

PAPER DETAILS

TITLE: The Philosophy of Zionism And Its Implications To Africa

AUTHORS: Türkkaya ATAÖV

PAGES: 0-0

ORIGINAL PDF URL: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/38366>

THE PHILOSOPHY OF ZIONISM AND ITS IMPLICATIONS TO AFRICA

Prof. Dr. Türkkaya ATAÖV

Introduction :

All mankind has a stake in the racism practised in some parts of the globe, whether it be South Africa or occupied Palestine. The world is intensifying its efforts to ensure the rapid eradication of racism and racial discrimination. It is now a common consensus that any doctrine of superiority based on racial differentiation is scientifically false, morally condemnable and socially dangerous. Wherever it survives, it is a superstition; there is no justification for it anywhere.

It was in this context that the United Nations General Assembly, in its resolution 3379 (XXX) of November 10, 1975, determined that Zionism was also "a form of racism and racial discrimination".¹ One may take the pronouncement of this supreme organ of the organized international community as a formal expression to the growing recognition of the racist nature of political Zionism.

The declaration made at the Twenty-Seventh World Zionist Congress in 1968, seventy-one years after the launching of the Zionist movement, that Zionism also constituted a "national liberation movement" would have sounded startling even to the early Zionist leaders who considered themselves as colonial settlers. It is the Palestine Liberation Organization (P.L.O.) that possesses the characteristics of a national liberation movement. Zionism, which is alien to Palestine, was founded on force and has similarities with the *apartheid* régime in South Africa.

It is important to note the alliance between the racism of imperialism and that of Zionism. Before it became principally anti-Arab,

¹ The International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, *Zionism and Racism*, London, Billing and Sons, (1979), pp. 249-250.

Zionism was linked with the representatives of the imperialist states. Its designs on Palestine were undertaken in a manner common to European colonial settlements in Africa and elsewhere. The State of Israel could not have been created on Palestinian soil without the role of certain European countries and later of the United States.

Israel, based on the Zionist philosophy, now expounds racist ideas, practices racial discrimination, violates the sovereignty of others and threatens international peace. Across Palestine, Israel applies state-consecrated racism, protected by police and army and principally aimed at the exiled Palestinians as well as the remaining ones.

The Zionist state has also expanded its links with South Africa, the other surviving bastion of settler colonialism and racism. The more the international community isolates racist *apartheid* régime, the more Israel collaborates with it.

This paper aims to show that political Zionism, in theory and in practice, is inseparable from the most aggressive part of imperialism and is therefore, in alliance with reactionary *apartheid* and with all that the latter stands for.

Zionism-A Racist Reaction :

Zionism itself emerged as a racist reaction to Jewish assimilation in Europe. In an attempt to prove that Jews and non-Jews cannot co-exist together, Theodor Harzl² (1860-1904), the founder of the Zionist movement, accused all peoples of the world by propagating the racist view that the non-Jews were "overt or covert anti-Semites". Zionism might have arisen as a response to anti-Semitism, but its founders took from their European surroundings the philosophy of imperialist thought about the non-Western territories. The characteristics of this philosophy has been settlement, territorial expansion, the will to power over other societies and the rationalization of ethnocentrism into racial and juridical doctrines.

Zionism was born not only amidst the European oppression of Jews, but also amongst the European exploitation of the 'coloured' peoples. The Zionist leaders chose to side with the oppressors.³ They asserted Jewish rights in Palestine in a metaphysical language, that went even beyond European imperialism. While the racist philosophy

² Die Judenstaet, Vienna, 1891; ———, Altneuland, Leipsic, 1902.

³ For instance: Richard P. Stevens, ed., Zionism and Palestine before the Mandate, a Phase of Western Imperialism, Beirut, the Institute for Palestine Studies, 1972.

of imperialism aimed at destroying the basic rights of a large part of mankind, Zionist racism aimed particularly at the Palestinians and the Arabs in general. It must be born in mind that the general philosophy underlying the slogans of Zionism, such as "the people chosen by God" and "greater Israel" contain elements of the unscientific thesis based on the so-called inequality of races through which imperialism justifies exploitation of the non-whites. The racist conceptions, adopted by the Zionists, are wholly unscientific. Science has reached the only correct conclusion that all races, equal physically, are capable of creating cultural values. The Zionist conviction that the Jews are "God's chosen people" does not even stem from the desire to "enlighten", but to dominate over, and if possible annihilate, others.

