

ISRAEL AND SOUTH AFRICA
Ideology and Practice
by Alfred T. Moleah



**THE INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION
FOR THE ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF
RACIAL DISCRIMINATION
(EAFORD)**

© 1979 The International Organization
for the Elimination of All Forms of
Racial Discrimination (EAFORD).

First published in 1979.
Second printing in 1987.

ISSN 0259-2878
Printed in U.S.A.

The International Organization for the Elimination
of All Forms of Racial Discrimination
(EAFORD)

EAFORD
International Secretariat
41 rue de Zürich
1201 Geneva (CH)

EAFORD (USA)
Suite #1020
2025 Eye Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

ISRAEL AND SOUTH AFRICA

Ideology and Practice

by

Alfred T. Moleah*

Southern Africa and the Middle East remain the two most serious concerns for the world today. They remain so because they represent the most potent threats to world peace. These two regions have a lot in common: The Middle East is the main source of oil today—a commodity that is now basic to our everyday existence. Without oil, what we commonly accept as our civilization today is simply unthinkable. Southern Africa is a main source of strategic minerals, such as manganese, cobalt, chromium, platinum, asbestos, fluorine, antimony, vanadium and copper, not to mention gold and diamonds. Strategic minerals are equally now basic to our everyday existence—still equally, without strategic minerals our civilization, as we know it and live it, would be unthinkable. Mere existence of essential commodities does not and should not constitute a crisis; it should, in fact, be a blessing. The Middle East and southern Africa represent a crisis for quite different reasons. Put quite simply, the central factors of this crisis are racism and human rights. In this tragic human drama are two actors: South Africa and Israel. Put differently, the state ideologies of South Africa and Israel constitute the crisis that the world faces today; they are a threat to world peace—a threat to humanity.

Israel, as a Zionist entity, and South Africa, as an *apartheid* entity, constitute this threat. This is not an issue of government policy; it is much more fundamental and basic. The Zionist entity and the *apartheid* entity are an idea—an idea that has become a material force. They are an idea that is racist, an idea that is anti-human. They are an idea that does not require and, therefore, does not seek any outside justification. The idea itself is the justification. They are an idea whose realization and affirmation is a negation and refutation of all else.

Zionism/*apartheid*, to its adherents, is a transcendent idea—the unfolding of a divine scheme. The Zionist Jews and *apartheid* Afrikaners, according to their own lights, are a chosen people—the elect of God to fulfill a divine mission. They are, therefore, unanswerable to no one and, in accordance with a divine injunction, are totally uninhibited

*Dr Alfred Moleah is Associate Professor, Temple University, Philadelphia USA; member of EAFORD Executive Council and Chairman of EAFORD (USA). This paper was delivered at the *Symposium on Racism* organised in Athens, 29-30 November 1979, by EAFORD's Greek branch.

by any and all considerations. For the world at large and for all humanity, this is dangerous in the extreme. The antecedent of the dimensions of this kind of danger was Hitlerite Nazism.

Therefore, the increasingly close relations between Israel and South Africa are not an issue of just ordinary concern. It is the coming together of two strands of the same idea, whose implications and consequences are fatal. In this relationship, the world is faced with a danger much greater than it faced from Nazism. This is so because the growing relations between Israel and South Africa are not the ordinary state relations based on pragmatic national needs and self-interest; they are the manifestation of a shared ideology, a common worldview. Both Israel and South Africa feel that they have a religious calling; both see themselves as Western outposts in a sea of barbarism. They both see their states and their political programs as the unfolding of a divine drama—the work of a higher authority and themselves as mere agents of this divine will.

The Afrikaner claim has always been rather tenuous. Their doctrine of election grows out of an assertion derived from an Old Testament analogue. Their fundamentalist Calvinism allows them to see a parallel, if not an identity, between themselves and the ancient children of Israel. To them, God is the architect of all history, and imbues it with ultimate meaning. The Afrikaners' settlement in South Africa was divinely ordained, and their survival and triumph is a miracle. Malan, the prime minister when the Afrikaners finally gained unfettered political power, best expressed this position when he observed:

Our history is the greatest masterpiece of the centuries. We hold this nation as our due for it was given us by the Architect of the Universe. His aim was the formation of a new nation among the nations of the world . . . The last hundred years have witnessed a miracle behind which must lie a divine plan. Indeed, the history of the Afrikaner reveals a will and a determination which makes one feel that Afrikanerdom is not the work of men but the creation of God.¹

The same Malan had also observed:

It is through the will of God that the Afrikaner People exists at all. In his wisdom he determined that on the southern point of Africa, the dark continent, a People should be born who would be the bearer of Christian culture and civilization. In his wisdom He surrounded this People by great dangers. He set the People down upon unfruitful soil so that they had to toil and sweat to exist upon the soil. From time to time he visited them with droughts and other plagues.

