime Minister Vorster said, "I certainly do not understand how Israel, which itself has a terrorist problem, can justify contributions to other terrorists." Transfer of funds to Israel was suspended temporarily, but a Jewish official in Johannesburg said he was confident the Government would unfreeze the funds following clarifications. (New York Times, July 5, 1971; Africasia, July 5, 1971) If past incidents stemming from United Nations votes are any guide, a brief public disagreement between the two countries will hardly interrupt continuing and growing economic, political, and military ties.

It is clear that the government of Israel and the Jewish community in South Africa are not identical in their words or actions on the issue of apartheid. There have been Jewish individuals both for and against apartheid in both locations. However, the official organizations speaking for the Jewish community in South Africa have been strongly Zionist and have raised financial support for Israel, perhaps second only to that raised in the United States. They have also strongly supported the South African apartheid government. Israel would hesitate to jeopardize for the Jewish community of South Africa its current position of safety and acceptance within the apartheid system. On the other hand the South African government does not hesitate to threaten the South African Jewish people if Israel acts against South Africa in any way, nor does it hesitate to cut off transfer of funds to Israel as

a pressure tactic. Thus the position of the Jewish community within South Africa is one more crucial factor in maintaining good relations between South Africa and Israel, besides the links arising easily out of the position of each country within the Western and capitalist context.

THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF
ISRAELI-SOUTH AFRICAN LINKS:
THE CONTEXT OF WESTERN IMPERIALISM

The first part of this pamphlet has delineated the present status of ties between South Africa and Israel. To understand the basis of those ties, however, one must also deal with the common context of the two countries as Western settler states intruded into the Afro-Asian world. Professor Richard Stevens, of Lincoln University, has laid out the common historical basis in an address entitled "Settler States and Western Response" given at an International Symposium on Palestine in February 1971. Included in it are the following observations:

Among the various decisions of the western world which have affected the lives and destiny of the peoples of the so-called Third World, none have revealed more clearly the very essence of western ethnocentrism nor have demonstrated more conclusively the capacity of the western world to transform, translate and legitimize its basic power thrust under the cloak of international law and morality than two decisions reached in London in 1909 and 1917; the first known as the South African Act of Union and the second, the Balfour Declaration. These two documents, formulated without regard to the rights and aspirations of the peoples

affected as the objects of power, were rationalized, however, in terms of the highest moral principles and responsibilities of western civilization. Thus, in the name of British liberalism the indigenous people of Palestine and South Africa would not only lose their homes, their land, their most basic natural rights, but would find themselves stripped of their own positive identity, subjected to the dictates of those capable of exercising massive power, and taxed and administered in keeping with a plan designed to insure the survival of the colonizers.** Defined in terms of 'otherness' as 'non-white' on the one hand and 'non-Jewish' on the other, the definitions revealed a psychological bias characteristic of the power possessors, a bias so completely assimilated into the prevailing international legal order that protests from those affected would be dismissed in terms of that same legal code. ... Palestine and South Africa - lands some 3,500 miles apart but each the concern of the same chancery, each sacrificed in the name of Western peoples and British imperial interests and the details of the sacrifice arranged by the same statesmen. In both cases, a perceived injustice committed by the western power or western civilization against Jew on the one hand and Afrikaner on the other was to be atoned for at the expense of those judged too 'uncivilized', too 'primitive' and too 'backward' to establish an equal moral claim. In both cases, the self-identification of Jew and Afrikaner as a 'chosen people' and inheritors of the 'promised land' was explicitly or implicitly accepted by Britain.

...in the final analysis, Britain's decision to sacrifice the rights of the indigenous peoples in South Africa and Palestine was perhaps traceable to imperial considerations. What dominated the thinking of the British government in 1909 was that in time of war the Suez Canal might be closed to British shipping in which case the Cape route would reassume its former commercial and strategic importance; a friendly South Africa would be a vital asset. Following the dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire British control of Palestine, with its Zionist settlers, was seen as the best guarantee that the Suez route would in fact never be denied Great Britain.

...British trust in her new white partners brought immediate rewards. ... General Smuts (of South Africa) was put in charge of the whole imperial force in East Africa and then went on to membership in the British War Cabinet itself. Although he declined to accept the Palestine command, Smuts was a staunch supporter of British control and Zionist settlement in Palestine, and his friendship with Chaim Weizmann was to be one of the most important in his life. Indeed, it

**The process by which these rights were lost by the indigenous majority populations, while symbolized by these legal acts, in both cases extended over a long period of time.

was due to Smuts as much as to anyone that the mandate system itself emerged and it is of no small significance that Smuts played a prominent role in the disposition of both Palestine and South West Africa under that system.