The Zionists also ascribe certain racial priorities to the Jews, lacking in other nations. Some Zionists claim that Jewish culture has been the driving force in the world. It is true that people with Jewish background, but as products of the national cultures of the countries in which they were born, have indeed left creative and lasting works of outstanding human endeavour. To make this statement is far removed from the racist narcissism of Max Nordau, who wrote: "The Jew possesses a greater enterprising spirit and greater abilities than the average European, to say nothing about all these Asians and Africans."⁴

Although research on precedence will indicate that fascists have probably borrowed racist ideas from Zionism, one may liken the exclusivist philosophy of Zionism to the racism of Nazism. There is convincing evidence now that the Zionist leaders have even cooperated with German fascism,⁵ and on occasion aided their war effort, to select young Jews from the concentration camps of Nazi-occupied Europe for settlement in Palestine, leaving the rest at the mercy of the enemies of the Jewish folk.

The Zionists and the Nazis both elevated race above all else. The former also accepted the racialist outlook of the anti-Semites, but concluded that it was the Jew, not the Teuton, that was of "pure" or "superior" race. In the theory and application of Zionism, one finds the same trappings condemned at the Nurnberg trials-the same

⁴ Türkkaya Ataöv, "Zionist Cooperation with the Nazis during the Second World War," *The Baghdad Observer*, October 3-4, 1978; Max Nordau to His People, pp. 73 and 92.

⁵ Faris Yahya, *Zionist Relations with Nazi Germany*, Beirut, Palestine Research Center, 1978.

"*Lebensraum*" theory for the "chosen people" with the camps for the Palestinian refugees and "ghettos" for the Arab population.

World Jewry, however, does not share the views described above. Judaism and Zionism are not the same; moreover, they are incompatible and irreconcilable. And consequently, anti-Zionism is not anti-Semitism. The first opposition to political Zionism was voiced by Jewish spiritual leaders, who insisted that the essence of "Zion" was a spiritual yearning and who countered the territorial priorities and the exclusivist nature of Zionism. The vast majority of Jews resisted the Zionist call to migrate to Israel. But when Jacob de Haan, a former Dutch diplomat of Jewish origin, initiated talks with the Arab leaders to establish a state in Palestine in which the Jews and the Arabs would have equal rights, he was assassinated by the Haganah, the Zionist para-military organization in 1924. Rabbi Judah L. Magnes, the founder of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, had said in 1929: "One of the greatest cultural duties of the Jewish people is the attempt to enter the Promised Land, not by means of conquest as Joshua, but through peaceful and cultural means, through hard work, sacrifice, love and with a decision not to do anything which cannot be justified before the world conscience."⁶

Colonial Settlement :

In the age of colonialism, the Europeans considered the non-European lands vacant, indigenous cultures inferior and foreign settlements permanent. The desire to stay on indigenous land on a permanent basis, brutality and discrimination against the original owners are the distinguishing features of settler colonialism.

George Jabbour⁷ made an attempt at relating basic facts in a way as to discern through them a pattern of behaviour existing in colonialism in Southern Africa and the Middle East. He assumed a pattern of behaviour identical in general lines exhibited by those European settlers who have formed political entities in non-European lands.

Israel's reserved attitude towards African independence movements, its stand on *apartheid* at the United Nations, its developing

⁶ H.J. Skutel, "Zionism and Nazism: Conceiving the Inconceivable," *Middle East Perspective*, New York, Vol. XIII, No. 11 (March 1981), p. 2.

⁷ *Settler Colonialism in Southern Africa and the Middle East*, Khartoum and Beirut, the University of Khartoum and the Palestine Liberation Organization Research Center, 1970.

relations with the settler régime in South Africa and its own neo-colonialist policy in respect to this continent will be easier to comprehend once it is established that the question in Palestine and in South Africa is basically one of colonial settlement.