But this was only one of the problems. God also willed that the Afrikaans People should be continually threatened by other Peoples. There was the ferocious barbarian who resisted the intruding Christian civilization and caused the Afrikaner's blood to flow in streams. There were times when as a result of this the Afrikaner

was deeply despairing, but God at the same time prevented the swamping of the young Afrikaner People in the sea of barbarianism.²

The Zionists have less of a problem in this claim. Jewish religious tradition has a rich vocabulary referring to the Jewish people variously as the Chosen People, the Holy People, the Spiritual People—a people set apart from the rest of mankind by having a special relationship with a transcendent God. This claim derives from the Bible which, as a Holy Book, is linked in a supernatural way with the people of Israel who produced it, and with the land of Israel which nurtured it. This then leads to a super-rational relationship between the Land of Israel and the Tribes of Israel. The land, as the fulfillment of a promise in the Covenant to the Tribes of Israel, is a holy possession of the Jews. Their claim is eternal and sacred, and they cannot be divested of their rights. The establishment of the state of Israel in 1948 was, therefore, a re-establishment—a fulfillment of the prophecy of restoration, a vindication of the prophetic vision of the Bible. Israel is, therefore, unique and miraculous.³

Having endowed a peoplehood with sanctity, it becomes incumbent to ensure the purity of that peoplehood since this peoplehood is unique and special. In South Africa, the question of who is white, especially Afrikaner, is crucial. Elaborate laws exist to thwart any infiltration by the impure—the non-elect. In Israel, the question of who is a Jew is even more crucial; thus the determination of who is a Jew is rigid and most serious. This determination is, however, not based on color, but on "Jewish nationality." As with whiteness in South Africa, Jewishness in Israel, as a Jewish state, confers status, rights and privileges. Conversely, those not so blessed—the non-elect—are considered beyond the pale of humanity. As such, normal human considerations and compunctions do not apply to them. This problem is, in fact, simply obviated by the denial of the existence of such "non-elect." Former Israeli Prime Minister Levi Eshkol could ask: "What are the Palestinians?" Another Israeli prime minister, Golda Meir, could state: "There is no such thing as Palestinians. . . . They did not exist."⁴ South Africa equally denies the existence of the peoplehood of the South African blacks—in fact, denies their Africanness by appropriating this African-ness for themselves in the Dutch term, Afrikaner. These historical claims are based on primacy. One such manifestation of this denial is to refer to those others by a negative; e.g., non-Europeans and non-whites in South Africa and non-Jews in Israel.

The Afrikaner claim to election is palpably false. This falsity is even evidenced by the inconsistency of the claim which, though focusing on the Afrikaner, somehow includes the English, Italians, Jews and other Europeans, and as well by the tentativeness and conjectural nature of the claim. That of the Zionists is equally false, but it rests on

a different kind of falsity.

Political Zionism claims to be a nationalist movement and masquerades in religious garb. It freely uses religious symbols and forms for its purposes. This charge equally applies to Religious Zionist apologetics, as is so well brought forth by Dr. Elmessiri:

One can detect the falseness of Religious Zionist apologetics by comparing them with genuine religious doctrine. The cardinal trait of religious conviction, in contrast with other human ideologies or creeds, is the concept of transcendence, based not on emotional experience but rather on a firm belief in something beyond nature and matter. Love of Zion is an excellent example of a Jewish religious concept suffused with this sense of transcendence; it sets the land of Palestine, or *Eretz Yisrael*, apart from the rest of the world as a holy land, God's own. Consequently, the concrete history of the peoples actually living there is rightly and legitimately overlooked. Zion is thus an ideal, and the believer is urged to develop a pious attachment to it. Such belief imbues him with the spiritual strength, particularly in this age of increasing materialism and positivism, to transcend his surroundings and to establish a link with the ideal. Dwelling in the land was indeed considered a *mitzva*, a good deed in the religious sense. Throughout history many religious Jews have gone to dwell in the Holy Land. Viewed in this light, love of Zion is not radically different from the attachment that the followers of many religions have for their respective 'holy places'—their 'Zions,' so to speak.⁵