Thus one historical dynamic common to both South Africa and Israel is that which derives from their origins as settler states. Specific circumstances of the settlement process differed in the two cases. Settlement occurred at divergent times and as the result of somewhat different motivations for the immigrants of the two areas. Dutch settlement in South Africa occurred early in the period of outward European expansion and the original settlers themselves subsequently experienced a degree of colonial subjugation by the British. Settlement of European Jews in Israel occurred relatively late and was not so much a manifestation of European economic expansion as the response to the persecution and attempts at genocide which the Jews suffered in Eastern and Western Europe. For its own reasons, the British Empire acquiesced in the Zionist settlement. Yet, in spite of such specific differences, the fact of the common origin of South Africa and Israel as settler states appears to be one which is useful in helping to explain the formation in each case of somewhat similar internal and external policies. In each case the government has developed policies to deal with indigenous peoples within and with independent Afro-Asian states outside their borders in the interest of survival of a regime which represents immigrants and their descendants. Both states, which were established with the aid of British imperialism (but also in conflict with it when settler and imperial interests failed to coincide) are now maintained with the aid of western imperialism of which the new center - the United States of America - itself has origins as a settler state. The

following sections explore the relationships of these two settler states to 1) the indigenous peoples, 2) the independent Afro-Asian states in the region, and 3) western imperialism.

Settler States and the Indigenous Peoples of South Africa and Palestine

Land. Of primary importance in both areas is what happened to the land. For it is the appropriation of land by immigrants which characteristically serves as the basis of legitimacy and power for the minority government in a settler state.

In South Africa, the Native Land Act of 1913 reserved 7.3% of the land for Africans. Except in the Cape, they were forbidden to buy land outside the demarcated areas. The 1936 Native Trust and Land Act made a new division, with allocation of 12.7% of the land as the African share. This means that today the white population (19% of the total population) is in possession of 87.3% of the land. This white portion contains all the rich mineral resources, the industries and commercial undertakings, and the urban areas. Ownership of the portion reserved for Africans is vested in the South African Bantu Trust, an all-white body appointed by the white government. (South Africa: "Resettlement" - The New Violence to Africans) This situation is further aggravated by the current removal campaigns, by which Africans living (perhaps for generations) in areas ruled "white" are deported into desolate "resettlement areas." Nadine Gordimer describes the effect on the

people in a New York Times feature article, January 15, 1971:

In South Africa, in ten years, 900,000 black people have been moved from their homes... They are usually eventually granted some sort of compensation for the houses they leave behind to be bulldozed, but where they are sent, there are no new ones: at best, some basic building materials may be supplied, and they are expected to build new homes themselves, living meanwhile in tents that may or may not be supplied. There may be water nearby and fuel; often they must walk miles for these necessities...

The bit of ground may be near a white town where work is available, or may not - it has not proved to be part of the "planning" to insure in advance that those who lose employment by the move shall be provided with alternative employment where they are ordered to live...

The physical conditions of resettlement are practically without exception of such desolation that confronted with them, one is almost unable to think beyond bread and latrines. The... struggle for existence has been reduced to a search for wood to make a fire, a bucket of clean water to drink, 20 cents to pay a busfare to a clinic ...

South West Africa, in direct contradiction to United Nations actions, has been incorporated into South Africa, and the same apartheid provisions applied. Africans are supposed to be content with the "Bantustans" created on "their" portion of the land, while continuing to supply their labor power to the white areas as transients without any rights in those areas.

South African policy has been oriented towards the dual aim of forcing Africans off the land and forcing them into the labor market to fuel South Africa's economic growth. Israel's policy has been more exclusively oriented toward acquiring land and simply replacing the previous inhabitants. With respect to the refugees

before and after the 1948 war, there was applied the Law on the Acquisition of Absentee Property (1950). Under this law the land and property of a person declared an "absentee" is transferred to the Custodian of Absentee Property. The law defines as absentee any person who is a citizen of Israel, but who left his place of residence between November 29, 1947 and the day on which the State of Emergency was abrogated, if that person went (a) to a place which before September 1, 1948 was outside the land of Israel or (b) to a place inside the land of Israel but occupied at that time by hostile forces (Arabs). By this law, people who had left their villages or had been driven out of them by the Israelis, even if they remained in areas that were Israeli controlled, were prevented from returning to their villages. Their lands were confiscated. Even though this law was dated 1950, its effect was back-dated to 1947. (Laws of Israel, 1950, vol. 37, p. 86)

