CHAPTER VII

DOMESTIC ELEMENTS AND ISRAEL'S THIRD-WORLD POLICY

Political Parties

As has been observed earlier, Israel's political life is distinguished by a multi-party system. An attempt will be made here to find out the attitudes of the Israeli political parties towards the country's relations with the Third World. The idea behind this discussion and analysis is that "although the influence of any one party's demand is at no time decisive, all competing programmes taken together constitute a vital input into the foreign policy system." 2

The ideological orientation of the political parties of Israel will be very briefly discussed in order to see the general framework of their foreign policy orientation. As a matter of fact, as far as the approach of the different parties to the country's policy towards the Third World is concerned, they seem to hold identical attitude.

1. See Chapter I.

Mepai

The discussion may well start with Mepai, the most pre-eminent party of Israel ever since its independence. Mepai has been the pivot of all the coalition governments and has always held the portfolios necessary to deal with Israel's foreign policy (and consequently, the policy towards the Third World as well): Foreign Affairs, Finance and Defence — and of course the Prime Ministership.

Mepai, ideologically, is a Zionist Socialist party. Its programme is based on a loose combination of Zionism and democratic socialism. The realization of the need that the Jews have to be gathered in Israel from all parts of the world (dispersion) made Mepai take into consideration private initiative and the demands of private foreign investors.

As far as foreign policy stand is concerned Mepai's formal official posture is that of "non-identification" with an orientation to the West. The fact is that Mepai is so much identified with the Government that we can always talk about the Government policy when we want to talk about Mepai's policy towards the Third World. In the first coalition Government of

Israel, the coalition partners were Mapai, the religious bloc and the progressives. In the Government's foreign policy decisions, Mapai's lead was accepted by the other two parties. Thus the basic principles of Government's policy reflect Mapai's stand on its foreign policy.

In March 1949, the first Knesset approved the Government programme which contained five principles of foreign policy. There was no reference to the Third World countries.

Again, the Government programme which was approved in October 1951 had a brief section on foreign policy. No mention was made of the Third World countries.

But, in the basic principles of Government programme that was approved by the third Knesset in 1955, mention was made of the policy to have "friendship with Asian peoples." This was the period when Africa was yet to emerge in the world political scene and in Asia, China and India were emerging as nations with potentiality to play a big role in world politics.

Similarly in the coalition programme approved in December 1959, there was again a mention of the Afro-Asian countries. The programme pledged to have friendship with Asian and African nations. Thus there was an acknowledgement of the approaching

independence of the African countries. As a matter of fact Israel's drive to have relations with the Afro-Asian countries had already started and it came to be a cardinal principle of Israel's foreign policy. The Mapai stalwarts, like Mrs Golda Meir, were behind the whole programme of cultivating friendly relations with Afro-Asian countries.

The same theme was repeated in the 1961 Government programme also. In the party level (election 1961), Mapai called for "recognition of the right of every people to be free from foreign rule".

And finally, in the Basic Principles of the Government programmes which were approved in January 1966, there was Government's support for "Eradication of Racial and Religious Discrimination", and "Completion of the Liberation of all Colonial people" and the emphasis on "International Co-operation". Israel's programme for international co-operation in the developing countries had by this time become an established fact of the government's policy. Thus the above three principles are Mapai's emphasis on having close relations with the Third World countries.

Further, by 1966 election, the alignment of Mapai and Shatut Ha'avadah had been formed. In their election manifesto (the alignment one), they had spoken of "normal relations with India" and "ties with China".

---
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10. Ibid., 5726, 1965-6, Special Supplement, pp. 1-8.
11. See New Outlook (Tel Aviv), November 1966, pp. 63-64.
member of the Third World countries had thus been acknowledged.

