

SOUTH AFRICA, JEWISH PALESTINE & ISRAEL: THE GROWING RELATIONSHIP 1919–1974

By

*Joshua David KREINDLER **

THE PRE-STATE PERIOD 1919–1948

The Balfour Declaration is the most important document in the history of Zionism, since the State of Israel derives its very legitimacy from it. The most prominent figures in drafting this document were Lloyd George, Lord Balfour, and Lord Milner, although, Leonard Stein, author of an analysis of the Balfour Declaration, says that «Smuts must rank among the architects of the Declaration» even though his contribution was not «of the same order as that of Balfour, Milner, or Lloyd George» (1).

The years between 1919 and 1924 were a crucial time for the Zionist movement as efforts to implement the aims of the Balfour Declaration came into conflict with the beginnings of nationalistic expression by the Palestinian Arabs. Consequently, the strengthening of the relationship between the Zionist movement, the Jewish community, and Prime Minister Smuts of South Africa, were important for the Zionist movement's goal of a «Jewish National Home» in Palestine.

Speaking on November 3, 1919 to a meeting arranged by the South African Jewish Board of Deputies and the Zionist Federation of South Africa, Smuts said; «The Old Testament, the most wonderful literature thought out by the brain of man, the Old Testament has been the very matrix of Dutch Culture here in South Africa. This is the basis of our culture in South Africa, that is the basis of our white culture, and it is the basis of your Jewish culture» (2). The Prime Minister on the same occasion was honored with the following declaration; «We shall never forget the valuable aid you rendered in the furtherance of our claim to national reconstruction in Palestine» (3).

Upon hearing that the mandate for Palestine had been awarded to Great Britain, and that the Balfour Declaration was included in the Peace Treaty at Versailles, the South African Zionist Federation cabled its thanks to the Prime Minister for his «Unfailing sympathy and powerful support» (4).

In February 1921, Smuts attended the mid-year Imperial Conference in London. Before he left he received a deputation of Jewish members of Parliament and local Zionists who urged him to make sure that Zionist interests would be safeguarded. Apparently he kept his promise because after his return to South Africa, Chaim Weizmann cabled the South African Zionist Federation informing them that General Smuts had not only carried out his promise to the Federation, but had been of great service to the Zionist cause during the recent crisis.

* *Director of the American Institute for the Study of Middle Eastern Civilization and Editor of its journal.*

During the years 1925–1933 when Smuts was not Prime Minister, he still was able to exert much influence on behalf of the Zionist cause. In an address to the South African Zionist Conference of 1926, he reminisced about the history of the Balfour Declaration and the roles played by Weizmann and Sokolow in obtaining it; «I remember the travail and labor that was required to secure the formula of the National Home, which is far more than a formula. In the War Cabinet it was discussed... and there was a great struggle of ideas centering around this principle. I want to mention two names specifically concerned with the working out of this formula. One was Lord Milner. All praise is due to Lord Balfour and the formula is properly associated with him. There is another who worked very hard for the success of this movement. Today he is Secretary of State for the Colonies, Colonel Amery. I say it is fortunate that the Jewish People in our day, at so critical a stage in history, has been guided and led by two such great statesmenlike men (Weizmann and Sokolow). To the work of these two men, the triumph of the cause is due» (5). These words of praise, aside from showing the importance of Zionism, also indicate the knowledge Smuts had of the behind-the-scenes efforts to push the Declaration through, as well as his genuine sympathy with the movement. During the 1929 Palestinian Revolt, Smuts placed himself entirely at the service of Weizmann. Weizmann pointed out during this period that a Jewish National Home would be an important ally for the Empire and Jewish immigration to Palestine should be fostered. If, however, the sympathies of the Palestine Mandatory authorities were going to «drift» to the Arab side, it would be better if Great Britain gave up the mandate. When Smuts met with Lord Passfield in December 1929 as a result of the meeting with Weizmann, he warned him not to continue «drifting» in dealing with the Jews because it would be, consequently, running against historic justice. Smuts told Weizmann that he had been offered the position of High Commissioner for Palestine and declined, but felt honor bound to help. On December 20, 1929, *The Times* printed a letter from Smuts, Balfour, and Lloyd George warning the Labor Government not to go against the Balfour Declaration (6). A few days later Smuts was on his way to America for a lecture tour on behalf of the League of Nations. At a luncheon in his honor tendered by the Zionist Organization of America on January 17, 1930, he told of the support that Zionism had, not only among the entire Jewish community of South Africa, but also within the Christian community of South Africa:

«I come from a little country where the Zionist movement is very strong. There may be doubts and misgivings or even a difference of opinion in other parts of the world over this great cause. In South Africa there is none. In South Africa all Jews are Zionists, and the Christians are pro-Zionists. And, therefore, in addressing me as you have done, you do not do it merely to a person, but you do it to a people, to a country which has not only in words but in deeds... through its contributions, and through its unwavering support of the Zionist cause... shown how wholeheartedly it supports that cause.

It is a very remarkable fact which nobody knows, and therefore should be publicly stated, that next to the United States, the country which makes the greatest contributions to the cause of Zionism is South Africa.

I am here once more to bear evidence of the faith in me as a friend of that great cause. My friendship with the great cause for which you stand springs out of very deep sources. I admire your people for the contribution that you have made to the history of the world. Dr. Wise has spoken about an immortal people. I take off my hat to the smallest of peoples, which has made so great a contribution to the advancement of the world. It is a wonderful people. I have stood in Palestine at certain points and viewed that little land which is so small that those who sit here as citizens of the United States have no conception how small that country is. And yet, that small people, inhabiting a small homeland, made a contribution to the cause of humanity such as no other nation has been privileged to make. I know that we are doing justice and showing the right sense of gratitude when we who are not of the Jewish faith and Jewish blood stand up for that great cause of that people, for what they have done for humanity...

It is not a small thing, not a hole in the corner. It was before the great history of the world, dealing with the great history of the world, that we made this promise, this Declaration which is called the Balfour Declaration: «His Majesty's Government view will favour the establishment in Palestine of a National Home for the Jewish people, and will use (these are the operative words) their best endeavors to facilitate the achievement of this object.»

The Balfour Declaration was laid down not in vague terms or aspirations, not merely as a gesture of good will, but as a definite constructive policy. «His Majesty's Government will use their best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object. «That is the promise. That is the policy; and it will stand. That was the first step. The next step was at Paris, when this solemn promise had to be pushed a stage further and had to become the law of the world, so to say; when other nations had to bind themselves to this solemn pledge...

At Paris the Mandate for Palestine was given to Great Britain. Under the Mandate the British Government is made responsible for placing the country, that is, Palestine, under such political administrative and economic conditions as will secure the establishment of the Jewish National Home and the development of self-governing institutions. Here you find not only the original promise made under the greatest stress to which the world was subjected, but solemn ratification of that promise and renewal by all Great Powers in the world taking part in the giving of the Mandate to Great Britain. Such policy must be carried out under this Mandate as will secure the establishment of the National Home.

In the days since August last, the question has been put whether there is any doubt, whether there is any misgiving, whether there is any weakening on this promise, on this pledge originally made by Great Britain, supported by President Wilson on behalf of the American Government, and finally ratified by the Great Powers in the Mandate. As far as I am concerned, as one of the original projectors of this Declaration, and in view of my knowledge of all that has happened since, this document, this promise, this pledge... the Balfour Declaration... will stand, and will be carried out both in the letter and in the spirit...

You will have to help more than ever with financial contributions in order to accelerate a reasonable pace of immigration to the National Home. Not only will your material assistance be necessary; there will remain the problem of statesmanship and of making peace with the Arabs. I do not despair. I think that with the wise guidance of the British Government and maintenance of law and order, and with the strong hand necessary in the East, I do not doubt that wisdom will be forthcoming and the initiative of the Jewish people will be forthcoming to help in the solution of the problems that have arisen with the Arabs.

There is a great responsibility on you. I do not want the Jewish people to adopt an attitude of fault-finding with the British Government. The British Government will play the game with you and it will carry out its pledge. On the Jewish people rests the responsibility to be wise and statesmanlike and to help in arriving at a settlement with the Arab people. I think it can be done with absolute consistency with the Arab people. I think it can be done with absolute consistency with the Balfour Declaration. You can have Palestine as a National Home without waving a red flag.

I hope that you will make your contribution, and with the British Government backing you up and carrying out in letter and spirit the pledge which it has given, and you helping from your side to the best of your ability to bring peace between two kindred peoples. I have no doubt that policy will win through and generations to come will see a new Palestine arise.» (6a)

Almost immediately after his speech he received a cable from Weizmann expressing his thanks for his words of encouragement in a critical time.

On October 21, 1930, The Passfield White Paper was published. This document offered as a remedy to the disorders in Palestine that Jewish immigration and land buying be stopped. At Weizmann's request, Smuts cabled the Prime Minister telling him that the British Government could not back down from its obligation for a Jewish National Home in Palestine. Prime Minister Macdonald reassured Smuts by saying that the prohibition of land buying by Jews did not mean that the Government was in any way shirking its responsibilities towards a Jewish National Home. Smuts also set up a meeting between Weizmann and Lloyd George, and as a result of

their meeting the Prime Minister wrote to Weizmann early in 1931, modifying the 1930 White Paper. The Seventeenth Zionist Congress which met in July 1931, did not appreciate Weizmann's conciliatory attitude towards the British Government, and, consequently, not only demanded that MacDonald's letter to Weizmann be published as a second White Paper revoking the first one, but also insisted upon the creation of a Jewish National Home on both sides of the Jordan. Infuriated by their demands, Weizmann left the office of President of the Zionist Organization for the next four years, although he remained loyal to the Zionist cause and a staunch Anglophile.

In late 1931, Weizmann went to South Africa on a fund-raising tour. Weizmann was impressed by the united Zionist front which the Jews of South Africa displayed. During the next four years when Weizmann was out of office, his requests of Smuts were mainly of a personal nature. Smuts would help Zionist fund-raisers on their way to Palestine, and Smuts introduced (by way of a letter) M. Kentridge, a Labor member of the South African Parliament and an ardent supporter of the Zionist cause. Smuts advised Weizmann to discuss the developments in Palestine with Kentridge.