The drive for profit, the assertion of racial inequality and the desire to further national interests were behind the dominant theme of the "white man's burden". Recent re-writings of African history, free from European distortions, show that the culture of that continent was well advanced prior to European expansion. And close scrutiny lays bare the fact that Palestine was usurped in ways more than one: not only the land, with all its natural resources, but also its culture was subject to theft.⁸

In both cases, the principal actors were foreign settlers, a number of imperial governments aiding them and the indigenous people. But they were the first two who decided on the issues, the last mentioned were only the recipients. And in both cases, the resistance of the indigenous peoples against the foreign settlers, though not successful at the beginning, continues.

In Southern Africa, as the natives were fast reduced to subjugation, driven back and denied the rights that they had inherited, the continent was opened to slave trade, economic exploitation and cultural oppression. Likewise, all important decisions concerning the life of the Palestinians, such as the Balfour Declaration (1917), the Mandate (1920-1948), accelerated Jewish immigration, the Partition (1947) and the Camp David Framework (1978) were taken without the participation of the Palestinians, the people directly concerned.

Religion played a role, in varying degrees, in both cases. There was speculation linking Southern Rhodesia to the religious book of Christianity. Some thought of the African land as the Ophir of the Bible. Similarly, the Zionists developed a myth concerning Palestine. But up to the First Zionist Congress, which met in Basel in 1897, there was no definite Zionist commitment to that land. There had been a number of projects involving the foundation of a Jewish colony in the island of Curacao, off the Venezuelan coast (1652); in Surinam, then (1654) a British colony; in Cayenne, a grant of the French East India Company (1659); in Argentina (1891); in Cyrenaica (Libya); in Cyprus (1902); in Sinai (1902); in Kenya (1903); and finally, in

⁸ Türkkaya Ataöv, "The Independent Personality of the Palestinians Through Their Arts," *The Baghdad Observer*, April 15-May 6, 1980 (Supplement).

Mozambique and Angola. Even in the Seventh Zionist Congress, which again met in Basel in 1905, there was a splinter of Zionists who advocated the acceptance of the East Africa offer.

Just as Tsarist Russia served its own interests by posing as the protector of the Christian Orthodox communities in the Ottoman Empire and the French were motivated by the same in respect to the Catholics, Britain's strategic and commercial interests led her to champion the cause of the Zionist Jews. While imperial Britain allied itself with Zionism, Palestine was being chosen for the settlement of the Zionist Jews, who interpreted the Bible as having promised them the land of Palestine.

The penetration into Southern Africa and into Palestine might vary in some detail, but both were the results of imperial scheme. If the charter given to the British South Africa Company had conferred a "legal" title to the whites to install themselves on other's land, the intentionally vague Balfour Declaration⁹ was the first major instrument utilized by the Zionists. In both cases, the documents referred to signified imperial backing to the new settlers.

Just like Cecil Rhodes in Africa, Theodor Herzl also sought charters for trading and colonizing companies. The former's British South Africa Company was a dazzling success that carried the imagination of the Zionist leader. Rhodes died in 1902 and Herzl, two years later; the two never met. Herzl, however, addressed a letter¹⁰ to Rhodes on July 11, 1902, in which he described the British colonialist as the "only one" who could help him. Herzl explained that he was turning to Rhodes, since his project was "something colonial". He wanted Rhodes "to put the stamp" of his authority on the Zionist plan. Herzl deplored that they did not manage to get together, his helpers in England having proved a failure.

The Balfour Declaration, actually a letter from the British Foreign Secretary to Lord Rothschild, was issued when the Europeans had divided the Ottoman Empire in secret agreements in a style reminiscent of scramble for Africa at the Berlin Congress (1884). When it was issued, the British did not even control Palestine. But a Jewish Colonization Association was already founded in Britain in 1891.

⁹ Compare: Leonard J. Stein, "The Balfour Declaration," *Israel Pocket Library: History from 1880*, Jerusalem, Keter Publishing House, 1973, pp. 38-43; J. M. N. Jeffries, *The Balfour Declaration*, Beirut, the Institute for Palestine Studies, 1967.

¹⁰ Jabbour, *op. cit.*, pp. 34-36.