Thus ever since 1955, Mapai has been advocating for friendly relations with the Third World countries as a principle of foreign policy. Let us now see how Mapai looks at Israel's relations with these countries. 12

Mapai thinks that Israel's ties with the new nations will strengthen Israel's position in the international arena more than anything else. The party further maintains that though African countries are not powerful, their voices are heard. At the same time, Mapai genuinely feels that since these countries are badly in need of help and Israel is in a position to do so, so, for altruistic reasons also Israel wants to help these countries. Mapai further maintains that though it is true that they want an Israeli presence in Africa to thwart Arab propaganda, they do not want this relation only for the negative aspect; Israel has earnest desire to help these countries. Thus, Mapai believes that whether there were the Bandung debacle or not, Israel would have extended its assistance to the Afro-Asian countries in any case. The party does not think that these countries are a force of peace nor do they have the potentiality because of the diversity they have among themselves.

Mapai wants these countries to be strong so that they can assert

12. The following account is based entirely on the writer's interview with the Secretary General of the Labour Party, Yisrael Yehezkiel, on 10 February 1972 in Tel-Aviv.
themselves. As for the economic aspect of Israel's relations with the Third World countries, Mepeti feels that that aspect has not been overlooked; but that is not the major aim of Israel's relations with these countries.

Mepeti hopes that Israel's friendly relations with the Afro-Asian countries in the long-run, will be able to bring about a solution of the Arab-Israeli dispute; though the party is not very clear in what form. Further, Mepeti thinks that if Israel can establish strong and close diplomatic relations with the Afro-Asian countries, Israel's standing with both the Super Powers would be enhanced.

As for military assistance to the Afro-Asian countries, Mepeti's contention is that the idea behind Israel's military assistance is simply "helping them to help themselves". The very purpose of Nafol and Gadna is that. Thus, Mepeti maintains that Israel's military assistance is "for peaceful purposes".

And finally, in spite of the anti-Israeli stands taken by various Afro-Asian countries in the UN and various international conferences, Mepeti is for continuing assistance to these countries and for cultivating friendly relations with them.

The Religious Parties

In the Israeli political life, the religious parties are conspicuous by their commitment to some degree of theocracy.

13. But at the same time the Secretary General told this writer that though Israel gives a high amount of importance to its relations with Afro-Asian countries, Israel "can continue without them also".
We can divide these religious parties into two different ideological groups: Zionists and anti-Zionists. Mizrahi and Heapoel Hemizrahi are middle class orthodox Zionist groups which developed along with the Zionist movement. Agudat Israel and Poalei Agudat Israel are anti-Zionist ultra groups which developed in the Diaspora. In 1949-election, all four groups ran as a united religious front. After that, the two Mizrahi groups merged together to form the National Religious Party (NRP). The NRP has been a member of every government coalition since 1949. The two Agudah factions have been in the Government since 1960.

These political parties have not shown much interest as in foreign policy and so long they are in the government (coalition) they have accepted the lead of the major partner, Heapoel. As a party, they have never articulated their views about Israel's relations with the Third World. They are, by and large, indifferent to it. As a matter of fact, their entire policy is based on realpolitik. Any attempt by Israel to befriend the countries of Third World has no meaning for them so long it did not enhance Israel's physical power. For example, Agudat Yisrael's newspaper Ha-modia commented on the Rehovoth Conference on "Science and Development in the New Nations", in August 1965 in the following words:

The world of our days, East and West alike, is built, perhaps more than at any other time, on the standards of physical strength, position of power and ability to manoeuvre between the competing blocs. Any other consideration even if it be most reasonable, just, righteous and
sincere, is of no value or weight in inter-State relations. 14

Similar is the case with Rafi - the Ben-Gurion led splinter group from Mapai. Rafi put - proportionately speaking - very little emphasis on foreign policy. As far as its attitude towards Israel's relations with the Third World was concerned the party defined aid to developing countries "as one of Israel's central task" - a "moral and social responsibility". 15

Further, there are two other parties which have normally followed Mapai's lead in foreign policy. They are the General Zionists and the Progressives. "The General Zionists have no special ideology, and the general policy of its leaders is to provide a platform that will provide an answer to the actual problems that trouble Israeli societies." 16 The General Zionists are a party of the "Centre" representing the middle class, their most important slogan being private initiative.