By 1935, both Weizmann and Smuts were back in positions of power. Weizmann was again President of the Zionist Organization and Smuts was a Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Justice. This simultaneousness of victory was Providential in that they were to meet two serious events and try to deal with them as best they could. The first event was the second Palestinian revolt in 1936; the second was the arrival in Palestine of the Royal Commission headed by Lord Peel. The Commission was entertaining the thought of partitioning Palestine into separate Arab and Jewish States. These events stimulated a considerable amount of correspondence and consultation between Weizmann and Smuts in which Weizmann asked Smuts to prevent the partition plan from being adopted as official policy. As the pressure on Weizmann and the Zionist Organization to accept partition grew, Smuts wrote Weizmann a «prophetic» letter saying that partition was inevitable; why not accept it on the condition that a certain amount of Jews be allowed into Palestine yearly and request that the Mandatory Authority remain not only to protect the Jewish State, but to protect British interests as well. Weizmann did not appreciate Smuts' suggestion and instructed Smuts that he do everything in his power to fight against partition.

When Great Britain entered WW II on September 3, 1939, the situation in Palestine was shifted in the minds of the policy makers to that of second place. The ongoing interest of Weizmann during the war, amid the sufferings of the Jewish people, was to implement the Balfour Declaration, although by this time the word «state» was used instead of «National Home». Weizmann, seeing that Great Britain was preoccupied with the war as well as with trying to find a compromise on the Palestine Question, wrote to various officials about the possibility of using American Jewry, especially the intelligensia among them to exert pressure on Great Britain. Smuts approved of this tactic, but advised Weizmann that it could backlash on him.

In the middle of the war, Smuts broadcast a lengthy message to mark the twenty-fourth anniversary of the Balfour Declaration on November 2, 1941: «Whatever it was, the step was taken, the document signed. With the approval of the British, French, and American Governments. (Note: The Balfour Declaration was in fact not approved or disapproved by the American Government). It was at least a great gesture before History. And finally it was embodied in the Peace Treaty, and the promise to Abraham had at last become part of the International law of the world. The Balfour Declaration is thus not a mere accident, a mere eccentricity of the Great War, but in its large historic setting and its solemn legal form is one of the great acts of History» (7).

In the remaining war years, the topics dominating the correspondence of Weizmann and Smuts were: the immigration restrictions imposed by the White Paper of 1939, the question of a Jewish Army, and Zionist terrorism against the British in Palestine. On October 14, 1939, Weizmann and Smuts met in London, their first meeting in eleven years, during which they spoke of the aforementioned topics. In 1944, with the end of the war in sight, Weizmann wrote to Smuts in October, asking him to oppose partition. As he had told Weizmann eight years previously partition was now more than ever, inevitable. Weizmann was still convinced that if Great Britain would be firm in her demand for a Jewish State, the Arabs would acquiesce. Weizmann hinted in later memorandums that unless a Jewish State were formed, Jews would flood Great Britain and the United States.

On April 4, 1945, Weizmann again met Smuts in London where the latter was attending the Commonwealth Conference as a preliminary to the International San Francisco Conference. The two primary reasons for meeting Smuts were: – 1/ To ask him to use his influence to end the White Paper policy which stopped immigration to Palestine, and – 2/ To further Zionist interests at the Conference since the Jewish Agency had not been invited. Apparently, Smuts fulfilled his duty, because upon his return to London he received a cable from Weizmann congratulating him on the role he played at San Francisco. In spite of the stalemate on the Palestine Question (at the San Francisco Conference), Prime Minister Winston Churchill told Weizmann on July 9, that he would not discuss the Palestine Question until the Peace Conference would convene. At the same time, many of Weizmann's colleagues were pressuring him to resign from office as head of the Zionist Organization because of his extreme Anglophilism, which his colleagues were afraid, might affect his activities on behalf of Zionism. Smuts cautioned Weizmann against resigning. His advice was well-timed because on July 26, the Churchill Government was defeated and the Labor Government came back to power. In mid-September, Smuts wrote to Weizmann telling him of his efforts to have the White Paper abrogated. Smuts submitted a lengthy memorandum to the Anglo-American Commission of Inquiry corroborating what Weizmann said, namely, that admitting 100,000 refugees would relieve the Jewish situation in Europe, and would stop terrorism once they arrived in Palestine as a result of which amicable relations with Great Britain would be reestablished. Weizmann testified before the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine (UNSCOP) during its

sitting from June 16 to July 24, 1947, reading a letter by Smuts to him (Weizmann) as «one of the last surviving statesman who formulated the Balfour Declaration» which encouraged the Committee to recommend partition. After the UNSCOP delegation left and the Palestine Question was put to the United Nations, Smuts told the South African delegation in New York to cooperate with Weizmann as much as possible. On November 15, 1947, Weizmann cabled asking him to exert his influence at the United Nations, as well as on the (British) Foreign Office so that they would vote for partition. Smuts complied with both requests of Weizmann; on November 29, 1947, the partitioning of Palestine into Jewish and Arab States became the declared policy of the United Nations.

The year 1948 saw increased violence on the part of the Haganah, Irgun and Stern groups. Consequently, the United States suggested that since the United Nations could not enforce partition, Palestine should be placed under trusteeship. Weizmann asked and received from Smuts the help of the South African delegation in maintaining the United Nations partition resolution and getting Australia and New Zealand to join with it in support of this resolution. On May 15, 1948, the State of Israel was declared independent. Weizmann sent Smuts the following cable: «Now that Balfour Declaration has been consummated by establishment State of Israel I take opportunity of expressing to you as one of architects of Declaration and most constant supporter of Jewish cause my deepest appreciation and gratitude for manifold kindness which you have shown to Zionist movement and to me personally during intervening years STOP I understand that new state has approached you for recognition and I venture express hope it will be possible for you to crown your life long encouragement of our national aspirations by giving speedy recognition STOP» (8). On May 24, 1948, in a cable to Foreign Minister Moshe Shertok, South Africa granted de facto recognition to the State of Israel (9). Two days later, the Smuts Government fell. Immediately after the Nationalist victory, Prime Minister Malan extended de jure recognition to Israel.

ISRAELI SOUTH AFRICAN RELATIONS 1948–1967

The new South African Government under Dr. Malan had a long record of anti-Semitism as well as racial discrimination, i.e. apartheid to its credit, the former being the reason for the internment of its leaders by the Smuts Government. Israel, to a great degree was created by the Western powers due to its feelings of guilt over Nazi crimes. In considering these facts, it would seem unlikely that both states (Israel and South Africa) would ever collaborate. However, due to the developments in the Middle East and Africa over the past thirty years both countries developed diplomatic, economic, and military relations, particularly after the June War.

Since Israel's admission to the United Nations, its representatives have made impassioned speeches against apartheid, as seen from this speech by Shlomo Hillel, Israel's Minister of Police:

«Amongst the people of Israel, this shameful tragedy of apartheid and discrimination has aroused the deepest indignation. Our position on apartheid, our support of all the resolutions passed here or anywhere else against apartheid, has not been only a matter of a government policy, but it was the instinctive reaction of our people for whom discrimination and persecution on racial grounds have been their lot for 2000 years, and who cannot possibly forget their horrible experience in our generation. I believe that for every Jew, and for that matter for every Israeli, the ugly face of discrimination is only too familiar, and it cannot but be regarded by all of us as the most horrible, shameful and dangerous expression of inhumanity. In this, we share with our African friends not only the same aims of eliminating apartheid, but we share with them the same feelings that come out of the same experience. These same sentiments might have aroused the words of the Premier of the Democratic Republic of Congo, when he greeted the Prime Minister of Israel in Kinshasa, as follows:

«The African people like Israel, because we are all victims of racial discrimination, and we have had to fight for our liberty.»

When Prime Minister Eshkol addressed a State dinner offered to him by the President of Liberia, His Excellency William Tubman, early this year, he expressed the feeling of the people of Israel when he said:

«... none have felt the lash of oppression down the ages of history, as have the Africans and the Jews.»

As indeed was the expression of the feeling of the people of Israel in the message sent by the venerated philosopher and theologian, Martin Buber -- and his appeal, with other Israeli writers and spiritual leaders, to the Government of South Africa:

«Yours is the supreme opportunity of proclaiming supremacy of sanity and understanding over ruthlessness... From the Land of Israel, we ask you to assert your faith in the nobility of man, whatever the colour of his skin. And if you 'Do Unto Others' in accordance with this faith, the future is yours, theirs and the world's».

It is our duty to continue to use this august rostrum to raise our voice against racism and apartheid, and to do whatever is possible and is in our ability to eliminate it. My delegation will support any resolution which aims at this purpose. We shall vote for such a resolution; we shall contribute to any programme of aid to the refugees from South Africa, as we have contributed last year to the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa. And let us hope that after all the day will come when -- in the words of Martin Buber -- «supremacy of sanity and understanding over ruthlessness» will prevail.» (10)

With the passage of time and the strengthening of relations between Israel and South Africa, those speeches have become less condemnatory, such as this speech by Ambassador Chaim Herzog:

« We are asked to vote today on a malicious and irrelevant resolution designed to abort the expression of the universal consensus on apartheid that exists in this chamber. The concoction of lies and innuendos contained both in the resolution and in the special report of the Special Committee Against Apartheid on which the resolution is based, serve no purpose other than to assuage the consciences of the many states represented here which maintain close relations with South Africa. By singling out Israel for special condemnation and thereby diverting attention from the massive quantities of foreign trade, investment, tourism, gold purchases and oil supplies flowing to and from South Africa, the Special Committee has betrayed its mandate, sabotaged international efforts to combat apartheid and slighted both the General Assembly and the African world.

Just a few days ago, on December 4, The New York Times published detailed statistics on investments, sales, assets, loans and credits of major foreign corporations in South Africa.

Mr. President,

Israel's total investment in South Africa is an infinitesimal percentage of that of any one of the companies listed in that survey. Since the same statistics that were available to the New York Times, were available to the Special Committee Against Apartheid, we must assume that they have been deliberately withheld from this Assembly.

Israel's relations with South Africa are alleged, in resolution A/32/L.23 to constitute «a hostile act against... The entire African continent,»

I cannot help but refer the distinguished representatives to an article published but a few days ago, in the Wall Street Journal on December 9. It is a very detailed article describing the economic links between much of the continent of Africa and South Africa. Referring to this subject, a diplomat is quoted as saying that «hypocrisy is the main ingredient on this continent.» I would add that the General Assembly shares this distinction as far as the use of the ingredient of hypocrisy is concerned. We are informed in that article that the South African Trade Organization estimates that South Africa's dealings with the rest of Africa total a billion dollars in exports and half a billion dollars in imports annually.