Among the Emergency Laws promulgated by the Minister of Defense in 1949 was the "Emergency Articles for the Exploitation of Uncultivated Lands" which empowered the Minister of Agriculture to take possession of uncultivated land. (Official Gazette, 27, 15 October 1948 (b), p. 3) Application of this legislation often worked in the following manner: The Minister of Defense declared a certain area a "Closed Area." To enter without a written permit from the Military Governor was a security offense. For "reasons of State security" owners of such areas were not granted permission to occupy their lands which were then declared "uncultivated."

The Minister of Agriculture could then ensure their cultivation by engaging laborers or allowing another party to cultivate it. (Sabri Jiryis: The Arabs in Israel, p. 56) According to the 1951 report of the United Nations Palestine Conciliation Commission, four-fifths of Israel's area and two-thirds of her cultivable land belonged to Palestinian refugees prevented from returning home. One-third of Israel's Jewish population was living on absentee Arab property.

In the aftermath of the 1967 war, similar policies have been pursued, on the Golan Heights, in Jerusalem, on the West Bank of the Jordan. Amos Kenan, Israeli journalist who served in the Israeli army at that time, commented on one such incident:

We were ordered to block the entrances of the villages and prevent inhabitants returning from their hideouts, after they had heard Israeli broadcasts urging them to go back to their homes. The order was to shoot over their heads and tell them not to enter the village. The first refugee column arrived from the direction of Ramallah. There were old people, old women, mothers carrying babies, small children. ...We told them to go to Beit Sura. They told us that they were driven out everywhere, forbidden to enter any village, that they were wandering like this for four days, some dying on the road ... We drove them out. They go on wandering in the south like lost cattle. The weak die. ... In the evening we found that we had been taken in (by the Israeli command), for in Beit Sura two bulldozers had begun to destroy the place and they (the refugees) were not allowed to enter. We found out that not only in our sector was the border straightened out for security reasons, but in all the other sectors too. (Quoted in Arab Areas Occupied by Israel in June, 1967)

Thus in both South Africa and Israel, the alienation of the indigenous peoples from the land has occurred as part of the pattern of establishing and maintaining a state controlled by the settlers and their descendants, in one case European whites, in the other

Jews, also primarily European and white.

Second Class Citizenship. Both Israel and South Africa are plural states, divided into several ethnic and racial groups, indigenous peoples, settlers of European origin, as well as intermediate groups. The fundamental cleavage between settler and indigenous groups which exists in the political sphere is manifested as well in the social sphere, and is enforced through differential treatment of the various groups under the law.

Israel's population is distributed primarily in three groups: Jews of European and American descent, Jews of Asian and African descent, and Arabs.

Table 3
Population Groups in Israel, c. 1968

Jews of European & American descent	1.4 million
Jews of Asian & African descent	1.1 million
Arabs	
within pre-1967 borders	0.3 million
in newly occupied territories	1.1 million

The primary dividing line is between Jews and Arabs. For Israel's national identity is defined as being a "Jewish state." Any Jew anywhere in the world has the right to instant citizenship in Israel. Christopher Mayhew, British member of Parliament comments:

The fate of the Arab refugees complicates things. They are victims of racial discrimination. It is a fact that if you are...in New York, with no family or personal ties in Palestine, but if you can prove that you are Jewish... then you have a right to go and live in Israel. But if you are a Palestinian, an Arab who was born and raised there, where your family has lived for centuries, you have no right to go and live there because you cannot prove that you have the right ancestors, because you are born in the wrong wing of the Semitic race.

(Speech at Church Center for the United Nations, 1970, as in Link, v. 3, No. 3, 1970)

In South Africa the population is divided into four groups: white, colored, Asian, and African ("Bantu" according to South African government terminology).

Table 4
Population Groups in South Africa, c. 1968

White	3.5 million
Colored	1.9 million
Asian	0.6 million
African	13.0 million

In South Africa the dividing line is clear - between white and non-white.