So far as their foreign policy is concerned, they take the stand of a pro-Western foreign policy. But after joining with the progressives in 1961-election, their foreign policy stand took the form of "Israel's relations with the blocs should be balanced according to her national interests". 17 In 1961

15. Mentioned in the weekly party organ Habbat Hedash (New Look) as quoted in Michael Brecher, n. 1, p. 181.
17. Election brochures in Hebrew, translated to the writer by Joshua Brilliant, an M.A. student in the Department of Asian Studies, Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
election they specifically mentioned about the strengthening of relations with the new nations of Asia and Africa.

The progressives also are a party of the centre, again representing the middle class. But, "economically the progressive party, though a middle class party, differed from the General Zionists in its emphasis on a planned economy...In other words, the Progressive Party sought a middle road between private enterprise and socialism." 18 As for the foreign policy "from the outset the progressive party never deviated from the course pursued by the government of the day. 19 The fact is, "owing to its (the progressive party's) small membership in the Knesset, it was practically forced to be part of whatever government coalition was formed." 20 In 1961 election, after its merger with the General Zionists to become the new United Liberal Party, it spoke of strengthening relations with the new nations of Asia and Africa (as noted above).

In 1965 the Liberal Party (formed in 1961 by a merger of the progressives and General Zionist parties) joined Herut Party to form the Gachal Party. But upon merger with Herut, most of the once-time progressives defected to form a new party called the Independent Liberal Party. In its foreign policy orientation


the Independent Liberals were more or less akin to Mepci. In their 1965 election programme the Independent Liberals advocated "closer political, economic and cultural contacts, and aid exchanges with the developing countries."21

Thus we see that "the religious parties, the General Zionists, the progressives and Rafi shared Mepci's general posture on foreign affairs",22 particularly with regard to Israel's relations with the Third World.

Herut

The Herut movement, which is a political party of the former underground movement against Britain - the Irgun Zvai Leumi - is no longer a revolutionary military group but a petty-bourgeois right-wing group, for whom economic problems, such as free enterprise for the middle-class have replaced their former demands to free all Jerusalem and to form an Israel on both banks of the Jordan.23 As Mepci has always been the party of the establishment, Herut has always been the party of the opposition. Herut has never shared the government power. In 1965, Herut joined forces with Liberal Party and the new coalition is called Gehal. In 1966, it won 21 per cent of the vote in the parliamentary election.24 Herut has normally been

22. Ibid., pp. 174-5.
indifferent to the question of Israel's relations with the Third World.

Herut is for extending assistance to the Afro-Asian countries to create an atmosphere of co-operation with these countries which is better than no relations at all, but the political aim here is not predominant. Herut expects friendship in return for Israel's co-operation with these countries. But friendship cannot be expected from these countries as a group because "we do not believe in Afro-Asian bloc, and, non-alignment is a myth". As a matter of fact, Herut believes that Israel has gone out of its way to befriend these countries.

Herut believes that there is the possibility of Israel's deriving some economic benefits from its association with the Afro-Asian countries. But, it does not believe - and they are emphatic about it - that Israel's friendly relations with these countries will be able to bring about any solution to the Arab-Israeli dispute.

As for military assistance to these developing countries, Herut is for assisting militarily, if it is used against imperialism; otherwise various considerations like the existing

25. The following observation is based on the writer’s interview with Dr. Eliahu Ben-Elieser, the spokesman of Herut, on 31 January 1971, in Tel Aviv.

26. Ibid.
regime in the particular country and its attitude towards Israel will have to be taken into consideration.

As for the continuation of the co-operation programme Horat thinks that that should be based entirely on Israel's national interest.