Indeed I would draw the attention of the Chairman of the Committee to the statement by Professor Piet Nieuwenhuizen, chairman of the department of economics at Rand Afrikaanse University in Johannesburg in which he describes the clandestine trade between Africa and his own country. Indeed, trade with South Africa is so extensive that it includes «almost every country on the continent», Professor

Nieuwenhuizen says. «I walked into an automobile component manufacturing company's dispatch warehouse and the managing director showed me about 100 wooden boxes ready for dispatch to 64 different countries,» he says. «There was hardly a country in Africa whose name wasn't included on the list.»

That article emphasizes that South Africa's trade extends beyond the continent to socialist bloc countries that would like to keep such business connections a secret. The representatives of Byelorussia and Ukraine who have chosen to sponsor this resolution, will be interested to learn that according to the Wall Street Journal article, «they seemed to do their own shenanigans through Amsterdam and Antwerp.»

Let us look at the facts: African trade with South Africa which includes the trade of many of the countries which are co-sponsors of this resolution against Israel, amounts to one and a half billion dollars annually or 16 % of South Africa's trade. Israel's trade with South Africa is 2/5 of 1 % of South Africa's trade. Yet Israel is singled out for condemnation.

The investment of Europe in South Africa is 13 1/2 billion dollars.

The investment of Asia in South Africa is 400 million dollars.

The investment of Africa in South Africa is 550 million dollars.

Israel's investment in South Africa is 1/8 of 1 % of the investment of Asia. Yet Israel is to be condemned.

Israel's investment in South Africa is 1/10 of 1 % of the investment of Africa. Yet Israel is to be condemned.

Israel's investment in South Africa is a tiny percentage of that of any single American corporation let alone the large ones. Yet Israel is to be condemned.

Mr. President,

This debate is an international disgrace. It is unworthy of any serious organization. By their craven submission to the dictates of those intransigent elements in the Arab world which oppose the process of peace-making today in the Middle East, the sponsors of this resolution have struck at the heart of the cause which they are supposed to be espousing. They have actively sponsored the case for apartheid because they have rendered the discussions here totally irrelevant by making them such a mockery.

We will not participate in this cynical exercise in international hypocrisy. Accordingly, because Israel has been singled out as the only country in the world for specific condemnation on its own in a special resolution, my delegation will not participate in any of the votes on this issue. Our position on apartheid has been clear and unequivocal. We do not need to be lectured to by those in this Assembly who preach a great deal and practice very little, if at all.

However, in order to identify with our opposition to Apartheid, we shall make one exception and vote for the resolution on International Anti-apartheid Year (A/32/L.21). If there is a consensus, we shall support that consensus. But on all other resolutions we shall not participate in the vote and thereby express our abhorrence, our condemnation and our disgust at the farcical level to which this discussion on apartheid has been dragged down by allowing cynical hypocrisy and double standards to prevail». (11)

Ambassador Herzog's speech not only seeks to defend trade with South Africa in general, but also to minimize Israel's guilt with the ridiculous argument, «when in Rome, do as the Romans do».

It is interesting to note how in a mere eleven years, Israel's sense of morality takes on a chameleon-like quality, able to blend in with the scenery and the times.

Until 1960, the African countries were not a force to be reckoned with at the United Nations due to their colonial status. With the independence of the African countries came conflicting pressures on Israel, for while wanting to win the friendship of Black African countries by voting against apartheid, they also had to consider how such a vote would affect the status of the South African Jewish Community, and, the reaction of the South African Government to such a vote. From 1960–1962, Israel supported resolutions calling for sanctions against South Africa as well as voted in favor of resolutions condemning apartheid. These actions by Israel against South Africa led to condemnation of Israel by South African officials. After the first Israeli vote against South Africa in 1961, South African Prime Minister Dr. Hendrich Verwoerd wrote a letter to a South African Jew which was «Leaked» to the press: «They (the Jews) took Israel away from the Arabs after the Arabs had lived there for a thousand years. In that, I agree with them. Israel is an apartheid state. People are beginning to ask why, if Israel and its rabbis feel impelled to attack the policy of separate development, 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 idea of separate development is wrong.» (12) Eric Louw, the South African Foreign Minister told the Israeli delegation to the United Nations that if Israel would ever again vote against apartheid, South Africa would not allow money to be sent to Israel (by the South African Jewish Community) free of exchange controls, or would sever diplomatic relations. The threat of Eric Louw was fulfilled in 1962 when funds to Israel (raised by the South African Jewish Community) were frozen by the South African Government.

Following Israel's vote against South Africa, Prime Minister Ben-Gurion explained the background for the vote; «For 2000 years we knew what racial discrimination meant, and we cannot in the Knesset adopt an attitude of indifference to a regime that upholds such discrimination in its

most extreme form» (13). «After 1960 we changed, because we did not want to alienate the new African countries. We knew that the Jews there (i.e. South Africa) wouldn't suffer very much. The South African Government was very angry, but not against the Jews there - - - against Israel. If there would have been pogroms, if their lives were in danger, then we would have abstained, but we would not have voted in favor (of South Africa). Certainly not. A Jew can't be for discrimination» (14). In the same Knesset debate, Yaacov Herzog observed that Israel had criticized South Africa because its national interest in friendship with the new African states was at stake (15). Dr. Haim Yakil, Director General of the Foreign Ministry 1960–1964, stated in 1966 that: «On no issue do I remember more discussion than on apartheid - - - among issues not directly concerning Israel's vital interests. Since 1951 this has been so. There was intense discussion among officials in the Foreign Office. The majority pressed for a strong line on principle; the minority stressed the welfare of South African Jews» (16).

It should be noted that during the years 1961–66, Israeli exports to South Africa averaged \$ 2–2.7 million, but its imports went from \$ 6.8 million in 1961, to \$ 3.4 million in 1966. Since exports went down so drastically it shows there was a deterioration of relations.

THE SOUTH AFRICAN JEWISH COMMUNITY, ZIONISM AND ISRAEL

At this point in our discussion of the evolution of relations between Israel and South Africa, it is important to understand the staunch Zionist feelings and support of the South African Jewish community in order to better understand the «concern» of some members of the Israeli Government for that community.

Since many, if not most of the Jewish immigrants to South Africa were of Lithuanian origin they brought with them a staunch support of Hibbat Zion. This is not to say that there was no opposition, but rather, since it was only from a small segment of the Jewish Community, it was eventually overcome, and the Zionist creed became the unquestionable victor.

Before the first Zionist Congress in Basle (1897) there were several chapters of Hovevei Zion in South Africa. In 1898 in a Zionist Congress of their own the various Zionist factions united to form an umbrella organization, the South African Zionist Federation. The first all-South African Zionist Conference was held in 1905. Zionist activity greatly increased after the Balfour Declaration. The Zionist movement counteracted assimilation and unified the different communities in far-flung parts of the country. The South African Zionist Federation's activities were and still remain widely diversified; fund-raising, promoting aliyah, tourism, youth work, adult education, and encouraging Jewish culture.

Although at the beginning of 1969, the number of South African Jews in Israel was over 6,000, at least according to one source, most of them have gone back to South Africa. Some South African Jews who

immigrated to Israel and achieved prominent positions in the Government are: Abba EBAN, Michael COMAY, Louis (Aryeh) PINCUS, Arthur LOURIE, and Jack GERI. In the 1948 Israeli War of Independence, thousands of South Africans volunteered. Of the 800 that were sent to Israel, one quarter remained there. Many Jews also volunteered their services for the 1956 and 1967 wars. As a result of the ongoing contact between the South African Jewish Community and Israel, Jewish identity in South Africa has been strengthened (17).

THE SOUTH AFRICAN JEWISH COMMUNITY & APARTHEID

At this juncture in our study, a brief essay about the South African Jewish Community and Apartheid is relevant in order to understand this unique Jewish community's ability to blend into the «white» South African population, thereby guaranteeing themselves an established place in their country's society and continuing to serve as a conduit of funds to Israel.

The South African Jewish Community's views on Apartheid and/or lack of them depended upon (at first) the position of the ruling party towards Jews, and later, the position of this same party towards Israel.

During WW II, the National Party, was openly pro-Nazi. Yet, upon the independence of the State of Israel, Prime Minister MANLAN granted de jure recognition to the new State. This dramatic about-face could be attributed to the admiration of the Afrikaaners for Israel in throwing off the British yoke (something which they themselves did) and wanting to gain the moral and financial backing of a very vocal and (economically) burgeoning community. As a result of the government's recognition of Israel, and the desire of the Jewish community to be as «white» in their views as they were in fact, *Jewish Affairs*, the official organ of the South African Board of Jewish Deputies from 1948 onwards never wrote a critical word about apartheid.

As relations between Israel and South Africa became stronger, the official resolutions and statements of the South African Jewish Board of Deputies regarding «racial problems» became more and more ambiguous as the following two statements will show:

«On South Africa's racial problems, the Board of Deputies' congress unanimously adopted a resolution stating:

Congress (of the South African Jewish Board of Deputies) recognizing that the fundamental racial problems of South Africa concern members of the Jewish community as vitally as they do all other sections of the population, urges every Jewish citizen to make his individual contribution, in accordance with the teachings and precepts of Judaism, towards the promotion of understanding, goodwill and cooperation between the various races, peoples and groups in South Africa and towards the achievement of a peaceful and secure future for all the inhabitants of the country based on the principles of justice and the dignity of the individual.

At the same time, the board deplored

any attempts, from within or outside the Jewish community, to introduce Jewish issues into the political controversies of South Africa. It affirms that there is no collective Jewish attitude on political issues (and) emphasizes that, in common with other South Africans, Jewish citizens as individuals have the right and duty to hold and express views on such questions and to exercise their civic responsibilities through the political party of their free choice.» (17a)

The following resolution was adopted in May 1976 by the South African Jewish Board of Deputies:

«Whilst recognizing that, in regard to the racial and political problems of the Republic, there is a diversity of outlook in the Jewish community as there is among our fellow South Africans (emphasis added), we share with all those who dwell in our country the great challenge and opportunity involved in establishing, on ethical foundations, a just, stable and peaceful relationship between all races and groups in South Africa, which acknowledges the right of all to live in dignity and security, to maintain their group identity and distinctive culture, and to exercise the opportunity to advance in all spheres.