Even the special relation between God and the Children of Israel, so abundant in the Old Testament, has been cynically transmuted. The idea of chosenness as regards Jewish people in Judaism is a religious one signifying a community of true believers who put faith in One True God, and whose membership in that community is conditional on their obeying God's commands. Zionist leaders reject this, except in its totally prostituted form. For instance, Micah Berdichevsky, the Russian Zionist writer, declared emphatically that the Jews should "cease to be Jews by virtue of an abstract Judaism and become Jews in their own right, as a living and developing nationality."⁶ Max Nordau, the Zionist leader and close friend of Herzl, declared that "we do not want to be a mere religious community; we want to be a nation like other nations."⁷ But these same Zionist leaders had no qualms whatsoever of investing a secular phenomenon with a religious idiom. The sanctity attached to the Jewish people in the religious sense is transferred to the Jewish people in the ethnic sense and, accordingly, to the people's history, to their land and, finally and more importantly, to their state. A Jew, therefore, can only attest to his/her Jewishness by being a nationalist; i.e., an unwavering and uncritical supporter of the state of Israel. The Lord and the Volk have become identical.

When religion is transmuted into the political, you have the worship of the state or the worship of collective human power. This is very much the case in South Africa, as was attested to by an editorial

in a ruling party paper, *Die Vaderland*: "There is a higher law before which we must bow, namely, the security of the state," and an Afrikaner member of Parliament, S.M. Loubner, responding to the opposition's insistence on respecting the Constitution: "The United Party comes and whines 'the Constitution.' Anyone would think that the Constitution was of greater importance to them than the maintenance of white civilization in our country."⁸ The same is the case in Israel. This religio-national pantheism made it possible for Vladimir Jabotinsky, the mentor of Menachem Begin, to speak of himself as "one of the masons building a new temple for my God—whose name is Jewish people,"⁹ and for General Ariel Sharon to declare, "The first and the most supreme value is the good of the State. The State is the supreme value,"¹⁰ and stated that "a Jewish nationalist, no matter how secularist his intention may be, must, despite himself, affirm the divine."¹¹

This transmutation of the religious into the political is a most dangerous attitude in a settler-colonialist set up, with all its attendant problems, as Arnold Toynbee so rightly observes:

The prevalence of this worship of collective human power is a calamity. It is a bad religion because it is the worship of a false god. It is a form of idolatry which has led its adherents to commit innumerable crimes and follies. Unhappily, the prevalence of this idolatrous religion is one of the tragic facts of contemporary life.¹²

This is especially so in the case of Zionist-Israelists, who have tremendous worldwide power and influence, are literally immune from any criticism and, with the ever prevalent charge of anti-Semitism, are able to whip everybody into line. This is indeed ominous. This is the context of Israel-South Africa relations.

As was so insightfully chronicled by Dr. Richard P. Stevens, Smuts and Weizman immediately recognized their similarity and fully appreciated this commonality. They laid the groundwork for the dangerous relationship.¹³ The similarities between Israel and South Africa are basic and fundamental and, therefore, totally unaffected by the vicissitudes of politics in both countries. Changes of government and political alignments and realignments have no bearing on this commonality of position and interest. Both Israel and South Africa are settler-colonial entities—both have expropriated the lands of other peoples; both see themselves as fulfilling a divine mission and are, therefore, supra-rational and supra-natural; both practice, as policy, harsh and extreme discrimination, on the basis of the superiority and purity of their race, against the dispossessed indigenous peoples. And because of these and more, both are beleaguered and garrison states.