The Communist Party of Israel

The Party was founded in 1919 on the basis of Marxism-Leninist theory. It aims at socialism, friendship with Soviet Union and other Socialist countries, peace, independence and neutrality, equal rights for the Arab population and peace with the Arab countries. In 1965 it split into Rechah, which supports Soviet policy in the Middle East and elsewhere, and Meke, which supported Israel's defensive action in June 1967. The party has continuously been anti-Zionist and that has consequently exerted a negative influence on the Jewish population. Thus, "the party - or parties - remain totally outside the mainstream of Israel's ideological debate and, therefore, have almost no influence over public life. They have never participated in governing coalitions, nor are their parliamentary representatives permitted to hold seats on security sensitive committees." 27

As for Israel's relations with the Third World, on principle, the party is for co-operating with the Afro-Asian

---

27. Fein, n. 3, p. 87.
countries, but Israel's present programme of international co-operation helps only the pro-imperialists and, further, these projects are financed by big monopolies and neo-colonialists. They believe that the entire venture is pro-capitalist. These parties think that the Afro-Asian countries are emerging progressive forces and they can do a lot to bring about a solution to the Arab-Israeli dispute. But, as long/Israel acts as the tool of imperialists, the Afro-Asian countries cannot be expected to respond favourably to Israel's programme of assistance. Thus, their stand is that Israel's programme of international co-operation is an imperialist inspired venture.

Ashut Ha-avodah

The Party was founded in 1954. It is a pioneering Zionist party, standing for planned economy, widespread agricultural settlement, co-operation of Zionist Socialist parties within the government; activist defence policy, a foreign policy of non-identification; and friendship with all peace-loving peoples, particularly in Asia. In 1965, the party aligned with Nepal.

In its foreign policy with regards to the Third World, Ashut Ha-avodah has talked about friendship with the peoples of Asia, but in essence, they have followed the line taken by Mepam.

23. The account is based on the writer's interview with the spokesman of Maki on 16 February 1972 in Tel-Aviv.
29. The Facts About Israel, 1964/65, p. 64.
and then Mapai. During its existence as a separate identity, for eleven years Ahut Ha-Svodedh has never opposed the government policy towards the Third World, though they have not articulated any particular stand regarding Israel's relations with these countries.

**Mapam**

Mapam came into existence as a party in 1948 as a coalition of left-wing groups that had left Mapai and more orthodox Marxists who had stayed outside the original Mapai coalition of 1929. Thus, "it is a left-wing Zionist party."\(^{30}\)

So far as its foreign policy is concerned, Mapam emphasizes true neutrality. "True neutrality in Mapam's context meant a strong pro-Soviet policy, for it considered itself an inseparable part of the revolutionary workers movement in its struggle against "capitalist-imperialist reaction".\(^{31}\) As far as Israel's relation with the Third World is concerned, in 1955-election programme, Mapam spoke of friendly relations with Asian peoples.\(^{32}\) As a leftist, pro-Soviet party Mapam, is always for having friendly relations with the Third World countries.\(^{33}\)

Mapam firmly believes that Israel should have friendly relations

---


33. The following account is based on the writer's interview with Yona Cohan, in charge, Department of International Relations, Mapam, on 8 February 1972 in Tel-Aviv.
with the Third World countries - for various reasons, political reason being one of them, but these reasons are not contradictory - rather they are complementary to each other. In return for Israel's co-operation with the countries, Israel expects them to understand Israel's peculiar situation (the very legitimacy of Israel's existence is questioned) - Israel needs their goodwill and friendship. Though Mapam does not believe very much in non-alignment, it thinks these "so-called" non-aligned Afro-Asian countries have the potentiality to create an atmosphere in which both Israel and the Arabs will be able to have a dialogue to sort out their differences to find a solution to the Arab-Israeli dispute.