The Congress therefore calls upon every Jew to make his contribution to the promotion of these ends in accordance with the teachings and precepts of Judaism, in his personal attitudes and dealings and in the particular sphere of life and activity in which he is engaged.» (17b)

This desire to be part of the Afrikaaner community was amplified by E. J. HOROWITZ, Chairman of the South African Board of Jewish Deputies, on July 8, 1951. «The South African Jewish Board of Deputies is a non-political body. It acts only in matters of concern to all Jews, and since individual Jews have diversified political opinions, the Board itself cannot adopt a party political attitude, and does not do so. The Board emphatically disapproves of attempts, no matter by whomsoever made, to persuade Jews as a group to vote for any one political party.» (17c) The National Party commented upon HOROWITZ's speech by saying: «The tone and tenor of Mr. HOROWITZ's statement are welcome... This is the only healthy position... In our opinion, anyone, Jew or non-Jew, who desires to force a united Jewish front on one side or other side in South African politics is a threat to race relations and to Jewry as a whole. The consolidation of Jewry against one of the big parties can only lead to the formation of a front against Jewry.» (17d) Considering that the National Party was «one of the big parties», the National Party's newspaper was appending a subtle warning to HOROWITZ's words, i.e., if you fight us, we will resume our anti-Semitic policies, consequently, the silence of South African Jewry on apartheid. In March 1960, South African Police suppressed a demonstration in Sharpeville, killing 70 people. Not a single leading

member of the Jewish Community spoke out against this terrible act. The «Board» again stressed that it was a non political party.

In 1961, the President of Upper Volta visited Israel. At the conclusion of his visit the governments of both countries issued a joint statement: Therefore they (the Israeli and Upper Volta Governments) regard the apartheid policy of South Africa as disadvantageous to the interests of the non-white majority of that land.» (17e) The South African press asked if perhaps the time was ripe for them to examine Israel's internal and foreign policies, specifically its treatment of the Arab refugees, and its «racial» and political aloofness from the Arab world. South Africa was especially hurt in view of all the special privileges they had given to South African Jews to raise money for Israel (in tax-deductible form) and to serve in the Israeli Armed Forces while at the same time retaining their South African citizenship. Matters were further exacerbated when in October 1961, Israel voted with 66 other countries in condemning the speech of the South African delegate, Mr. Eric LOUW. In a broadcast from South Africa to New York, Mr LOUW accused Israel of ingratitude especially in view of the fact that the South African Government had gone out of its way to foster good relations with Israel, and that Israel should have abstained from voting on that resolution. The three major Jewish/Zionist newspapers, the *Zionist Record*, the *Jewish Herald* and the *South African Jewish Times* were all vociferous in their condemnations of Israel's vote, not because it would have repercussions in the relations between the South African Government and the South African Jewish Community, but rather because it would rupture relations between South Africa and Israel. Many Jews who were still upset about Israel's vote at the United Nations, cancelled their contributions to the United Israel Appeal. Four months later the (non-Jewish) South African press revealed that the South African Government had rescinded the special concessions in the foreign currency regulations which allowed South African Jewish organizations to transfer money and goods to Israel. However in 1967, if not beforehand, this law was repealed.

In conclusion, why South African Jews more than any other ethnic group of the South African populace fight apartheid? The fact that many South African Jews have lost relatives to Nazism, an ideology just as dangerous as apartheid if not more so should make the South African Jewish Community sensitive to the oppression of a majority of the population. It is easily realized that a small white minority cannot forever dominate a growing, race conscious, black majority. «Siding with the powers of today is bound to mean alienating the makers of a very different tomorrow. Conversely, unpopularity with the bosses of the present might well be the price of becoming accepted and respected partners in the formation and running of a more just South African future.» (17f) Quite simply, if the blacks are the targets of oppression one day, it is more than likely that Jews will be the next victims. It is unfortunate that Jews in South Africa think that the National Party, by becoming so staunch an ally of Israel has become

pro-Jewish. The most powerful gentiles in various governments have been the most virulent anti-Semites (Count Plehve in Russia who had spoken to and encouraged Herzl, Lord Balfour who at one time was against Eastern European Jews coming to England and Verwoerd during WW II was all in favor of exercising a quota on immigrants allowed into South Africa). The Jew is enjoined to «Love your neighbor as yourself» (Leviticus IXX, 18) and that eventually the Holy Temple «will become a house of prayer for all Nations» (Isiah LVI, 7) the Jews are not allowed to discriminate and yet, by being silent when it comes to speaking out against the oppression of its neighbors «the chosen people are choosing not to be chosen.» (17g)

1967 – 1970

Both Jews and non-Jews distinguished themselves in their aid to, and support of Israel before, during, and immediately after the June War. The South African Zionist Federation at one of its meetings in Johannesburg was reputed to have raised «tens of thousands of rand». (18) Jewish doctors from Port Elizabeth flew to Israel while their community raised two million rand. In a discussion in Parliament on June 5, 1967, members of all parties identified with Israel, and many leaders of the opposition United Party attended a special service on behalf of Israel in Cape Town's Great Synagogue.» (19) Students at the English-speaking University of Witwatersrand collected blood for the Magen David ADOM (i.e. Israeli Red Cross). The Dutch Reformed Church (which is the national Church of South Africa) called upon its congregants to support Israel. Dave MARAIS, member of Parliament and chairman of the Nationalist Football League, planned a game to raise funds for Israel. There were reports that the Afrikaaner fraternal organization, the Brozderbond, had given money to the United Israel Appeal Fund; the Johannesburg Star reported that it had made a sizable contribution to assist Israel (20). A spokesman for the Zionist Federation stated that several «well-known Afrikaans organizations are among the many non-Jewish bodies which have contributed to the United Israel Appeal Fund. (21)

The South African Government remained officially neutral during the June War, Foreign Minister Dr. Hilgard MULLER stated after the war (22). The neutrality Dr. MULLER spoke of was by no means absolute. During the war and immediately afterwards, the South African Blood Service loaned blood to Magen David ADOM. The Government relaxed its restrictions on the transfer of money out of the country imposed upon Israel after the 1962 United Nations vote, to allow money to be sent for humanitarian purposes, while allowing all money donated by individuals to be sent without hinderance. At the United Nations, South Africa abstained from the votes in the General Assembly dealing with Israeli annexation of Arab Jerusalem which was even condemned by the United States; South Africa claimed that the issue was the responsibility of the Security Council. *Perspective*, the journal of the South African Foundation, a group of businessmen devoted to improving South Africa's image abroad, stated in its August 1967 issue: «The recent war in the Middle East aroused fevered interest and passionate concern in many parts of the world, but in so few a deep 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 assist and succor them accordingly.»

During the Six Day War and the period immediately following, Israel had the financial and political support of the Anglican, Methodist and Presbyterian churches, who, in a joint statement, condemned the Arab States, and, as stated previously, the Dutch Reformed Church, as well as fraternal Afrikaaner organizations gave their moral and financial support as well. Chief Rabbi Abrahams felt that the support extended to Israel by South Africa was due to one important interest shared by both countries, namely, to fight against the spread of communism.

E. J. HOROWITZ, chairman of the (South Africa) Zionist Federation speaking at its 30th conference in September 1967, said that one of the results of the Six Day War had been the signs of a marked improvement in relations between both countries, though they still might have their differences on their mutual internal policies.

The positive reactions of the South African Government and people to Israel gave way to the idea of increased contacts between both countries.

In January 1968, Eliezer SHOSTAK, a Knesset member of the Free Center Party, formed the Israel-South African Friendship League, whose purpose was to foster increased trade and general improvement of relations between both countries. The South African Foundation formed an «Israeli-South African Committee.» Its most prominent (Israeli) members were: Colonel Ephraim SHURER, El Al's manager in South Africa and Dr. Sholomo PEER, a co-founder of the Rafi Party, living in South Africa since 1965. One of the first actions of this Committee was to arrange a meeting between P. W. BOTHA, South African Minister of Defense and Shimon PERES, Secretary General of the Israeli Labor Party. During PERES' stay in South Africa he said that Israeli-South African relations had undergone a slight improvement, the primary reason for this being South African support of Israel during the June War. «Although we still have different points of view, our relations are excellent (23). Another activity by the South African Foundation Committee was to participate in a «Millionaires Conference» held in Jerusalem in the beginning of April to raise money from businessmen and to promote trade. David SUZMAN of Cape Town, was appointed chairman of the South African Regional Committee of the conference. A number of leading South African businessmen attended.

The newspaper *Die Burger*, official organ of the Nationalist Party in the Cape, wrote in an editorial on Israeli-South African relations: «Israel and South Africa have a common lot. Both are engaged in a struggle for existence, and both are in a constant clash with the decisive majorities in the United Nations. Both are reliable foci of strength within the region,

which would, without them, fall into anti-Western anarchy. It is in South Africa's interest that Israel is successful in containing her enemies, who are among our own most vicious enemies; and Israel would have all the world against it if the navigation route around the Cape of Good Hope should be out of operation because South Africa's control is undermined. The anti-Western powers have driven Israel and South Africa into a community of interests, which had better be utilized than denied» (24).

One example of expanded commercial relations was the Israel Fashion Week, held in Johannesburg and Cape Town in August 1968 and organized by the Israeli Export Institute headed by Ruth KIMMEL. Another example was increased flights by El Al to South Africa. «Trade between Israel and South Africa has doubled since the end of the June War and air freight is playing an increasingly important part in this growth (25). The Karmon Israeli Singers and Dancers and the comedian Shimon DZIGAN visited South Africa in July and August. The Director of the foreign broadcasting branch of Kol Israel, Dr. Geoffrey Wigoder visited South Africa for six weeks (26). Among the many leading Israelis who visited the country were Gideon Hausner, former attorney general and member of the Knesset for the Independent Liberal Party (27), and General Uzi NARKISS who came as a guest of the South African Zionist Federation (28). During the year, trade between both countries rose greatly from the 1967 level. Exports to South Africa from Israel rose from \$ 4 million to \$ 5.7 million, an increase of over 40 %, while imports from South Africa rose from \$ 3.4 million to \$ 5.2 million, an increase of over 50 %. Despite an increase in the level of Israeli exports to Ethiopia during the year, the rise was sufficient to secure the position of South Africa as Israel's major trading partner in Africa (29). The establishment of the Israeli-South African Trade Association was the primary factor for increased trade. Expansion of trade continued into the following year together with more visits by prominent Israelis to South Africa. At the beginning of the year, Michael was named the new head of the Israeli diplomatic mission in South Africa. He had held the title of Charge d'Affaires and had held a number of posts in the Israeli Foreign Ministry. In a comment from Tel Aviv the day that the appointment was announced, the correspondent of *The Star* reported: «Israel will try in the future to maintain much closer and fuller contacts with South Africa. The pro-South Africa faction has, so it seems, won the day» (30).