For the dominant group in each case there is an ideology of survival, and of nationalism - but a nationalism that includes within the orbit of nation only one sector of the population. Apartheid ideology and Zionist ideology both stress the central importance of group survival and identity. The South African newspaper Die Transvaler (quoted by H. Katzew, Apartheid and Survival) asked, "and is there any real difference between the way that the people of Israel are trying to maintain themselves amid non-Jewish peoples and the way the Afrikaaner is trying to remain what he is?" Mr. Katzew, himself editor of the Zionist Record, the official organ of the South African Zionists, writes (Africa Report, May 1970) that

You cannot in one breath claim the right of Jews to political power and sovereignty in one corner of the earth (Israel), as South Africa's fervent Zionists do, and in the next breath approve attitudes which seek to take away the same hard-won right from the children of the Boers.

In the name of survival, then, the rights of non-whites in

South Africa, of Palestinians in Israel (or those expelled from Israel) are sacrificed to the interests of a dominant settler group.

In South Africa, the following are only a few of the restrictions on rights of Africans. An African person:

- may not vote and has no voice in his future
- is forbidden to own land anywhere, even in his own area, the Bantustan "homelands."
- may be removed from any area, any time, whether or not he has been born there and lived there all his life; he has no access to court in this.
- may not leave his municipal area without a special permit
- may not be employed in those professions and forms of labor which under the "Job Reservation Act" have been reserved exclusively for white people.
- may not strike
- may not organize or attend a meeting of more than ten people without a permit.

The restrictions in South Africa are directed toward two ends: the provision of a cheap and easily manipulated labor force, and the prevention of any resistance by the subject population.

In Israel, the use of Arab labor does not assume a primary role (although it is growing). But complete territorial displacement has not proved possible, and Israel since 1967 has control in the occupied territories over an additional 1.1 million Arabs. Accordingly there is disagreement "on how to subjugate the Palestinian Arab people and on whether to adopt a demographic (Jewish majority) or territorial (Greater Israel) approach." (Lobel, Palestine and the Jews, p. 127). But there is agreement, as in South Africa, on hostility to the subordinate group. Israeli sociologist, Peres (American Journal of Sociology, May 1971) reports that 91% of his 1968 sample of Israeli Jews agreed that "It would be better

if there were fewer Arabs"; 76% agreed that "the Arabs will never reach the level of progress of Jews;" 86% said they would not "rent a room to an Arab."

Discrimination also affects education. In South Africa the system of Bantu Education is deliberately designed as education for subjugation. Primary and secondary education is free for whites while Africans have to pay school fees. Expenditures per pupil for education in 1962 were 12 Rand (1 Rand = \$1.40) for Africans, 62 Rand for coloreds and Indians, and 147 Rand for whites. (Apartheid: Its effects on Education, Science, Culture, and Information. UNESCO. 1967. p. 42) The Extension of University Education Act (1958) actually precluded the option of non-whites attending any of the eight White universities in South Africa. Instead, ethnic colleges were established for the Xhosa (Port Hare), the Zulu (Ngoya College), the Sotho (Turfloop - the University College of the North), the Coloreds (Belleville College) and the Indians (Salisbury College). Non-whites are not trained to be engineers, dentists, or what is often called the "white-collar" professions.

Likewise, a New York Times report (January 29, 1971) notes a wide gap between Jew and Arab in post-primary education in Israel: "almost 60 per cent of the Jews but only 20 per cent of the Arabs between the ages of 14 and 17 are regular students." Sabri Jiryis (The Arabs in Israel) notes also that

The educational standards in the Arab schools are extremely low, in comparison not only with Jewish schools in Israel, but also with present standards all over the Middle East, and with those prevailing in Palestine under the Mandate.

Newsweek (February 8, 1971) reports that officials justify lack of equality for Arabs in Israel on the basis of their low education, "yet it is precisely in the field of education that the most pervasive inequities exist."

To document fully the character of inequity in South Africa or in Israel is not possible within the limited scope of this pamphlet. (Some references to further sources can be found in the list of references at the end of this pamphlet; of particular relevance in this connection are S. Jiryis, The Arabs in Israel, and the documents of the United Nations Apartheid Committee including the UNESCO report on Apartheid: Its effects on Education, Science, Culture, and Information.) But it is clear that systematic inequality and inequity for subordinate groups in both societies (manifested as a "second-class citizenship" with associated handicaps for the group subordinated) are features which cannot be denied, and which both societies share with their prominent ally and supporter, the United States.

Tools of Repression. The basic systems of settler domination in Israel and South Africa are justified in terms of the survival of the dominant group. To maintain control in the face of threats from the subject populations each state makes use of a variety of police-state measures.

In South Africa the pass system provides an efficient instrument for constant pressure on Africans. The passbook must be carried at all times on one's person, and pass raids, even at night

while people are asleep, are a constant threat. 1500 per day are arrested under the pass laws.