As for the economic benefits that might accrue from Israel's relations with the Third World countries, Mapam feels that the potentiality is there. Further, Mapam admits that friendly relations with these countries would enhance the international standing of Israel. So, it is very important for Israel's diplomacy to cultivate friendly relations with these countries.

As for military aid, Mapam as a party is not very happy that Israel provides military assistance to some of these countries. Even if military assistance is to be provided, it should be very very selective. Mapam has no objection in offering Gabbai and Nabul type of military assistance.

Thus, from the above account it becomes apparent that, though the emphasis differs, all the political parties of Israel are for having friendly relations with the Third World countries.
If Mapam wants it on principle, Herut wants it on national interest. But no party questions the basic assumption of the necessity to have friendly relations with these countries.

The Press

According to Government Press Office, in 1969-70, there were twenty-three daily morning newspapers and two daily evening ones in Israel. Political parties in Israel also have their own newspapers. Thus Davar (Histadrut), Al-Hamishmar (Mapam), Ha-vm (Ghash), Ha-Boker (General Zionist), Herut (Herut), Ha-romde (Agudah Yaarei), Ha-tzofeh (National Religious Party), Kol-Hai (Meki), Lehem (Adut Ha'avodah), and She'elim (Pa'elei Agudah Yaarei), are all party mouthpieces.

As a matter of fact, these papers' positions on different issues are always on the party-line and we can as well find out the party position from the opinions expressed by these papers. But there are three independent daily newspapers in Israel which have the biggest circulations - and are very influential as well. These are Haaretz, Ha-are and Yediot Ahronot. The Israeli decision-makers invariably read, apart from their respective party-newspapers, Haaretz and Ha-are. Haaretz is reputed to be the most reliable Israeli newspaper, with the highest intellectual standard. This, combined with its penchant for dissent from much of government policy - it has long been anti-establishment and liberal non-conformist - makes it

required reading. Ha'aretz is staffed by many ex-revisionists and is hawkish on Israel's Arab policy and generally anti-establishment from a rightist perspective.

In this section, we will analyse the attitude of the Israeli Press towards Israel's relation with the Third World. That can best be done by analysing the editorials of various newspapers with regard to the issues related with the Third World, over the years. But it may be maintained right at the outset that reporting on Afro-Asia in Israel's Press has been inadequate (at least up to 1963). This is borne out by the fact that during the period of our discussion Ha'aretz had (has) resident correspondents in Washington, London, Paris and Bonn and many associate correspondents or 'stringers'. Ha'aretz also had (has) resident correspondents in New York, London, Paris, Bonn, Rome, Brussels and Ankara, with 'stringers' in many cities. Both also have specialists in Arab and Middle East Affairs, Domestic Politics, Defence, Diplomacy etc. But up to 1963, there was no resident correspondents in any Afro-Asian country. It is true that these Israeli newspapers cannot afford no to have their own people in the American and European capitals - but whatever that may be, the fact remains that reporting on Afro-Asia in Israeli Press is inadequate.

Histadrut's (we may as well call it as Hapoel's also) paper Meyez has normally taken a sympathetic attitude towards

35. Ibid., p. 183.
Israel's association with the Third World countries. Their attitude can best be represented here by quoting an editorial which appeared on 17 June 1960:

The £60 m. worth of work being carried out (by Israel) in the states of Africa and Asia is a small sum in comparison with their needs, but put our financial resources to a severe test. But the test we face in Africa and Asia is not only a material one. Also under test...is our basic assumption that there is no conflict between our political and economic ties with the West...and a policy of political and economic cooperation with the states of Africa and Asia....on the contrary because of our special geographical situation and because we are surrounded by a hostile belt, we can act as an effective and useful bridge between Europe and the continents gaining their freedom.