When the white settlers in South Africa held the reigns of government in their hands and the decision-makers of the British Mandate in Palestine were themselves vehement Zionists, the indigenous peoples were barred from governmental machinery in both cases. While the white settlers in Southern Africa contemplated the exploitation of the natives, the Zionists wanted to remove the Palestinians from their land altogether. The Zionist slogan that "Palestine is Jewish, as England is English and France, French" is not a fact, but the expression of an intention. The Palestine question is actually the destruction of the native Palestinian Arabs, Moslem or Christian, and its replacement by transplanted Zionist Jews and a foreign political body. The process of destroying the indigenous Palestinian community and replacing it by an alien Zionist society has all the essential earmarks of classical colonialism.

Some twenty years after the rise of Zionism, when it succeeded in securing conditional British support in the Balfour Declaration, the native Jews and the new Jewish immigrants constituted 8 percent of the population, owning less than 2.5 percent of the total land. Even when Israel was established in 1948, after thirty years of British control, the Jews constituted only a third of the population and owned about 6 percent of the land-despite organized mass immigration and land acquisition. And consequently, about four decades before struggles of national liberation became popular in Africa, the Palestinian people had rebelled (in 1920, 1921, 1929, 1931, 1935 and 1936-1937) against both British rule and the Zionist program.

As the first British census (1922) shows, about 75 percent of the Jews were concentrated in the urban areas of Jaffa and Jerusalem, thereby refuting the Zionist claim that "Jewish farmers were tilling the ancient soil".¹¹

The Mandate was drafted to accommodate the Zionist objectives. The administration being studded with Zionists (Jewish or non-Jewish) or sympathizers, the new Immigration Ordinance (July 1921), the Land Transfer Ordinance (September 1921), the new system of settlement of land-titles, and grants to Jewish companies of concessions over state lands and natural resources were all designed to make it easier, less costly or faster for the Zionists to acquire land.¹²

¹¹ Janet L. Abu-Lughod, "The Demographic Transformation of Palestine," *The Transformation of Palestine: Essays on the Origin and Development of the Arab-Israeli Conflict*, Evanston, Illinois, 1971, p. 142.

¹² Sami Hadawi and Walter Lehn, "Zionism and the Lands of Palestine." *Zionism and Racism*, op. cit., pp. 59-77.

The Jewish National Fund was allowed to buy land, hold it in perpetuity and prohibit its leasing to non-Jews. The Palestine Foundation Fund prohibited the Jewish settler to hire non-Jewish worker. And the *Histadrut* (the General Federation of Jewish Labour), prevented, at that time, the Arab workers from joining the union. If Jewish ownership of land, in spite of such facilities provided under the Mandate, could reach a bare 6 percent, instead of being much higher, the most significant reasons were probably growing Palestinian resistance and Arab unwillingness to sell their land.

Conquest of Land :

Colonial settlement in Southern Africa and in Palestine required land. In both cases, the settlers systematically tried to acquire land to enable them to secure the material basis of their state. And in both cases, the indigenous people were pushed aside. The use of brutal force¹³ is a second nature to the settlers. The massacres at Deir Yasin or Sharpeville illustrate this point.

South Africa and Israel claim to be democratic, just because there is an executive responsible to the legislature, elected by eligible voters. It is well-known, however, that certain rights in South Africa are the privileges of the white settlers only. South Africa is a state adapted to secure the supremacy of the white minority, based on racial discrimination, economic exploitation and police terror.¹⁴ The State of Israel, which the Zionist leaders proclaimed as their own creation, is meant to be for the Jews. The Partition recommendation had assigned 56 percent of the area of Palestine. This gross injustice certainly led to armed conflict. When it subsided in 1949, however, the new State of Israel emerged controlling 77 percent of former Palestine. In 1956, Israel invaded Egypt, and with the *blitzkrieg* of 1967, occupied territories of Egypt, Syria and Jordan.

Just as the settlers, government in Southern Africa tried to set up "Bantustans" for the non-whites, the Zionists preached and Israel implemented the expulsion of non-Jews from their ancestral home in Palestine. The Jewish "surplus" in Europe was meant to possess the land of Palestine *without* its indigenous inhabitants.

The settler colonialism of Zionism consists in usurpation of the land, settlement of an alien people and the transfer of the original

¹³ For instance : Bassam Bishuti, *The Role of the Zionist Terror in the Creation of Israel*, Beirut, Palestine Research Center, 1969.