The former business manager of the *South Africa Jewish Times*, Harold BLUMBERG, was appointed to a post with Israeli Publications in Tel Aviv in January; he described his role as that of helping to expand trade through publications produced by the company. He was assisted by official Israeli sources, whose representatives in South Africa emphasized their desire for more trade. In May, Amitay BEN-JOSEPH addressed the Executives Association in Johannesburg, saying that South African businessmen could easily and quickly double their exports to Israel, and urging them to set up joint projects with Israeli businessmen (31). In May 1967 the World Federation of Diamond Bourses and the International Diamond Manufacturing Association Conference was held in Johannesburg, following the one held the previous year in Israel. Given the importance of the Israeli

diamond industry, becoming the largest foreign currency earner for the State, and given the world diamond market dominance by De Beers of South Africa, collaboration in this field grew steadily closer.

The Israeli-South African Trade Association announced in June that 17 South African businessmen were to attend the first meeting of the Economic Advisory Council set up in Israel. Their aim was to discuss ways and means to increase bilateral trade between Israel and South Africa.

The Israeli shipping company, ZIM, announced in early August that through its subsidiary, Gold Star Line, it would provide four ships for the South African-Japan route. It also stated that traffic on the Israel-South Africa route had shown a 50 % increase since the June War, and that the Australian-Eilat run would be extended to include a call at Durban. The Zim Far East director, Carmel HACOHEM, who visited South Africa a week later came to study port conditions and inquire into the possibility of expanding South Africa-Israeli trade, for which he believed there was considerable scope because of the tremendous development in South Africa (33).

There was also an increase in the number of prominent Israelis who visited South Africa, among them former Prime Minister, David BEN-GURION, and former head of intelligence services, Chaim HERZOG. Both came in May for the fund-raising appeal launched by the Zionist Federation. During his visit, BEN-GURION had discussions with Prime Minister VORSTER, and was accompanied by Colonel Joseph GOLAN, former military attache in France. General Aharon DORON who had been commander of Tel Aviv's civil defense during the June War arrived in August as guest of the Zionist Federation.

In an editorial welcoming BEN-GURION, *Die Vaderland*, one of the most influential Nationalist papers stated: «Israel's survival is a fundamental part of our security. If our Jewish citizens would listen to what our important visitor has come to ask, help for the building of Israel, then their contribution is also a contribution to South Africa's security. Israeli control over the Suez Canal has meant that South Africa had gained a large material as well as strategic advantage.» (34)

BEN-GURION took the opportunity during his visit to deny a report earlier in the year that Israel had developed a nuclear weapon. Reporting on the Dimona nuclear project in Israel, which had initially been a joint Franco-Israeli project, the *Rand Daily Mail* wrote: «It is now virtually certain that Israel has, or is within weeks of possessing a nuclear bomb,» (35) drawing attention to the fact that Israel refused to sign the Non-Proliferation Treaty, or to incorporate its nuclear program into the International Atomic Energy Commission based in Vienna. This was followed in early May by reports from Montreal that Israel had assembled five small nuclear bombs. Dismissing the report as nonsense, BEN-GURION refused to elaborate, but the report gave rise to speculation that South Africa and Israel might be collaborating in this field.

In November, Israel Aircraft Industries appointed a South African company, Placo, as distribution agents for their new Commodore 10 seat executive jet, which was due for delivery in August 1970.

Trade during 1969 showed a further rapid increase. Israeli exports to South Africa rose from \$ 5.7 million to \$ 8.2 million, while imports from South Africa rose from \$ 5.2 to \$ 5.8 million (36). Israel's exports to South Africa thus reached the level of nearly a third of its exports to the rest of Africa (Israeli exports to South Africa: polished and cut diamonds, chemicals, medicaments, paints, foods and metal processing equipment).

1970 – 1972

The first report of trade in military hardware between Israel and South Africa was at the beginning of 1970; «The South African Government has begun to organize the export of tanks to Israel, marking a new stage in their cooperation. The South African tank is a 65-ton giant, armed with a heavy gun, and designed according to the model of the new British tank» (37). The following day the *Jewish Telegraphic Agency* (hereafter abbreviated JTA) reported; «The Israeli Foreign Ministry had no comment today on a charge that South Africa was shipping arms to Israel... The charge, which appeared Sunday, stated that the South African Government was planning the export of giant 65 – ton tanks to Israel». (38)

Not long after the JTA report, the Commander of the Woman's Army Corps in Israel, Colonel Stella LEVY, visited South Africa. She was accompanied by Mrs. Tamar ESHEL, in charge of foreign relations for the municipality of Jerusalem. They came for a three week visit to launch the 1970 Women's Biennial Zionist Campaign (39).

Allister SPARKS, a commentator for the *Rand Daily Mail*, discussing the similarities between Israel and South Africa, wrote in March that; «They (the similarities) have broadened out beyond the Biblical and historical, in the contemporary world, they have become political too. There are obvious similarities between the position of modern Israel, embattled and fighting for survival in a corner of the Arab World, and that of white South Africa, at the southern tip of a black continent» (40).

In July the (South African) Government controlled Industrial Development Corporation signed an agreement with David GOLAN, managing director of the official Foreign Trade Bank of Israel, extending a guarantee line of credit for 10.7 million rand, to help augment the level of South African capital exports to Israel. In October, the Steel Pipes Industry Party, a subsidiary of the African Gate Holdings, sold a spiral steel pipe mill for 250,000 rand to the Middle East Tube Company of Haifa, thus taking a share in the company.

Jewish Affairs, official organ of the South African Jewish Board of Deputies, had the following editorial, emphasizing the similarities between Israel and South Africa: «The argument that Israel and South Africa have a basic community of interests in the Middle East and further south has more than a grain of truth. There is nothing secret or sinister about it. The strong ties between the two countries, closer than ever since the 1967 war, are inseparable from their geographical and strategic position, from their anti-Communist outlook, and all the realities of their national existence. In short, the destinies of the two countries, so different in many ways but so alike in the fundamental conditions of their survival, are interwoven in a

much more meaningful sense than any enemy propagandist could conceive, or for that matter, would be happy to see. Israeli and South African interests converge not just on the eastern fringe of the African continent, but more positively in the heart of the continent itself. Both share an interest in the material and social development of those among the 20 million Africans who wish to seek their help and cooperation. It is on African soil that the paths of Israel and South Africa are certain to cross in the 70's, and to an increasing extent, in the more distant future. It is not, and never has been a question of rivalry, but rather complimenting the other where they happen to meet.» Such a clear analysis of identity of interest in the official journal of the South African Jewish Board of Deputies is an indicator of the extent to which the Jewish leadership felt identified with the Nationalist Government.

Besides the development of trade and the encouragement of South African capital in joint projects, the progress of cultural and sporting relations have begun to accelerate as well. Two Israeli musicians from the Israeli Philharmonic visited South Africa to play in Johannesburg in August, 1970. The Israeli Lawn Tennis Association declined to use its proxy vote at the Davis Cup meeting in London which was to discuss the participation of South Africa and Rhodesia, thereby disassociating themselves from those who were working for the implementation of the boycott of South Africa in sports (43).

In 1970, Israeli exports to South Africa amounted to \$ 10.7 million, while imports amounted to \$ 10.2 million. Exports increased to over 30 % of the total figure for the rest, while the increase in imports from South Africa (up from \$ 5.8 million) meant that Israel imported from South Africa nearly half as much as it imported from the rest of the continent as a whole (44).

Increase in trade was matched by an increase in tourism between the two countries. The number of South African tourists to Israel increased by more than 11 % according to Israel Zuriel, deputy director, Ministry of Tourism (45).

The most recent incident which potentially could have caused a break of relations, or at best, economic sanctions as in 1962 by South Africa against Israel, was the decision by Israel in the summer of 1971 to offer a contribution to the Organization of African Unity for use by liberation movements in Southern Africa. An examination of the relations between both countries during the year shows that this disagreement – which was resolved by the decision of the Israeli Government to withdraw the offer – did not affect the development of relations (46).

Trade continued to advance, with the South African government making two important decisions during the year in favor of Israel, as well as working to strengthen trade. In January 1971, the first delegation of the South African Trade Association, under the auspices of the Israeli Consulate, visited Israel. It was composed of representatives of some of South Africa's largest heavy engineering, construction, casting and foundry work companies. Standard Bank and Barclay's Bank International also participated in the mission, which sought to insure that the line of credit extended to Israel in 1970 was fully taken up, and that the campaign to strengthen trade would receive another increase (47).

At the beginning of May, the Israeli Consul General in Johannesburg, Itshak Unna, stated at an Israeli Independence Day rally that relations between the two countries were stronger than ever. «We would not have been able to maintain this good relationship if we could not overcome our differences. On the contrary, a free and open discussion on matters on which we agree, as well as those on which we disagree, improves the atmosphere for a better understanding of each other's problems.» (48)

Almost simultaneously, the first permanent representative of an Israeli bank in South Africa was announced. The Japhet Bank, one of Israel's oldest and controlled by Bank Hapaolim, one of Israel's three largest banks, appointed a South African representative, Ephraim FREUND, whose task was to promote trade contacts, especially in the field of base minerals, semi manufactured and manufactured products, to promote South African exports by providing financing through associate companies abroad, to give information about investment possibilities in Israel, including the field of joint-capital projects, and to give exchange advice (49).

At the end of the month, the South African Government announced a further incentive to trade (with Israel). Controls on direct investment by South African companies in Israel were relaxed to the extent of 10 million rand, meaning that South African companies wishing to enter partnership in Israel or set up new enterprises, were free to do so. The ceiling of 10 million rand was generally expected to be raised once the investment generated the need for further participation. *The South African Financial Gazette* reported: «This move is seen as the forerunner of further relaxations designed to encourage the «export» of South African capital to Israel. The development follows closely several other moves which have highlighted the growing trade and economic ties between Israel and South Africa. The *Financial Gazette* understands that most of this credit (i.e. that granted in July 1970) has been subscribed and that demand for its facilities were particularly heavy after a South African trade mission, organized by the Israeli Consulate in South Africa, visited Israel's main centers earlier this year. The significance of the latest development is that the South African Government, for the first time, has given its official encouragement for further investment in Israel» (50). The journal also revealed that some private investment had already begun - - - the Desiree Clothing group of companies in Cape Town had established the Cecil knits textile venture in Israel, in collaboration with local interests, while African Gate had bought into a tube company in Haifa (51).

The relaxation of controls was rapidly followed by a new line of credit being granted by the Industrial Development Corporation at the beginning of June. The second in a year, it was worth \$ 14.9 million. Again, the primary reason for the extension of credit was to increase exports (52).