And two days later, commenting on the U.N. resolution on Palestine at the Addis Ababa Conference of independent African states, Dayan took this stand:

We do not by any means ask the African States receiving Israeli aid to fight our wars.... But we at least have the right to expect that they should not support Egyptian provocations against Israel....At the same time, we in Israel should not hurry to draw conclusions on the basis of the Addis Ababa vote. Anyone who considers it to indicate the failure of our activities in Africa cannot see beyond the end of his nose. Though we have had certain difficulties in our relations with African states, if it were not for the ties of friendship that we have established with many of them, it is not beyond the realm of possibility that they would have actually joined in hostile acts against Israel, like Morocco and Tunisia.... The Addis Ababa incident obliges us to continue our constructive and informative work in Africa with even greater energy, for this is the very really to strengthen Israel-African friendship.
The above two editorials clearly show the attitude of editorial towards Israel's relations with the Third World countries. The first editorial has clearly stated that Israel's role in the co-operation programmes with the Afro-Asian countries is to act as "bridge" between the West and the developing countries. Further, Israel expects some political benefit out of it. But political benefits cannot be measured by one to one equation. So, in spite of some Afro-Asian States sometimes taking some anti-Israeli stands, Israel should not stop this co-operation programme. Continuation of this co-operation with greater vigour only will result in closer friendship.

But almost a diametrically opposite stand is taken by Herut - the mouthpiece of Herut movement. We have noted above that Herut is all for realpolitik - everything should be based on direct national interest. Herut is willing to help the Afro-Asian states but the response of the Afro-Asian states should be favourable to Israel. Thus on 16 June 1960, Herut said that since the new African states are at present unwilling to trust their former rulers, "it is no wonder that Moscow and Cairo are strengthening their grip; though Cairo's infiltration into Africa could be stopped by an active and determined Israeli policy." (emphasis added). Further, on 1 July 1960, commenting on the Palestine resolution in the Addis Abeba Conference, Herut made their stand with regards to Israel's relations with the Third World very clear:

The resolution on the Palestine problem adopted at the Addis Abeba Conference of Independent African states was stronger than similar resolutions adopted at previous Afro-Asian conferences
and thus shows that the great efforts we are daily making to win the hearts of the African rulers are in vain...The more we flatter them and give them aid, the more they will spurn us, strike at our honour and device to the tune of Hitler's pupil, the Egyptian dictator.

This is the general stand of Herut and they have maintained that right from the beginning through 1968.

Al-Hamiashmer (Hapem) is always for friendly relations with the Third World countries. Its left-orientation is unmistakable. Thus, commenting on the Congo's gaining its independence and on the adoption of the U/N resolution on the "Palestine Problem" at the Addis Ababa Conference, Al-Hamiashmer wrote on 11 July 1960:

Within the bounds of the limited resources, Israel is capable of offering aid to these states to the mutual advantage of both sides...They should not see us as identified with one bloc or Heaven forbid, its servant. Only a policy of independence can help strengthen the friendship that has already been gained and extend it to the states now reaching independence.

The paper concludes by expressing its disagreement with the Prime Minister's statement about Israel being "part of Europe":

"We must find our place in the family of Asiatic peoples among whom we are located while promoting friendship with all peoples."

Those statements clearly express Al-Hamiashmer's attitude and stand towards Israel's relations with the Third World.

Ha-Boker is the newspaper of the General Zionists. Ha-Boker has always been supporting the Government in its relations with the Third World countries. Thus on 1 July 1960,
He-Hokar, after mentioning the problems facing the newly independent Congo writes: "The path we have followed in Africa is undoubtedly the correct one. This is testified to by the rather ironical fact that we come to court Europe today with our position in Africa as our dowry."

He-tsofeh is the party organ of the National Religious Party. The National Religious Party has always followed Mepol's lead with regards to Israel's relations with the Third World countries. Apart from the political reasons, the National Religious Party wants to develop relations with the African countries for economic reasons also. Thus on 27 June 1960, He-tsofeh maintained that it sees "great importance" in Mepol's failure to get the African states at the Addis Ababa Conference to join his anti-Israeli boycott. After predicting an increasingly virulent Egyptian anti-Israeli campaign in Africa, the paper calls on Israel to carry out "more vigorous political and propaganda activities in the young states of Africa in order to assure herself of their friendship and support and also to guarantee Israeli trade and proper share of the large and growing African market."