This control system has been supplemented with a wide variety of laws permitting preventive detention, banning (a form of flexible house arrest by which those banned can be limited to only certain kinds of contact with the world outside their house), and imprisonment for extended sentences under charges of "sabotage" or "communism," the definitions of which can include almost any kind of activity designed to upset the existing social order.

In Israel the foundation of control has been the system of Defence Laws (State of Emergency) originally imposed by the British in 1945 and directed against both the Arab and Jewish population. Mr. Y. Shapiro, later attorney-general of Israel, said then that, "The system established in Palestine since the issue of the Defence Laws is unparalleled in any civilized country; there were no such laws even in Nazi Germany." (quoted in S. Jiryis, The Arabs in Israel). This system of laws has been used to restrict movement in areas declared closed - an individual may also be restricted to a certain area or put under house arrest; a person can be detained indefinitely. In the newly occupied territories Proclamation No. 3 lays out a set of similar regulations.

Other measures taken particularly in the wake of the 1967 war are deportations of Palestinians, such as the ex-mayor of Jerusalem and the mayor of Ramallah, and "collective punishment" of villages, such as Beit Nuba and Yalu which were destroyed in 1967.

Houses may be destroyed simply because somebody suspected of guerrilla activity is living there. Other villages, like Emmaus, were totally depopulated and destroyed for strategic military or political reasons. (For more details see the pamphlet on Arab areas occupied by Israel in June, 1967) Such "reprisals" inside Israel are supplemented by raids across the border against Jordan, Syria, and Lebanon.

The massacres of unarmed Arab villagers in Deir Yassein (April, 1948) and of black South African unarmed civilians in Sharpeville (March, 1960) have become important symbols to resistance movements in the Middle East and in Southern Africa. They are representative for them of their experience of confronting an overpowering enemy whose strength will destroy them unless met by popular movements of liberation. The highly publicized events of Sharpeville and Deir Yassein grew directly out of official policies of the two countries, although both South Africa and Israel were hurt by world opinion when the massacres occurred and have since preferred less visible control tactics.

The "violence of apartheid" in South Africa is documented at length in a pamphlet by that name written by A.Sachs and published by the International Defence and Aid Fund in London. Half the world's "legal" executions each year are carried out in South Africa. There are approximately a million prosecutions each year under specifically racial laws. Detention without trial has been the fate of many Africans, as well as dissenters of other racial groupings. In 1968, 741 people stood under banning orders.

Such repression is systematic and efficient. But, unlike Israel, South Africa is so far insulated from active guerrilla warfare within its own boundaries. However, South Africa itself has had troops fighting guerrillas in Namibia (South West Africa) and Zimbabwe (Rhodesia) and has often threatened to invade Zambia. In this context South Africa has been quick to appreciate the Israeli example of reprisals against neighboring countries supporting Palestinian liberation movements, and Israeli tactics in the 6-day war. The hope is that Zambia will be intimidated into moderating or stopping support for guerrilla forces.

Neocolonialism in Africa: Settler States and Independent Countries

The struggle of the indigenous peoples of South Africa and of Palestine meets with the immediate sympathies of the peoples in independent countries most closely related with those two areas. Israel and South Africa are continuing reminders for Sub-Saharan Africans and Middle Eastern Arabs of their own time under direct colonial rule. This means that even the states in these areas with "moderate" or even "reactionary" regimes, states very close on other grounds to the interests of Western imperialism, are forced to give at least lip service to the cause of liberation. Real support for liberation is another matter, however, and therefore the attempt to find moderate states that will be interested in dialogue, in reaching some kind of settlement which may sacrifice the interests of the people actually under settler rule, is

a major aim of the foreign policies of South Africa and Israel.

South Africa's Outward Thrust. South Africa's "outward policy" in this direction has taken substantial shape especially in the years since 1966, when Vorster became Prime Minister. There was already a "Southern African complex" to build on - the alliance with Portugal, the illegal control over Namibia (South West Africa), the support for Ian Smith's Rhodesia. As the former British High Commission territories of Swaziland, Lesotho, and Botswana got their independence, South Africa, playing on their hostage position, gained dominant influence. Only Botswana seemed as if it might try to develop alternative ties to the North, with Zambia.

Malawi, under President Banda, is notorious for having succumbed almost completely to South African control. Diplomatic relationships with South Africa are maintained, South African aid is constructing the new capital at Lilongwe, and South African advisors staff the police, information agency, and many other Malawian government offices.