The growing importance of the trade to Israel was revealed by the disclosure in July that from mid-1971, South Africa and Mozambique would be supplying two-thirds of Israel's monthly needs of sugar to be shipped to Eilat (53), while Carmel HACOHEM, of ZIM, revealed during a visit in October that the new direct route from South Africa to Japan was

now being plied by Gold Star Line ships on a monthly schedule (54). Likewise, the figures released by the Deputy Director General of the Israeli Ministry of Tourism, Israel ZURIEL, indicated that the increase (of tourists) of the previous three years was being maintained. In South Africa to attend the conference of the Association of South African Travel Agents in Swaziland and to spend two weeks in South Africa, ZURIEL said that figures from January to June 1971 showed a 27 % increase over the same period in 1970 (55).

Increasing public knowledge of the growing relationship between Israel and South Africa and its importance, continued to be a source of embarrassment to the Israeli Government. In an article in the *New York Times*, C. L. SULZBERGER wrote: «The basic truth remains that this country (SA), which had 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» (56). He said that especially for South Africa, 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 feels, therefore, that if Israel is sympathetic, this will help its own international standing. He quoted South Africa's Prime Minister VORSTER: «We view Israel's positions 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.»

What disturbed the Israeli Government most was the report of collaboration in the military field. SULZBERGER said that South Africa was manufacturing the Israeli Uzi submachine gun under licence, granted by Belgium, and went on to repeat what he termed «wholly unconfirmable» rumors that the Israelis, having obtained blueprints of the French Mirage fighter, had made them available to South Africa. He also reported that he had been told officially that a South African mission flew to Israel during the June War to study use of weapons and the tactics of lightning strikes.

A Foreign Ministry press briefing in Jerusalem the following day denied the SULZBERGER allegations about military ties, and claimed that the last links of even a vague nature, had been in 1955, when Belgium sold some Uzis to South Africa (57). The Israeli embassy in Washington after consultation with Jerusalem, issued a statement saying that there was «absolutely no truth» in the SULZBERGER report (58).

Attempts to develop arms trade, however much denied by the Israeli Government, were exposed by the Israeli offer in May to sell three airplanes to replace those of the South African Air Force which crashed into Table Mountain. While the South African Government did not take advantage of this offer, collaboration was confirmed by an incident in Durban involving a fire aboard a small Greek freighter. The ship, the *Antonios Ventorious*, had sailed from Eilat, via Mauritius, to Durban with a cargo of high explosives. The fire broke out after most of the cargo had been unloaded and led to publicity as to the nature of the cargo (59).

In early 1972, the expansion of links continued. It was marked by the decision of South Africa to open its first diplomatic representation in Tel Aviv, announced early in March. The former South African consul general in Angola and New York, Charles FINEBAUM, was sent to open the office together with, E. A. Van NIEKERK. Although the South African government refused to comment officially on the decision, it was welcomed by one Israeli official who said that, «it should have happened years ago. Israel have considered the unfavorable reaction that is bound to come from the Afro-Asian and possibly the Scandinavian missions based in Tel Aviv and Jerusalem before agreeing to the establishment of the South African mission. By having accepted the South African request, Israel has shown that it values a close relation with South Africa». (60)

A new South African trade mission was announced in April, when the Israeli trade consul in Johannesburg said that a mission from the city's chamber of commerce would visit Israel in November to consolidate the growing trade. The South African minister for water affairs and forestry, Stephanus BOTHA, visited Israel in June to study Israeli methods of water conservation, telling reporters on his arrival that he hoped to establish cooperation with Israel. The former Israeli ambassador to Denmark, Ester HERLITZ, spent a month in South Africa in the early part of the year at the invitation of the Women's Zionist Council. She addressed a meeting of parliamentarians in Capetown. Raya JAGLON, president of WIZO, was also in South Africa during this period to assist with the fund-raising campaign of the Women's Biennial Zionist Campaign for Israel's Human Needs (61).

An Israeli Women's Tennis team visited South Africa in March to participate in the international Federation Tennis Cup. It was the first time Israel had taken part in this event (62).

The pattern of growing collaboration continued throughout the year. One indication of it being the statement by the South African deputy commissioner of police General Danie BESTER, in May, that following the establishment of diplomatic links, an extradition treaty was now a possibility (63).

1973

Following the October War, Israel found itself being increasingly isolated, especially from the black African countries, as the following list shows: (Israel was asked to leave the following countries at these respective dates):

Benin,	10.6.73
Botswana,	11.13.73
Burundi,	5.16.73
Cameroon,	10.15.73
Central African Rep.	10.21.73
Equatorial Guinea,	10.15.73
Ethiopia,	10.23.73
Gabon,	10.30.73

Gambia,	10.26.73
Ghana,	10.28.73
Ivory Coast,	12.8.73
Kenya,	12.1.73
Liberia,	12.2.73
Mali,	1.5.73
Madagascar,	10.20.73
Nigeria,	10.25.73
Rwanda,	10.9.73
Senegal,	10.28.73
Sierra Leone,	10.30.73
Tanzania,	10.18.73
Togo,	9.21.73
Upper Volta,	10.11.73
Zaire,	10.4.73
Zambia,	10.26.73

It is specifically because of its isolation from other African countries that relations between Israel and South Africa increased so dramatically.

South African officials openly expressed their support for Israel during the October War. Mr. P.W. BOTHA, South African Minister of Defense and present Prime Minister, declared that «within our means and without declaring war» his government would provide assistance to Israel. Prime Minister VORSTER stated that if Israel lost the war, its defeat would have important consequences for South Africa (65). To lend credibility to their words, South Africa immediately lifted exchange controls to allow free transfer of funds to Israel, and provided various forms of material assistance. After the war, South Africa became Israel's sole substantive supporter on the African continent and one of the few governments anywhere not calling for Israeli withdrawal from occupied Arab territory (66).

In the years since the October War, the two countries have further consolidated relations. They upgraded the level of their diplomatic relations from the level of legations to that of embassies. Several joint projects were undertaken by corporations in both countries, and commercial and scientific ties were strengthened with the appropriate organizations and the exchange of high level visits. Political contacts were greatly intensified. Among the high-ranking Israeli officials who have visited South Africa since 1974 are: General Moshe DAYAN, former Minister of Defense and Former Foreign Minister, General Meir AMIT, former head of the Israeli Intelligence Service, and General Chaim HERZOG, former representative of Israel to the United Nations and now in private law practice in Tel Aviv. While such Israeli visitors had in the past usually been admitted to South Africa in connection with fund-raising and functions of the Jewish community, this limitation was dropped in 1974 (67).

CONCLUSION

In researching the unique relationship between Israel and South Africa the following parallels, non-parallels, emotional and practical reasons explain why relations have been consolidated to so well in the last decade.

Both Israel and South Africa feel that their lands are more than simply, places of residence, they are «promised lands». One needn't be an expert in Middle Eastern or African affairs to be aware of the Biblical characteristics of both these countries and their peoples (particularly their newest settlers).

The Israelis claim that Palestine was promised to their Patriarch, Abraham (of course Abraham is looked on as the father of both Arabs and Jews). Consequently, the modern term, «historic rights», for this particular people to a specific geographic area is a continuation of the religious and cultural attachment of Jews to Palestine over the centuries.

The Afrikaaners of South Africa have adopted and adapted the «historic rights» argument to their own national-religious beliefs. The Dutch ancestors of today's Afrikaaners, fleeing the unrest and religious persecution of 17th century Europe landed in South Africa in a miraculous way, just as NOAH was «guided» to Mount Ararat. Providence had, in their opinion, given them a new lease on life, a new land. This religious bond to the land has grown stronger in the course of three centuries of struggle against various enemies, black and white.

Israel and South Africa, due to their individual struggles against the British, see themselves as nationalists rather than colonialists. In many present-day international forums, such as those of the Organization for African Unity and the Conference of Non-Aligned Countries, Israel and South Africa are often accused of being vestiges of the colonial past. This is one accusation which raises the ire of leaders of both countries. Israelis and South Africans have been taught by national ideologies to view themselves and their countries as the *victims* of the colonial powers. Both struggled against the British — the South Africans in the Boer War and the Zionists in the late 1930's and 1940's. Consequently, Israel and South Africa are at least as sensitive to outside meddling in their internal affairs as are other countries that lived under colonial rule.

Both Israel and South Africa view themselves as outposts of Western civilization (to guard against Asian and African barbarism). In spite of assertions of independence from European ties that are part of Israeli and South African national ideologies, there remains a strong sense of participation in the course of Western, i.e. European, civilization. Both use the parliamentary system of democracy, of constitutional government, and of freedom of religion. Yet because both are small nations that are geographically cut off from the North Atlantic world, there is a growing sense of isolation. A «siege mentality» or «Massada complex» has developed in both countries. In his book *The Jewish State*, HERZL said that a Jewish Palestine «should form a portion of the rampart of Europe against Asia, an outpost of civilization as opposed to barbarism» (68). The deepening antagonism of their neighbors has reinforced and intensified this sense of isolation.

In recent years many people in Israel and South Africa have come to feel that they have been abandoned by the West. Since its independence in 1948, Israel has had a fluctuating relationship with the West. The 1956 invasion of Egypt by Britain, France and Israel was reversed by President EISENHOWER who forced a complete withdrawal. During the June War of 1967, the French government under Charles De GAULLE cut off further arms sales to Israel which was then heavily dependent on advanced French weaponry. In 1973, all of the NATO allies with the exception of Portugal, refused landing rights to American cargo planes carrying weapons to Israel. At the United Nations, there has been a serious erosion in the support given Israel by Western states.

South Africa has suffered a similar decline – from being a respected member of the world community to the status of a pariah. Nearly sixty years ago, South Africa was given mandatory powers over the German colonies, South-West Africa, by the League of Nations. Today, South Africa is the object of universal condemnation by the United Nations. Unlike Israel, which continues to receive grants of military aid and also purchases additional sophisticated weaponry mainly from the United States, South Africa faces the prospect of a total arms embargo. If further international sanctions are forthcoming, South Africa will probably suffer the loss of future foreign investment and may experience a damaging flight of internal capital to safer havens abroad. South Africa might have gone under economically much sooner but for its vast wealth in diamonds, gold and uranium.