After Hertzog, then a political enemy of Smuts, formed his Nationalist Labor Parties coalition government, he fully supported the crea-

tion of a "Jewish Homeland" in Palestine and adopted a resolution to that effect in 1926. The resolution also promised to support the Zionist aims before the League of Nations. The same year and month that the state of Israel was declared, the Afrikaners gained political power in South Africa under the leadership of Dr. D.F. Malan, a political enemy of both Smuts and Hertzog, who became prime minister and the architect of *apartheid*. Malan fully understood the meaning and significance of the declaration of Israeli statehood and quickly offered *de jure* recognition of the new state. Malan also became the first prime minister in the British Commonwealth to pay a courtesy visit to Israel. The symbolism of this visit was important. Malan permitted South African Jewish reserve officers to serve in Israel and approved transfer of funds and goods to Israel, despite South Africa's financial difficulties at the time. The now ruling National Party also reversed its policy towards the Jewish community, which had hitherto been one of rabid anti-Semitism. Jews were now allowed into the National Party, and prominent Jews were appointed to important governmental positions.¹⁴

The South African Jewish community serves as an important link between the two countries. The South African Jewish community is a very well organized community. It is chiefly organized under the South African Zionist Federation and the South African Board of Jewish Deputies, and these two encompass a host of allied organizations. Because of this, it is the most Zionist Jewish community in the world. South African Jews established themselves as a financial power by the end of the last century, are overwhelmingly Lithuanian, and by 1945 constituted the wealthiest Jewish community in the world on a per capita basis. They are also the highest per capita contributors to the state of Israel in the world, and their pace of *aliyah* has been at least five times greater than in the United States. Their number is only about one hundred and twenty thousand, but due to superior Zionist organization, they are quite cohesive and, therefore, powerful. They have organized chapters of Christian Action for Israel among white and black "Gentile Zionist" groups, as well as record-breaking Jewish and non-Jewish (white) tourism to Israel. For good measure, there are between fifteen thousand and twenty thousand Israeli expatriates in South Africa.¹⁵ So, in response to Malan's new policy, the Jewish associations toned down their previously outspoken criticism of racial discrimination and followed the South African Board of Jewish Deputies in taking the position that, as non-political bodies, they would "refrain from taking any position on party political issues" and would not "express views on the various race policies being advocated."¹⁶ This position was elaborated upon by Rabbi M. C. Weiler at the Eighth International Conference of the World Union for Progressive Judaism in London

in 1953:

The Jews as a community had decided to take no stand on the native question, because they were involved with the problem of assisting Jewry in other lands. South African Jewry was doing more to help Israel than any other group. The community could not ask for the Government's permission to export funds and goods and, at the same time, object to the Government.¹⁷

When African states gained independence in the 1960s, Israel, in courting these states, found it necessary to put some distance between herself and the abhorred *apartheid* regime of South Africa. When Israel, in keeping with this political expediency, voted in the United Nations General Assembly (1961) in support of a resolution which deprecated South Africa's policy of *apartheid* "as being reprehensible and repugnant to the dignity and rights of peoples and individuals,"¹⁸ South Africa felt betrayed. Dr. Verwoerd, prime minister and prophet/ideologue of *apartheid*, caustically observed that the Jews, "took Israel from the Arabs after the Arabs had lived there for a thousand years. In that I agree with them, Israel like South Africa is an *apartheid* state."¹⁹ The government rescinded the special concessions in foreign currency regulations which allowed Jewish organizations to transfer money and goods to Israel, despite the restrictions in effect since Sharpeville (1960). The Zionist organizations and press in South Africa were equally dismayed at this latest Israeli switch, which they correctly saw as hypocrisy; according to Mr. Katzew, many wondered whether there were "any circumstances at present imaginable in which the Jews of Israel would consent to share power with an Arab majority,"²⁰ any more than Afrikaners would with Africans. The South African Board of Jewish Deputies and Zionist organizations intensified their efforts to deflect criticism abroad of South Africa by other Jewish bodies. Prominent Jewish figures travelled abroad to urge this message and succeeded in getting Zionist organizations to heed this plea at the United Nations and other forums.

This was not a break, but merely a tactical hold. The ties between Israel and South Africa were just too real to suddenly disappear. In addition to factors already mentioned, there were also many personal ties; i.e., the large South African Jewish emigrant group in Israel, many of whom held prominent positions such as Mr. Eban and Mr. Pincus, who in 1966 was elected chairman of the Jewish Agency in Jerusalem, the controlling body of the World Zionist Organization.²¹ In South Africa, many Jews were quite influential in the governmental and National Party structure. Even more importantly, the litmus test of devotion and service to the state of Israel was bound to win out. Even with all these, the relationship between the two states continued on many different levels, albeit with some rancor and less fanfare.