In the last year other Indian Ocean states have been wooed by South Africa and have begun to respond. Direct air flights have been inaugurated between South Africa and the Malagasy Republic, in defiance of Organization of African Unity resolutions. Formal visits between the two countries were exchanged in 1970, and trade and financial deals were discussed. South African tourists are beginning to go to the Malagasy Republic. In November, 1970, a South African loan to the Malagasy Republic was arranged for

airport improvement, and the construction of a tourist hotel begun. Under consideration is a joint Portuguese-South African project in the Malagasy Republic for construction of a dry dock for super tankers.

Mauritius has also begun to consider ties to South Africa. Parliamentary delegations have been exchanged, and there is talk of financial assistance. One proposal is that Mauritius would provide in return an "Export Processing Zone," through which South African goods could pass, be labeled "Made in Mauritius," and be re-exported to other African countries. South Africa's plans envisage not only assisting regimes that will stop support for liberation movements, but also a neo-colonial relationship with the nations of Africa whereby South Africa could take in that continent the role that the United States has played in Latin America.

The most recent result of South Africa's outward drive has been the proposal by Ivory Coast President Houphouet-Boigny for a "dialogue" with South Africa. He proposed this step to African governments in November, 1970, and was supported primarily by other states under strong French neo-colonial influence. The initiative followed a visit by Prime Minister Vorster of South Africa to France, South Africa's most important arms supplier. The Organization of African Unity, meeting in June, 1971, passed a strong resolution condemning such attempts as dialogue, dialogue which would exclude the representatives of the African peoples of South Africa itself. In the vote, Swaziland and four French-speaking states (Dahomey, Upper Volta, Niger, and Togo) abstained. The Malagasy Republic,

Malawi, Lesotho, Ivory Coast, Gabon, and Mauritius voted against; Uganda and the Central African Republic were not in attendance. Uganda's position however was clear, as two of the diplomats of the new military government there had only recently returned from visits to South Africa.

Israel and Independent Africa. Israel too has engaged in this kind of diplomatic outreach. But while some Arab states may share a common interest with Israel in "restraining" radical action by Palestinian guerrillas (the Jordanian massacre of Palestinians being the most notorious case), such close ties as those of South Africa and Lesotho do not exist. The most successful Israeli efforts have been concentrated on the second range of states, those in sub-Saharan Africa (such as Chad, Ethiopia, Uganda, or the Congo), in an attempt to outflank the Arab support for Palestinian rights. These efforts have been characterized by the use of limited amounts of aid to secure friendly votes in the United Nations, close ties with and dependence on American aid programs, the development of an export market, and (in selected cases) active involvement with military advisory missions.

O. Ayaga, writing in the Pan-African Journal (Spring and Summer, 1968), tabulated African voting records on Middle Eastern questions during the 1967 United Nations session. Analysing the results, he isolated two groupings of countries. With a pattern of pro-Israeli votes were Botswana, Cameroon, Ethiopia, Ghana, Gambia, Ivory Coast, Lesotho, Malawi, Sierra Leone, Togo, Liberia, Malagasy

Republic, and Upper Volta. On the other side were grouped Algeria, Burundi, Mali, Morocco, Mauritania, Libya, Guinea, Tanzania, Tunisia, Sudan, Somalia, United Arab Republic, and Zambia. On the vote on Israeli annexation of Jerusalem, 99 countries called on Israel to withdraw its claim; of the 20 abstentions, 9 were from African states (including South Africa).

The character of Israeli aid to African states has been documented in most detail by the Africa Research Group in their pamphlet "David and Goliath Collaborate in Africa." There they describe how aid given by Israel (private as well as by the government) to African states frequently originates from American sources. This practice of American organizations diverting aid through Israeli agencies has been referred to as the 'third country' technique. An example of the use of this technique is that of the Afro-Asian Institute for Labor Studies in Israel which is aided by the international programs of the AFL-CIO (which have since been revealed as closely linked with the CIA). The advantage of such a practice for Israel is that through utilization of a relatively small capital investment, important trade relations may be built. L. Laufer (Israel and the Developing Countries) notes in this regard the growing importance of Africa as a market and supplier of raw materials for Israel. He also notes that the greatest trade increases have come in countries having an active technical cooperation program with Israel, this being a typical pattern for Western Capitalist countries as they assume a neo-colonial relationship with a developing country.