In the field of military tactics and strategy, Israel has entered a number of contests with only partially modernized Arab armies but has, however, rightly gained a reputation as a strong military power in her theater. By contrast, South Africa has faced no serious external threat to her hold in the region, but the internal strife in recent times has reached a critical stage. Israel, by contrast, prior to the 1967 war, purged its borders of an overwhelmingly large Arab population. As in the case of Kenya, Uganda and the Rhodesias, South Africa may ultimately find it impossible, even with a modern military to stand up to a black-white ratio of 20 to 1. Israel may also face a demographic monster if it does not settle the Palestine question. In both cases, military prowess does not seem to be solving the problem of survival.

Until recently, Israel's internal enemies, the Palestinian nationalists have had a «terrorist» image in much of the West partly because of the effectiveness of Israeli propaganda. Palestinian commandos generally have committed atrocities in public, while Israeli 'hit squads' have killed or maimed beyond the public eye. South Africa's internal enemies, the Black nationalist are viewed as «civil libertarians» and «freedom fighters» in the West because they have effective spokesmen in the United Nations and Western journalists.

Given this difference in public image, Israel enjoys considerably more latitude in dealing with internal security. A case of this Western intolerance was seen in 1973 when the Israeli Air Force shot down an unarmed civilian airliner that strayed over the Sinai Peninsula with a loss of 106 lives. Not only was Israel not condemned for this vicious attack, but it was even

pitied because it is a nation that is in a constant state of war. However, when the South African government takes steps to deal with its internal enemies there is usually an outcry of major proportions. The closing of Black newspapers and the banning, arrest or killing of dissidents provoked a storm of protest. Yet the Israeli government has closed down Arab newspapers, arrested, deported and eliminated dissident Arabs for years without comparable international reaction of the proportion seen in South Africa.

South Africa has enjoyed a strong, viable economy while Israel's economy is weak and dependent. The difference in the strength of the two economies is largely a product of another non-parallel. South Africa is rich in natural resources, Israel is not. South Africa is the world's largest producer of gold, diamonds, platinum and antimony, the second largest producer of chrome, vanadium and vermiculite. It is the third largest producer of uranium, manganese and asbestos. More than 90 % of Africa's total coal production takes place inside South Africa and 80 % of the continent's coal reserves are found inside South Africa's borders. Besides mining, the country's economy is well balanced with strong agricultural, manufacturing and commercial sectors. By comparison, the Israeli economy is negligible. One problem they share is that both are dependent on the exploitation of native laborers whose land they have colonized.

Israel has had the benefit of strong lobby groups in the West, because Jewish supporters and many Bible fundamentalist Christians have worked for Zionist ideology. Israel is bolstered by the pressure of strong Zionist organizations in Europe, the Americas and South Africa. The ability of these organizations to raise funds for Israel and to lobby on behalf of Israeli interests before their respective governments has proven invaluable to Israel time and time again. White South Africans, lacking the worldwide «family» support so useful to Israel, has encountered considerable difficulty in projecting a favorable image to the governments of many key countries. Rather, it is the Black South Africans who can call for the support of large Black populations in North and South America as well as in sub-Saharan Africa. The growing strength of the Black lobby in the United States is viewed as a growing threat to South Africa. To counter this, as noted above, South Africa has supported a number of public relations schemes in recent years. One may cite the «Time magazine» style journal, *The Point International*, whose initially appointed liberal editors were fired when they failed to remember that their financial support came from the South Africa establishment.

While the government of Israel continues to make statements at the United Nations criticizing apartheid, and from time to time makes seemingly «progressive» offers to the Organization of African Unity, it has become evident, especially in the years after the June War, that both countries are engaged in a process of strengthening their relationship. The role of the South African Jewish Community, as sometime mediator between both countries as well as a major (financial) contributor to Israel, is widely known, but the Israeli diplomatic, commercial, cultural, scientific and military collaboration, which the Israeli government seeks to hide, keeps Israel to a large degree, in diplomatic isolation from Black Africa, and to a lesser degree also from the Arab World (69).

FOOTNOTES

1. Stein, Leonard – *The Balfour Declaration*, Simon & Schuster, New York, 1961, p. 482.
2. Stevens, Richard P. – *Weizmann & Smuts: A Study in Zionist-South African Cooperation*, Institute for Palestine Studies, Beirut, 1975, p. 33.
3. *Ibid*, p. 33.
4. *Ibid*, p. 34.
5. *JTA Bulletin*, May 26, 1926.
6. *The Times* (London), December 20, 1929.
- 6a. Smuts, Jan Christian – «A Great Historic Vow: An Address On British and Jewish Responsibilities in Palestine». *Palestine Papers* # 3, London, 1930, pp. 1, 2, 3, 7.
7. Radio Address by Prime Minister Smuts, November 2, 1941, cited in Stevens, p. 14.
8. Cable from Weizmann to Smuts, cited in Stevens, p. 102.
9. *South African Jewish Chronicle*, May 28, 1949.
10. Israel Mission to the United Nations: *Statement by Mr. Shlomo Hillel in the Special Political Committee, December 9, 1966*.
11. Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations – *Explanation of Vote by H. E. Ambassador Chaim Herzog before the Vote on the Policies of Apartheid, December 14, 1977*.
12. *Rand Daily Mail* (Johannesburg) November 24, 1961. (hereafter R.D.M.)
13. *R.D.M.* November 28, 1961.
14. Brecher, Michael – *The Foreign Policy Systems of Israel*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1972, p. 234.
15. *Ibid*, p. 235.
16. *Ibid*, p. 145.
17. For this chapter, I have relied heavily on the following sources:
Encyclopaedia Judaica, articles on South Africa and Zionism as well as:
 Gitlin, Marcia – *The Vision Amazing: The Story of South African Zionism*, Johannesburg, Menorah Book Club, 1950.
 Mankowitz, Carmela – «South African Immigration – Integration and Yeridah.» Lisk, M., Mizrahi, B. & Ben-David, O. *Olim B'Yisroel* (Immigrants in Israel), Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1969, pp. 809–833.
- 17a. *American Jewish Yearbook 1963*, The American Jewish Committee New York and the Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia, 1963, p. 420.
- 17b. *Ibid*, 1976, p. 504.
- 17c. Katzew, Henry – «Jews in the Land of Apartheid» *Midstream*, Volume 4, December 1962, p. 71.
- 17d. *Ibidem*.
- 17e. *Ibid*, p. 73.
- 17f. Ungar, Andre – «The Abdication of a Community» *Africa-South*, Vol. 3, January – March) 1959, p. 35.
- 17g. *Ibid*, p. 38. For this chapter on the «South African Jewish Community and Apartheid» I have, aside from the above sources, consulted the following articles: Sachs, Bernard, «South Africa: Life on a Volcano: The Jewish Commu-

- nity in a Caste Society» *Commentary*, Vol. IX, (June 1950), pp. 530–537.
Weisbord, R. G., «The Dilemma of South African Jewry», *Journal of Modern Studies*, Vol. 5, # 2 (1967), pp. 233–241, *Jewish Currents*, January 1977, pp. 26–27, *Jewish Currents*, March 1977, p. 47.
18. *R.D.M.*, June 3, 1967.
 19. *R.D.M.*, June 6, 1967.
 20. *The Star*, June 10, 1967.
 21. *R.D.M.*, June 9, 1967.
 22. *R.D.M.*, June 19, 1967.
 23. *R.D.M.*, April 5, 1968.
 24. *Die Burger*, May 29, 1968.
 25. *R.D.M.*, August 1, 1968.
 26. *R.D.M.*, July 17, 1968.
 27. *R.D.M.*, September 9, 1968.
 28. *R.D.M.*, October 28, 1968.
 29. *International Monetary Fund*, Directions of Trade, 1968.
 30. *The Star*, January 3, 1969.
 31. *R.D.M.*, May 22, 1969.
 32. *R.D.M.*, August 12, 1969.
 33. *R.D.M.*, August 20, 1969.
 34. *JTA*, May 6, 1969.
 35. *R.D.M.*, February 16, 1969.
 36. *International Monetary Fund*, Directions of Trade, 1969.
 37. *JTA*, January 20, 1970.
 38. *JTA*, January 21, 1970.
 39. *R.D.M.*, February 19, 1970.
 40. *R.D.M.*, March 21, 1970.
 41. *The Star*, (Johannesburg), October 3, 1970.
 42. *Jewish Affairs*, November, 1970.
 43. *R.D.M.*, March 17, 1970.
 44. *International Monetary Fund*, Directions of Trade, 1970.
 45. *R.D.M.*, August 9, 1971.
 46. *New York Times*, July 5, 1971.
 47. *R.D.M.*, January 22, 1971.
 48. *R.D.M.*, May 3, 1971.
 49. *South African Digest*, (Ministry of Foreign Affairs), May 7, 1971.
 50. *South African Financial Gazette*, May 28, 1971.
 51. *Ibidem*.
 52. *Christian Science Monitor*, June 5, 1971.
 53. *Financial Times*, (London), July 6, 1971.
 54. *R.D.M.*, October 28, 1971.
 55. *R.D.M.*, August 9, 1971.
 56. *New York Times*, April 30, 1971.
 57. *Jewish Chronicle*, (London), May 7, 1971.

58. *R.D.M.*, May 1, 1971.
59. *R.D.M.*, September 11, 1971.
60. *R.D.M.*, March 10, 1972.
61. *The Star*, (Johannesburg), February 26, 1972.
62. *Jewish Chronicle* (London), March 24, 1972.
63. *Sunday Times*, (Johannesburg), May 7, 1972.
64. *Third World Magazine*, Israel and South Africa: Cooperation of Imperialistic Outposts, Bonn, Germany, n.d. p. 43.
65. *R.D.M.*, October 15, 1973.
66. *New York Times*, April 18, 1976.
67. *Jewish Chronicle*, (London), August 2, 1974.
68. Herzl, Theodor – *The Jewish State: An Attempt at a Modern Solution of the Jewish Question*, New York, Scopus Publishing Co. 1943, p. 43.
69. Farley, Deborah H. & Lawrence T. – *Israel & South Africa: Parallels & Linkages*. Oakland University, November 1977. A Paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the Middle East Studies Association, New York, November 9–12, 1977.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abu-Lughod, Ibrahim & Abu-Laban, *Baha-Settler Regimes in Africa and the Arab World: The Illusion of Endurance*, Medina University Press International, Wilmette, 111. 1974.
- Africa Research Group—*David & Goliath Collaborate in Africa*, Cambridge, Mass. 1969.
- American Jewish Year Book*, The American Jewish Committee, New York, and the Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia, Vol XXI, (1919-1920). Vol. LXXVIII (1978).
- Bentwich, Norman – «Jewish Life in South Africa,» *Jewish Social Studies*, January 1942, pp. 73–84.
- Bernstein, Edgar – *The Legacy of General Smuts: Its Significance for South Africa & the World*, Eagle Press, Johannesburg, 1950.
- *South African Jewry*, South African Zionist Youth Council & Merkaz Habonim, Johannesburg, 1944.
- Brecher, Michael – *The Foreign Policy Systems of Israel*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1972.
- Brown, Douglas – *Against the World; A Study of White South African Attitudes*, William Collins Sons, London, 1966.
- Brown, William O. – «Race Consciousness Among South African Natives» *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 40 (1935) pp. 569–81.
- *Race relations in the American South and in South Africa*, Boston University Press, Boston, 1959.
- Buell, Raymond L. «The Race Problem in South Africa» *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 4 (1928) pp. 265–76.
- Bunting, Sonia – «The Prisons of Apartheid» *Africa South*, Vol. 4 (1960) pp.42-48.