¹⁴ Türkaya Ataöv, *The Case in South Africa*, London, EAFORD, (1980).

owners. There is no fundamental change in these facts from one Zionist Congress to another. The Twenty-Third World Zionist Congress, for instance, set down the contemporary aims of Zionism as follows: to promote the strengthening of Israel, to gather into Palestine the Jews "living in exile", to solidify the Jewish people. As in the years prior to 1948, the World Zionist Organization (WZO) heads the Zionist movement. In Israel, the WZO and the Jewish Agency are two organizations combined into one or one organization operating under two signboards: one in Israel and the other in the "*Diaspora*". In Israel, both engage in the colonization and development of the Jewish state, supervise the settlement and employment of immigrants and coordinate the activities of various Zionist and Jewish agencies. And abroad, the WZO pursues the objective of securing mass immigration and strengthening Israel. The WZO Executive, which is also the Executive of the Jewish Agency, with headquarters both in Jerusalem and New York,¹⁵ operates on the basis of full cooperation with Israel. The WZO looks like a consortium consisting of the Israeli ruling elite (with seats in Israel) and of American Zionists (who direct the organization from New York). The broad powers of the WZO are recorded in a covenant signed between the Israeli Government and the WZO Executive in 1954. The Covenant stipulates that the Executive shall function in accordance with Israeli laws. But it binds the Israeli Government to inform the Executive of every draft law in respect to its functions before the draft is submitted to the Knesset.

In this context it is not surprising that the Arabs are described as "a cancer in the body of the nation".¹⁶ It is not also unexpected that the same discriminating attitude may be observed in the treatment of some Israeli citizens who are Jewish. The Knesset passed a law in March 1970, under which an Israeli citizen could be legally considered a Jew only if his mother was Jewish or if he adopted Judaism. This may be taken as a legal enforcement of a racist principle classifying Israelis into "pure" and "non-pure" categories. The 1970 Law brings back to memory Hitler's racial passports, showing the holder's "purity" of blood. However, although the law was adopted at a later date, the principle had been alive almost since the creation of Israel. It is also common knowledge now that the

¹⁵ Rabbi Dr. Elmer Berger, *The Structure of the Zionist Movement in the United States*, London. EAFORD, (1981).

¹⁶ Description by Israeli Major General Avigdor Ben-Gal, quoted in Skutel, *op. cit.*, p. 2.

white European Jews are discriminating against the Oriental and Black Jews.¹⁷

The racist-militarist set-up is mainly directed against the Arabs, who are regarded as an obstacle to the Zionist plans of exclusivism and expansion. The Zionists try to seize territories "cleansed" of the original inhabitants. Israel Shahak, the founder of the Israeli League for Human and Civil Rights,¹⁸ pointed out that Zionism was "worse than the apartheid régime"¹⁹ in South Africa. The latter had divided the country and had forbidden the Blacks to buy land in the 'white' area. Zionism, on the other hand, wanted to save as much land as it could without any limit at all, in all areas of the 'land of Israel', and it turned the land it 'saved' into one big *apartheid* area, in which human beings who were born from non-Jewish mothers had no right to live.

Initially, there was the outright denial of the existence of Palestinians. It is rather well-known now that early Zionist literature refers to Palestine as a land without a people, which ought to be given to a people without a land. Israel's former Premier Golda Meir, in an interview in London, reiterated the same theme that the Palestinians "did not exist".²⁰ Vladimir Jabotinsky had urged that the treatment inflicted by European colonization in "backward lands" be applied in Palestine.²¹

For the Palestinians this means a terrorist régime, a consequence of which is the control and manipulation of the Jewish majority. There is a state-organized drive to deepen terror in an expanding state.²² Israeli expansion calls to mind the Nazi quest for *Lebensraum*. General Moshe Dayan had given expression to expansionism when he said the following after the Six-Day War:

"Our fathers had reached the frontiers which were recognized in the Partition Plan. Our generation reached the frontiers of 1949. Now the six-day generation has managed to reach Suez, Jordan and the Golan Heights. That

¹⁷ Türkaya Ataöv, "Human Rights and the Palestinians," paper submitted to the International Conference on Human Rights, Istanbul, March 1979.