It is of particular interest that the list of countries that have established especially close military or economic ties with Israel include many of those who have recently become more interested in dialogue or other interaction with South Africa. The Ivory Coast is prominent among these, Houphouet-Boigny having plans to build, in partnership with Israeli promoter Moshe Mayer, an "African Riviera" at Abidjan, the capital of the Ivory Coast. The Ivory Coast Presidential guard is equipped with Israeli Uzi machine guns.

In Chad and Ethiopia, Israel has been actively involved in counterinsurgency operations. In Chad French and Israeli military advisers cooperate in actions against the National Liberation Front of Chad (see Africasia, July 20, 1970). In Ethiopia, American and Israeli work closely together in support of the feudal Ethiopian regime against Eritrean guerrillas and internal unrest. According to the Washington Star (May 16, 1971),

Along with American military assistance, Haile Selassie is also receiving considerable amounts of aid from the Israelis. Officially, the Israelis are training only the Eritrean Commando Police, a mobile force, but Israeli influence is felt all the way up the Ethiopian chain of command. Following the death by ambush last November of Gen. Teshome Ergetu, most of this province was placed under martial law. Diplomats say Israeli advisers urged the Ethiopian second division to avenge the death of Ergetu with a series of infantry sweeps throughout the country in which dozens of villages were burned to the ground and hundreds, possibly thousands, killed.

In the Congo and Uganda, Israel has had active roles in military training. Both are countries whose policies toward the minority white regimes of South Africa, Rhodesia, and the Portuguese colonies of Mozambique and Angola, are at best ambiguous or inconsistent. Actively involved liberation movements of the still

oppressed southern African countries often find them aligned with the Western imperialist interests as if part of the "enemy." In the Congo (Kinshasa), Mobutu's regime is one of the African governments most closely tied to American interests. Its ambivalent attitude toward Portuguese colonialism is illustrated by the trade and diplomatic ties still maintained with Portugal and by its refusal to give access to its territory to the MPLA, the most effective Angolan liberation movement. Israel has responsibility for training Congolese paratroops.

In Uganda, Israel has since 1966 had full responsibility for military training. Israeli advisors have been very close to Commander Idi Amin, trained in Israel, who in January 1971 took over in a military coup against President Obote. Obote had been urging the ouster of foreign military advisors, and moving to the left domestically by nationalizing foreign companies. Since the coup, Uganda has moved right domestically (e.g. denationalizing already nationalized corporations), and has turned against liberation movements and towards rapprochement with South Africa.

South Africa, Israel, and American Imperialism

It is essential in understanding South Africa, Israel, or the links that they have, to deal with the fact that both are intimately tied to the continued economic expansion of the West, and in particular to American imperialism. Both present themselves as outposts of "Western civilization" in the Third World, make much of their

military importance in "containing Communism," mount major efforts to influence public opinion and government officials in the West, and cooperate with American neo-colonial expansion of influence.

Although the United States has other interests in the Middle East and in Africa, resulting often in small divergences of opinion with Israel or South Africa, American support for both has been sustained and significant. In the case of Israel, the motivation and pay-off for the United States has been primarily strategic (with the additional impetus of the close ties between the Israeli Government and American Zionist organizations). But continuation of American support has been of indispensable military and economic significance to Israel. In the case of South Africa, the primary motivation and pay-off for the United States and other Western countries has been in economic gain from the mineral riches and cheap labor of South Africa. But military ties exist also, as illustrated by the recent British decision to sell arms to South Africa, American supply of light planes, and French military supplies of all kinds. (See South Africa's Defence Strategy by Abdul Minty; Portugal and NATO by the Angola Comite, Amsterdam; and Africa Today, July-October, 1970).

American policy in the Middle East and Africa is dual in character: continued support for Israel and for the white Southern African regimes, and the attempt to promote "moderate" independent countries that will neither challenge American interests within their own borders nor support Palestinian or Southern African resistance movements. In its role as "world-wide policeman," the United

States finds South Africa and Israel faithful and useful, if occasionally embarrassing. Each in turn makes use of American support to help consolidate its own position.

The United States, South Africa, and Israel thus are joined in opposition to the growing struggles of the Palestinian and Southern African peoples for their rights. This is consistent with the international Western capitalist structures and presuppositions in which all three are a part. International imperialism involves the maintenance and expansion of the relationships of economic dependence of developing nations on the centers of world capitalism. Liberation struggles, built upon principles of self-determination and control by peoples of their own development and futures, challenge the practice of economic domination by Western capital.