- Cervenka, Zdenek, & Rogers, Babara – *The Nuclear Axis: Secret Collaboration Between West Germany and South Africa*, New York Times Books, New York, 1978.
- Dubb, Allie – «Changes in the Ethnic Attitudes of Jewish Youth in Johannesburg» *Jewish Social Studies*, January 1972, pp. 58–72.
- *Jewish South Africans; A Sociological View of the Johannesburg Community*, Institute of Social & Economic Research, Grahamstown, 1977.
- Encyclopedia Judaica*; Articles on South Africa & Zionism.
- Farley, Deborah H. & Lawrence T. – *Israel & South Africa: Parallels & Linkages*. Oakland University, November 1977. A paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the Middle East Studies Association, New York, November 9–12, 1977.
- Flesch, Fritz – *Jews - South Africa, 1960–1966*, (no publisher) Detroit, 1965–66.
- Giniewski, Paul – *The Two Faces of Apartheid*, Regner, Chicago, 1965.
- Gitlin, Marcia – *The Vision Amazing; the Story of South African Zionism*, Menorah Book Club, Johannesburg, 1950.
- Hepple, Alexander – *Verwoerd*, Penguin Books, Inc. Baltimore, 1967.
- Herman, Louis – *A History of the Jews in South Africa from the Earliest Times to 1895*, South African Jewish Board of Deputies, Johannesburg, 1935.
- Holloway, John Edward – *Apartheid: A Challenge*, Afrikaanse Pers-Boekhandel, Johannesburg, 1964.
- Hurley, Denis Eugene – *Apartheid: A Crisis of the Christian Conscience*, South African Institute of Race Relations, Johannesburg, 1964.
- Infeld, Zvi – *Pesach Book, Including Haggadah for the Third Seder for Zionist Societies*, Information & Organization Department of the South African Zionist Federation, 1944.
- *The Jewish State in the Making: Its Institutions & Parties*, Cultural Department of the South African Zionist Federation, Johannesburg, 1946.
- International Defense Review*, Geneva, 1968–1978.
- International Monetary Fund*, Directions of Trade, Washington, 1968, 1969, 1970.
- International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination – *Zionism & Interstate Relations*, Tripoli, 1977.
- Israel Mission to the United Nations – *Statement on Apartheid in the Special Political Committee by Ambassador Arieh Eshel, November 8, 1961*.
- Israel Government Press Bulletin – *Reply by the Prime Minister, Mr. David Ben-Gurion to Motions on the Voting of Israel's Delegation to the United Nations on the Question of South Africa's Apartheid Policy in the Knesset, Monday, November 27, 1961*.
- Israel Mission to the United Nations – *Statement by Mr. Shlomo Hillel in the Special Political Committee, Friday, December 9, 1966*.
- Jacobson, Dan – «The Jews of South Africa; Portrait of a Flourishing Community» *Commentary*, January 1957, pp. 39–45.
- Katzew, Henry – «Jews in the Land of Apartheid» *Midstream*, December 1962, pp. 65–78.
- Keet, B. B. – *The Ethics of Apartheid*, South African Institute of Race Relations, Johannesburg 1957.
- Kuper, Simon Myer – *South African Jewry Today*, South African Jewish Board of Deputies, Johannesburg, 1949.
- Laufer, Leopold – *Israel & the Developing Countries; New Approaches to Cooperation*, the Twentieth Century Fund, New York, 1967.

- Litvinoff, Barnet – *The Letters & Papers of Chaim Weizmann*, Transaction Books, Rutgers University, 1979.
- Madison Area Committee on Southern Africa – *Israel & South Africa*, n.d. Madison, Wisconsin.
- Marmon, L. M. – «Israel & South Africa; The Odd Couple» *Times of Israel*, June 1974, pp. 17 – 20.
- Millin, Sarah Gertrude – *General Smuts*, Faber & Faber, London 1936. (2 volumes).
- Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations – *Explanation of Vote by H. E. Ambassador Herzog Before the Vote on the Policies of Apartheid, December 14, 1977*.
- Rubin, Leslie – «Dialogue; South Africa Jewry & Apartheid» *Africa Report*, Vol. 15 (February 1970) # 2 pp. 22 – 5.
- Scott, Judy Anne Sinclair – *Jan Christiaan Smuts: A Bibliography of Prefaces, Forwards & Introductions by Smuts & Biographical Data About Him*, University of Cape Town, Cape Town 1953.
- Shimoni, Gideon – «Jan Christian Smuts & Zionism» *Jewish Social Studies*, Vol. 39 (Fall 1977) # 4 pp. 269 – 98.
- Smuts, Jan Christiann – *Holism & Evolution*, The Macmillan Company, New York 1926.
 «A Great Historic Vow; An Address on British & Jewish Reponsibilities in Palestine» *Palestine Papers*, # 3 London 1930, pp. 1 – 8.
- South African Jewish Board of Deputies – *The South African Jewish Board of Deputies; The Story of Fifty Years*, Johannesburg, 1953.
 *The South African Jewish Yearbook*.
- South African Jewish Historical Society – *The South African Jewish Yearbook*.
- Stein, Leonard – *The Balfour Declaration*, Simon & Schuster, New York 1961.
- Stevens, Richard P. – «Colonization by Proxy: Two Franchising Ventures of the Home Office» *The Arab World*, March – April 1972.
 *Weizmann & Smuts: A Study in Zionist-South African Cooperation*, Institute for Palestine Studies, Beirut, 1975.
- Tahtinen, Dale R. – *Arab-Israeli Military Status in 1976*, American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, Washington 1976.
 *National Security Challenges to Saudi Arabia*, American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, Washington, 1978.
- Tahtinen, Dale R. & Pranger, Robert J. – *Implications of the 1976 Arab-Israeli Military Status*, American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, Washington 1976.
 *Nuclear Threat in the Middle East*, American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, Washington 1975.
- Ungar, Andre – «Tents of Jacob on a Darkling Plain», *Worldview*, August 1973.
- United States Library of Congress. Division of Bibliography, *Jan Christiaan Smuts: A Bibliographical List*, August 11, 1927 (Select List of References #1032), Washington 1927.
- Van Der Poel, Jean – *Selections from the Smuts Papers*, Cambridge University Press. London 1973, Vols. V, VI & VII.
- Weisbord, R. G. – «The Dilemma of South African Jewry», *Journal of Modern Studies*. Vol. 5 (1967) 2 pp. 233–41.
- Zionist Organization of South Africa – *Futilities of the Revisionist Policy*. Johannesburg 1939.

..... *In Tribute to Dr. Chaim Weizmann on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday, November 27, 1944.*

..... *The Balfour Declaration: Issued in Commemoration of the Tenth Anniversary of the Declaration Made by the British Government on November 2, 1917 in Favor of the Establishment of a National Home for the Jewish People in Palestine, Johannesburg 1927.*

Periodicals & Newspapers Used.

England

Jewish Chronicle

The Times.

Israel

Jerusalem Post

Ma'ariv

New Outlook.

South Africa

Die Burger;

Jewish Affairs;

Perspective

Rand Daily-Mail

South African Digest

South African Financial Gazette

Sunday Times

The Jewish Herald

The South African Jewish Times

The Star

The Zionist Record.

RESUME

Dans cet article l'auteur donne les raisons du rapprochement de plus en plus étroit entre Israël et l'Afrique du Sud depuis 1919. Il analyse successivement la situation de ces deux pays pendant la période 1919-1948, leur relation entre 1948 et 1967, le rôle qu'a joué et que joue encore la communauté juive de l'Afrique du Sud dans ces rapports, ainsi que les rapports de cette communauté avec l'apartheid. Puis l'auteur continue son analyse de l'évolution de ces rapports entre 1967 et 1970, de 1970 à 1972 et en 1973. Cette analyse lui a permis de noter que le rapprochement qui s'est progressivement installé entre ces deux pays était dû à plusieurs raisons de nature différente :

Il y a d'abord des raisons liées à une identité de situation de ces deux pays :

— Ainsi tous deux affirment que leur terre est plus qu'un simple lieu de résidence, qu'elle est aussi et surtout «une terre promise». Aussi parlent-ils de droits historiques.

— A la suite des luttes qu'ils ont menées contre l'impérialisme britannique, Israël et l'Afrique du Sud se considèrent plus comme des nationalistes que comme des colonialistes.

— Ils estiment aussi qu'ils constituent un avant-poste de la civilisation occidentale.

— Ils ont tous l'impression d'être abandonnés et isolés du reste du monde par l'occident.

Au titre des situations différentes mais qui ont un effet de rapprochement entre ces deux pays, l'auteur note que :

— les deux pays ont eu et continuent d'avoir une expérience de la guerre (interne en Afrique du Sud et externe en Israël). Dans les deux cas, la puissance militaire n'a pas l'air de pouvoir résoudre les problèmes.

— qu'étant donné une différence dans l'image que se fait le public à propos de ces deux pays, Israël jouit d'une grande liberté de manœuvre pour résoudre ses problèmes internes que l'Afrique du Sud; mais que par contre l'Afrique du Sud possède une économie moins dépendante, plus forte et plus viable.

— sur le plan purement politique, Israël bénéficie de plus de soutien des lobbies dans les pays occidentaux et des mouvements sionistes solides en Europe, aux Amériques et en Afrique du Sud, tandis que l'Afrique du Sud rencontre énormément de difficultés pour se faire une bonne image auprès des gouvernements des autres pays.

En conclusion, l'auteur fait remarquer que bien que le gouvernement Israélien continue de faire des déclarations à l'O.N.U. et à l'O.U.A. condamnant l'apartheid, il est maintenant clair, surtout après la guerre de Juin, que ces deux pays ont décidé de renforcer leurs liens.