¹⁸ Israeli League for Human and Civil Rights: *the Shahak Papers*, Adnan Amad, ed., Beirut, Palestine Research Center, 1973.

¹⁹ Rabbi Elmer Berger's Report No. 25, December 1975 - January 1976, p. 17.

²⁰ *Sunday Times*, June 15, 1969.

²¹ Hans Kohn, *Reflections on Modern History*, New York, 1963, p. 192.

²² For instance; Khalid Kishtainy, *Whither Israel? A Study of Zionist Expansionism*, Beirut, P.L.O. Research Center, 1970; Ass'ad Razzouk, *Greater Israel*, Beirut, P.L.O. Research Center, 1970.

is not the end. After the present cease-fire lines, there will be new ones. They will extend beyond Jordan - perhaps to Lebanon and perhaps to central Syria as well."²³

George J. Tomeh provides a concise résumé²⁴ of the plans of the Twenty-Eighth Zionist Congress to encourage immigration and enhance the settlements in the occupied territories. Israel's recent bombing of the Iraqi nuclear reactor, built to serve peaceful purposes and internationally controlled, is a new manifestation of the Zionist entity's desire to keep the developing Arab people from achieving progress and taking its due share from contemporary scientific innovations.

State Terrorism :

Palestinian resistance is the reaction to state terrorism of Israel.²⁵ If contemporary Europeans are not blowing up any bridges, as they used to do during the Second World War, it is because they are free now. But as the recent Camp David talks have again demonstrated, the Palestinians are being ignored in any settlement of the dispute. Abuses by Israel with respect to the inhabitants' rights in the occupied areas include illegal Israeli settlements, the forceful resettlement of the Gaza population and the barring of Palestinians' return to their own lands.

Even the Balfour Declaration had stated that nothing was to be done which might prejudice "the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine". These values are now additionally protected by the United Nations Charter and the 1949 Geneva Convention. The last mentioned states (in Art. 49) that "the occupying power shall not deport or transfer parts of its civilian population into the territory it occupies".

The right of return is specifically recognized in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (Art. 13), the International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights (Art. 12) and the Racial Discrimination Convention (Art. 5). But the Israeli Supreme Court has rejected this right for the Palestinians (in *Abu El-Tin v. Minister of Defence et al.*). Despite international law to the contrary, official Israeli policy has

²³ Alfred M. Lilienthal, *The Zionist Connection: What Price Peace?* New York, Dodd, Mead and Co., 1978, p. 142.

²⁴ *Immigration of Mobilization?* Beirut, Palestine Research Center, 1973.

²⁵ For instance: James P. Terry, "State Terrorism: A Juridical Examination," *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Beirut, Vol. X, No. 1 (Autumn 1980), pp. 94-117.

been to deport and resettle involuntarily the population of Gaza. The Defense Emergency Regulations of 1945 (Art. 125) allows the Israeli Government to declare an area "closed" for security reasons. It does not, however, define "security", and its application is left to the Israeli military governor in each region. "The Abandoned Property of Private Individuals Order" is implemented to acquire for Israel the lands of Palestinians displaced in 1967. The Order defines as "abandoned property" any property the legal owner who left the region, for any reason, on or before June 7, 1967 "or subsequent thereto". The International Commission of Jurists agrees that these laws are being utilized by Israel to acquire land illegally.

The Israelis now require that most of the water needs of the Palestinians be satisfied from Israeli sources. In fact, Israel's settlement policy and the expropriation of Palestine water are linked with the water shortage in this land. Israel wants to continue its control over the water resources. Israel's use of West Bank waters, for instance, is a clear and gross violation of the Fourth Geneva Convention (1949).²⁶ The collective penalties, administrative detention and expulsion are methods of suppressing resistance to such illegitimate policies.

It should be pointed out, in this connection, that state-organized terror, as the one seen in Israel, not only transforms the society, but also the individual, human nature itself.