Despite the apparent rancor of the early and middle 1960s, when Israel unleashed its aggression in the 1967 War, South Africa accordingly escalated its support. Special regulations to allow free transfer of funds to Israel were quickly reinstated and other forms of material aid were made available. The war reaffirmed the basic similarity of the two countries and reemphasized the need to cooperate. *Die Burger*, an organ of the National Party in the Cape Province, explained this commonality of interest, albeit in more mundane terms:

Israel and South Africa have a common lot. Both are engaged in a struggle for existence, and both are in 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.²²

The same sentiment was reiterated by *Jewish Affairs*, the official organ of the South African Jewish Board of Deputies:

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 in it. 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 from 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.²³

Economic, political and military links between the two countries grew rapidly in the subsequent years. The October 1973 War was a major milestone in the process of growing identification between the two countries. After this war, which led most African countries to break relations with Israel, Israel buried its pretense, especially at the United Nations, of being opposed to *apartheid*. South Africa openly expressed its support for Israel during the war. Mr. P.W. Botha, then minister of defense and now prime minister, declared his full support. The then-Prime Minister Vorster stated that if Israel lost the war, its defeat would have important consequences for South Africa; South Africa gave full support, including military support, both in men and material.²⁴

The relationship became open and formal. They upgraded the level of their diplomatic relations from the level of legations to that of em-

bassies. Several joint investment projects were undertaken by parastatal corporations in both countries, and commercial and scientific ties were strengthened with the creation of appropriate organs and the exchange of high-level visits. From Israel came such high-ranking officials as Moshe Dayan; General Meir Amit, former head of Israel's intelligence services and chairman of Koor Industries; and General Chaim Herzog, among others. From South Africa to Israel went Mr. C.P. Mulder, then South Africa's minister of interior and information, who visited twice, and many others. The high point of this exchange of visits was the April 1976 visit by Prime Minister Vorster. Not only was Mr. Vorster accorded a warm welcome, he laid a wreath at the Yad Vashem Holocaust Memorial—an act which can only be described as a desecration of the memory of those unfortunate victims, given Mr. Vorster's background of Nazi sympathy and identification for which he was interned by the British authorities during the last World War. Reasons of state produce strange bedfellows indeed. In the wake of Vorster's visit, wide-ranging agreements on economic, scientific and industrial collaboration were concluded between South Africa and Israel. Subsequent events indicate that military cooperation was an important aspect of this visit, though this is, of course, officially denied.²⁵

The relationship has flowered and expanded in all fields, such as the diplomatic; military, where Israel has largely stepped in to fill the vacuum created by the United Nations embargo of arms to South Africa; and trade, which has increased dramatically. For example, Israel's exports to South Africa were 2.7 million dollars in 1965 and 28.7 million dollars in 1974. Israel imports from South Africa were 4.3 million dollars in 1965 and 43.1 million dollars in 1974. Israel also imports over 100 million dollars worth of raw diamonds, which are not included in the trade statistics. There has also been great investment by Israel in South Africa and South African investment in Israel. The two countries are also increasingly involved in joint investment ventures in both countries. By these arrangements, South Africa is able to use Israel as a base from which to evade boycott of her trade and commerce. This is simply done by the stratagem of shipping semi-finished South African goods to Israel to be finished there and qualify for an Israeli certificate of origin. This has the added advantage of South African goods benefiting from Israel's free trade agreements with the European Economic Community and the United States. Airline and shipping ties have increased, as have cultural, sports and scientific/technological ties. The most ominous aspect of these ties is nuclear development collaboration between the two.²⁶ The implications of this are too obvious to warrant elaboration.²⁷

This ever-growing and intensifying relationship poses a most serious threat to world peace. This is essentially the coming together of

two strands of the same ideas as a material force. This danger is further compounded by the worldwide power and influence of Zionism, whose power and influence renders it immune from normal scrutiny, debate and criticism. This Zionist power and influence is South Africa's boon. As the relationship intensifies, especially in the area of joint investment ventures, the argument of vital interest will literally merge the two countries. We already have a glimpse of this in Israel's historical involvement in Rhodesia (now Zimbabwe), Namibia and Angola, as well as South Africa's involvement in the Arab-Israeli War of 1973.

The world view of the two states is the most dangerous component. When a divine injunction rests on privilege, floats on oil, is gilded as well as festooned with diamonds, and is girded by uranium, chrome and platinum group metals, you then have a most explosive mixture. This is a most serious development whose threat goes far beyond Palestinians and South Africans, or even Arabs and Africans, but threatens every man and every country—it is a threat to humanity.