CONCLUSION

In this pamphlet, analysis of the internal and external policies of South Africa and Israel has revealed a number of parallels in practice and a network of economic, political, and diplomatic ties binding the two societies. Internally the governments of both societies maintain repressive control measures against indigenous peoples. Externally both are engaged in an attempt to develop relationships of influence in African, and to some extent Middle Eastern, states. Both are integrated into the international system of imperialism, maintaining close economic,

military, and diplomatic ties with Western capitalist nations and simultaneously collaborating in neocolonialist expansion. Israel and South Africa have had common historical experiences following in part from their origins as settler states. Whatever differences in ethics or concepts of justice or human rights the two countries may verbalize, the reality remains one of a network of economic, military and diplomatic relations binding South Africa and Israel.

REFERENCES CITED IN TEXT

- Africa Research Group. "David and Goliath Collaborate in Africa." Boston, 1969.
- Africa Today. "Allies in Empire" and "Apartheid and Imperialism," July-August and September-October, 1969.
- American Jewish Committee. American Jewish Yearbook. New York (annual).
- Angola Comite. Portugal and Nato. Amsterdam, 1969. (b)*
- Association of Arab-American University Graduates. Information Paper No. 2: Arab Aress Occupied by Israel in June, 1967. Chicago, 1970.
- Ayaga, Odeyo. "Africa's Dilemma in the Arab-Israeli Conflict," in Pan African Journal, 1968.
- Hennle, Alex. Workers Under Apartheid. London, 1969. (b)*
- International Monetary Fund. Direction of Trade (annual).
- Jiryis, Sabri. The Arabs in Israel: 1948-1966. Beirut, 1969.
- Katzew, Henry. Apartheid and Survival. Capetown, 1965.
- Laufer, Leopold. Israel and the Developing Countries. New York, 1967.
- Lobel, Eli. "Palestine and the Jews," in The Arab World and Israel by Ahmad El Kodsy and Eli Lobel. New York, 1970.
- Minty, Abdul. South Africa's Defense Strategy. London, 1969. (b)*
- Resettlement: The New Violence to Africans. London, 1969. (b)*
- Sachs, A. The Violence of Apartheid. London, 1970. (b)*
- Stevens, Richard. "Zionism, South Africa, and Apartheid: Paradoxical Triangle," in Phylon, V. 32, no. 2 (1971).
- UNESCO. Apartheid: Its Effects on Education, Science, Culture, and Information. Paris, 1967.

(b)* = booklets (available through the Madison Area Committee on Southern Africa)

Other Suggested Readings

For an occasional article on the current links of South Africa and Israel, see Sechaba, the journal of the African National Congress of South Africa.

For a brief account of the struggle in Southern Africa, see Race to Power (Africa Research Group, 1971). Brian Bunting's The Rise of the South African Reich (Penguin, 1969) emphasizes apartheid, the most recent phase of white supremacy in South Africa. Van Jaarsveld, "The Afrikaner's Interpretation of South African History" (Capetown, Simondium Publications, 1964) is an academic view of the Afrikaner presuppositions. For fuller background see the bibliography in Heribert Adam, Modernizing Racial Domination: The Dynamics of South African Politics (University of California Press, 1971). For current news of southern Africa see Southern Africa: A Monthly Survey of News and Opinion. (published by the Southern Africa Committee, 637 W. 125th St., New York, N.Y. 10027).

In Israel and the Arabs (Penguin, 1968), Maxime Rodinson presents a critical account of the conflict in the Middle East. A dissenting Israeli voice is that of Uri Avnery, Israel Without Zionists (Macmillan, 1968). And Ibrahim Abu-Lughod has recently edited a set of essays on The Transformation of Palestine: Essays on the Origin and Development of the Arab-Israeli Conflict. (Northwestern University Press, 1971). For further bibliography see the Middle East Reader edited by Irene L. Gendzier (Pegasus Paperback 1969). For information on contemporary events in the Middle East see MERIP Report (free from the Middle East Research and Information Project, Box 48, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138).

Other publications of the Madison Area Committee on Southern Africa include:

Is Southern Africa Wisconsin's Business? (50 cents)
M.A.C.S.A. News (an irregular newsletter available on request with a donation toward costs)

M.A.C.S.A. also distributes several dozen other booklets and reprints from a variety of sources including: Africa Research Group, American Committee on Africa, Angola Comite, Anti-Apartheid Movement, Committee of Returned Volunteers, International Defence and Aid Fund, Liberation Support Movement, and the United Nations.