Relations with the Apartheid Régime :

The alliance of the white racists of South Africa and the Zionists of Israel, who cooperate in the implementation of their common policy of racial discrimination and neo-colonial expansion in Africa, is particularly dangerous. Even before the establishment of Israel, attempts for a Zionist presence in Africa had been laid down. There was a deep personal relationship between C. Weizmann, who was to become Israel's first President, and General J. C. Smuts of South Africa.²⁷ The latter was one of the architects of the Balfour Declaration. The Nationalist-Labour coalition of General J.B.M. Hertzog

²⁶ Türkaya Ataöv, "The Use of Palestinian Waters and International Law," prepared for the Third Regional Seminar on the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, Colombo, Sri Lanka, 10-14 August 1981.

²⁷ Richard P. Stevens describes this relationship: *Weizmann and Smuts: A Study in Zionist-South African Cooperation*, Beirut, the Institute for Palestine Studies, 1975.

adopted as early as 1926 a resolution in support of a "Jewish homeland" in Palestine. South Africa supported Zionist aims in the League of Nations and the United Nations. The Nationalist Party recognized Israel as it came to power in 1948. Dr. D. F. Malan, who was the first Prime Minister in the British Commonwealth to visit the new state, permitted South African reserve officers of Jewish origin to serve in Israel.²⁸ Some of the South African Jews, who had emigrated to Israel, occupied prominent positions there. The South African Jewish community had always been strongly Zionist. Responsive to Dr. Malan's pro-Israeli policy, the South African Jews reduced their criticism of racial discrimination. The Jewish press in South Africa was silent even on the Sharpeville massacre (1960).

For a number of years, the United Nations Organization, especially its General Assembly, and world public opinion have been expressing concern over the intensification of political, economic, military and other relations between the Zionist entity and the *apartheid* régime in South Africa. Relations between the two acquired new dimensions after the 1967 war and even more after the 1973 war. The last-mentioned was a milestone in the process of growing relations between the two governments. Most African states broke relations with Israel, ending the Zionists' need to maintain a pretence of opposition to *apartheid*.

Israel and South Africa have rapidly moved towards each other. Politically, collaboration between the two aimed at driving a wedge, on the one hand, amongst the Africans themselves and, on the other, between them and the Arabs as well as linking South Africa and the Middle East as common strategic concerns. Economically, Israel has access to important raw materials, and while South Africa uses Israel for evading the international boycott, it circumvents high Common Market tariffs and also benefits from a favourable balance of trade with that country. Trade relations between the two were established after the creation of Israel, but a major boost was given after the 1976 agreement. Dr. Vorster's visit brought forth a wide-ranging agreement, received by both as a question of survival. Especially since 1975, South Africa and Israel have been developing closer ties

²⁸ For South African Jews, see: Gustav Saron and Louis Hotz, *The Jews in South Africa*, Cape Town, London, and New York, Oxford University Press, 1955; Henry Katzew, "Jews in the Land of Apartheid," *Midstream*, Vol. VIII (December 1962); Leslie Rubin, "Afrikaner Nationalism and the Jews," *Africa South*, Vol. I, No. 3 (April-June 1957).

in science and technology. This collaboration extends to agriculture, water resources management, construction, electronics, chemicals and fertilizers. Militarily, both benefit from an additional source of arms and technological know-how. South Africa sent volunteers, pilots, food and medical supplies and relaxed controls on the transfer of funds, in support of the Zionist war efforts. Israel has been aiding South Africa in military equipment, sophisticated weapons and counter-insurgency techniques. Their cooperation in the field of nuclear weapons is most hazardous of all. Culturally, of course, several activities help to promote closer ideological identification between the two.

Conclusion :

The Zionist enclave erected on the Arab Palestinian soil is a settler-colonial scheme, supported by some Western states to help solve their economic and strategic interests in the area. The Zionist presentation of the conflict as a clash between the opposing Jewish and Arab nationalist movements is misleading. Such an identification, which acquaints Israel with a small but gallant David dueling (with God's help) with the mighty Arab Goliath, is groundless. The conflict is a clash between two qualitatively different forces. The basic character of Zionism is racist. Aid to *apartheid* and Zionism is meant to sustain these two bases to keep Africa and the Middle East within the imperialist orbit. These two military-political bases are decidedly anti-Africa. The injustices committed by Zionist racism must be redressed by the return of the Palestinians and their exercise of their inalienable rights to self-determination. The proclaimed goal of the Palestine Liberation Organization, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, is the creation of a pluralistic society of free and equal Moslems, Christians and Jews.