NOTES

1. Quoted in T. Dunbar Moodie, *The Rise of Afrikanerdom* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975), p. 1.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 248.
3. Fedynand Zweig, *Israel: The Sword and the Harp* (London, Heinemann, 1969), pp. 70-71.
4. Alfred M. Lilienthal, *The Zionist Connection: What Price Peace?* (New York, Dodd, Mead & Co., 1978).
5. Abdelwahab M. Elmessiri, *The Land of Promise: A Critique of Political Zionism* (New Jersey, North American, 1977), pp.6-7.
6. Quoted in *Ibid.*, p. 14.
7. *Ibid.*
8. Quoted in Gwendolen M. Carter, *The Politics of Inequality: South Africa Since 1948* (New York, Praeger, 1959), p. 130.
9. Quoted in Elmessiri, *Land of Promise*, p. 15.
10. Quoted in *Ibid.*, p. 12.
11. Quoted in *Ibid.*, p. 15.
12. Quoted in Lilienthal, *Zionist Connection*, p. 3.
13. Richard P. Stevens, *Weizman and Smuts: A Study in Zionist-South African Cooperation* (Beirut: Institute for Palestine Studies, 1975).
14. Richard P. Stevens, *The Paradoxical Triangle: Zionism, South Africa and Apartheid* (Beirut: Institute for Palestine Studies, 1975).
15. Marcus Atkin, "South Africa, Its Jews and the Israel Connection," *South Africa International*, Vol. VIII, No. 2.
16. Henry Katzew, "Jews in the Land of Apartheid," *Midstream*, Vol. 8 (December 1962).
17. Quoted in Stevens (1969), *Weizman and Smuts*, p. 18.
18. *Ibid.*, p. 24.
19. *Ibid.*, p. 25.
20. *Ibid.*, p. 27.
21. *Ibid.*, p. 33.
22. *Die Burger*, 29 May 1968.

23. *Jewish Affairs*, November 1970.
24. *Special Report of the U.N. Committee Against Apartheid*, (New York: United Nations, 1977), p. 23.
25. *Ibid.*, pp. 24-25.
26. *Ibid.*, *passim*.
27. On September 22, 1979, a U.S. satellite picked up a nuclear explosion off the South African coast. Subsequent press reports stated that this was an Israeli test carried out with the collaboration and contrivance of South Africa. See Department of Political and Security Council Affairs, United Nations Centre for Disarmament. *Study on Israeli Nuclear Armament*. (Disarmament Study Series 6) (New York: United Nations, 1981); The Washington Office on Africa Educational Fund. *The September 22, 1979 Mystery Flash: Did South Africa Detonate a Nuclear Bomb?* (Washington: The Washington Office on Africa Educational Fund, 1985); Jane Hunter. *Undercutting Sanctions: Israel, the U.S. and South Africa*. (Washington: Washington Middle East Associates, 1986.)

EAFORD Publications

Books

- EAFORD. *Zionism & Racism*. Proceedings of the International Symposium 1976 (London: International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, 1977.) ix + 238 pages. Appendix to p. 250. \$3.95, paper.
- EAFORD and American Jewish Alternatives to Zionism (AJAZ). *Judaism or Zionism: What Difference for the Middle East?* (London: Zed Press, 1986.) x + 277 pages. Index to p. 285. \$12.95, paper.
- National Lawyers Guild. *Treatment of Palestinians in Israeli-Occupied West Bank and Gaza*. Report of the National Lawyers Guild (USA) 1977 Middle East Delegation. (New York: National Lawyers Guild, 1978.) xvi + 121 pages. Appendices to p. 241. \$2.95, paper.
- Nordic Commission. *Witness of War Crimes in Lebanon*. Testimony given to the Nordic Commission, Oslo, October 1982. (London: EAFORD and Ithaca Press, 1983.) xviii + 146 pages. \$2.95, paper.
- Stevens, Richard P. and Abdelwahab M. Elmessiri. *Israel and South Africa: The Progression of a Relationship*. Forward by John Henrik Clarke. (New Brunswick, NJ: North American, 1977.) 226 pages, including 114 pp. of documentation. Index to p. 228. \$6.95, paper.

EAFORD Papers

- 5 *Dossier: Le Racisme au Québec*, The Québec Movement to Combat Racism. \$1.50
- 7 *La relation et les relations entre Israël et l'Afrique du Sud*, Elizabeth Mathiot. \$1.00
- 8 *A Question of Identity and Self-fulfilment*, Dr. Anis Al-Qasem and Dr. Roberto Cardoso de Oliveira. \$1.00
- 9 *Israel and South Africa: Ideology and Practice*, Dr. Alfred T. Moleah. \$1.00
- 10 *The Structure of the Zionist Movement in the United States*, Rabbi Elmer Berger. \$1.00
- 11 *The Case in South Africa*, Dr. Türkayya Ataöv. \$1.00
- 12 *Sanctions against South Africa: The Lessons of Sanctions against Rhodesia*, Dr. Alfred T. Moleah. \$1.00
- 13 *The Autonomy Plan: Israeli Colonisation under a New Name* (published by EURABIA, Paris), Elizabeth Mathiot. \$1.00
- 14 *Le Racisme en France*, par un groupe de stagiaires Québécois. \$1.00
- 15 *An International View of Racial Discrimination*, Dr. Anis Al-Qasem. \$1.00
- 16 *Zionist Ideology—Obstacle to Peace*, Rabbi Elmer Berger. \$1.00
- 17 *Zionism and the Lands of Palestine*, Sami Hadawi and Walter Lehn. \$1.00
- 18 *The Jewish National Fund: An Instrument of Discrimination*, Walter Lehn. \$1.00
- 19 *The Independent Personality of the Palestinians through Their Arts*, Dr. Türkayya Ataöv. \$1.00
- 20 *Israeli Use of Palestinian Waters and International Law*, Dr. Türkayya Ataöv. \$1.00
- 21 *Canada's Aborigines: The Struggle for Their Homelands*, Charles Roach. \$1.00

- 22 *Racist Regimes and the Land of the Indigenous Peoples*, Dr. Anis Al-Qasem. \$1.00
- 23 *The Caribs and Their Colonizers: The Problem of Land*, Chief Hilary Frederick. \$1.00
- 24 *Zionism and Apartheid: The Negation of Human Rights*, Dr. Alfred T. Moleah. \$1.00
- 25 *Zionism, A System of Apartheid*, Elizabeth Mathiot. \$1.00
- 26 *Human Rights or Self-righteousness in the State of Israel*, Rabbi Elmer Berger. \$1.00
- 27 *Racism and Racial Discrimination*, Dr. Fayeze Sayegh. \$1.00
- 28 *Israel and Nuremberg: Are Israel's Leaders Guilty of War Crimes?*, John Reddaway. \$1.00
- 29 *Internal Control in Israel and South Africa: The Mechanisms of Colonial-Settler Regimes*, Christopher Mansour and Richard P. Stevens. \$1.00
- 30 *Proceedings of the Symposium on Ethnic Groups and Racism*, EAFORD and the Universidade de Brasília. \$1.00
- 31 *The Image of the Amerindian in Québec Text-books*, Sylvie Vincent and Bernard Arcand. \$1.00
- 33 *Education, Culture and Identity Among Palestinians in Israel*, Sami Khalil Mar'i. \$1.00
- 34 *Racial Discrimination and Refugee Law*, Dr. Anis Al-Qasem. \$1.00
- 35 *Insensitivity to Wrong*, Dr. Anis Al-Qasem. \$1.00
- 36 *The Apartheid Fraud: The So-called New Constitutional Dispensation*, Dr. Alfred T. Moleah. \$1.00
- 37 *Racisme, Sionisme, Antisemitisme* (public debate, Montréal), EAFORD, The Québec Movement to Combat Racism and Centrale de l'Enseignement du Québec. \$1.00
- 38 *Palestinian Rights and Israeli Institutionalized Racism*, Dr. Anis Al-Qasem. \$1.00
- 39 *New Trends in Brazilian Indian Affairs*, Prof. Roque de Barros Laraia. \$1.00
- 40 *The Torah and Political Zionism*, Rabbi Joseph Becher. \$1.00
- 41 *Jewish Nationality Status as the Basis for Institutionalized Racism in Israel*, Dr. Roselle Tekiner. \$1.00

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Amount Enclosed \$ _____

Please mark quantity ordered in box next to publication title. Add 50¢ for postage on orders of less than \$5.00.

EAFORD

International Secretariat
41 rue de Zürich
1201 Geneva (CH)

EAFORD (USA)

Suite #1020
2025 Eye Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