He'aretz, as we have mentioned above, is an independent paper. It has a tremendous amount of influence on the Israeli public as well as on the Israeli policy makers. He'aretz has always favoured Israel's friendly relations with the emerging Afro-Asian countries of the Third World. Thus on 23 June 1960, He'aretz said: "The growth of the wave of independence in Africa
arouses the hope that friendly relations and co-operation between
Israel and these states will also grow, to the benefits of the
peoples of Israel and Africa alike." Ha'aretz, of course, always
wanted Israel to be cautious and wanted it to put the priorities
in proper places. Thus on 1 April 1958, while recognizing the
importance of the "pioneer work" done by the Foreign Minister in
her goodwill tour of West Africa, Ha'aretz warned against

a tendency to exaggerate the importance of these
ties for the central problem of our foreign policy.
Even today there is only a faint hope that we shall
succeed in breaching the front of Arab hostility
from the rear - in either Asia or Africa - our main
front is in the Middle East itself....Our central
problem remains the problem of the attitude of the
Arab states to us.

Lemerhav is the party organ of Ahut Ha'avyodeh. In
an editorial written on 28 June 1960 very clearly states Lemerhav's
attitude towards the Third World:

Israel is interested in friendly relations with
the peoples whose independence needs strengthen-
ing and guidance....The African peoples can
of course, receive Israeli aid or refuse it.
We are interested in friendship with them.
They are the key to the future for us. (emphasis
added).

A very strong anti-Israeli resolution was adopted in
the Casablanca Conference. Like the Israeli Government,
Israeli Press was also shocked to have known about the resolu-
tion. The reaction of the Press ranged from outspoken indigna-
tion from the right to self-criticism from the left. Thus

37. Casablanca Conference will be discussed in details in
Chapter VIII.
on 8 January 1961, Herut wrote: "In view of this new step in the face from the leaders of Ghana and Mali, the Government of Israel must again consider whether or not it is worth our while to make the vast investments that we are making to win the 'goodwill' of these countries."

Similarly, Ha-modie opined on 8 January 1961 that—

While we do not think that Israel's relations with the countries of Africa and Asia have come to an end, we nevertheless feel that we have exaggerated their importance as Israel is investing much strength and capital in this work. The time has come for us to get to the bottom of things and to determine whether this investment is worthwhile.

She'arim disagreed with Ha-modie and argued that the importance of our relations have not been exaggerated and maintained that "Israel's activities in Africa will undoubtedly bear fruit in the future". (3 January 1961)

Ha-tzofeh in its issue of 8 January 1961 expressed concern over it; but thought that Israeli activities in Africa should be rather intensified. Thus it said:

The fact that a very strong anti-Israeli resolution was adopted at a Conference in which two states which maintain relations with us, Ghana and Mali, participated shows that our political relations with the countries of Africa and Asia demand unceasing efforts on our part in disseminating information and in constructive acts.

---

33. The party organ of Agudat Yisrael.
39. The party organ of Poalei Agudat Yisrael.
Similarly Ha-Jaber in an obvious reference to Israel's voting with France on colonial issues of intrinsically French interest, said on 6 January 1961: "Israel's African friends must understand that just as they must sometimes disregard our interests, we must sometimes also vote against them because of matters of vital importance to us."

Ha-Jaber had taken a moderate stand and stated that the Conference and the decision should be considered in the light of the fact that Africa is not a united bloc and that the States represented at Casablanca did not speak of the entire continent.

Mapam's Al-Hamishmar even on this occasion adopted the typical party line of neutralist sentiment: "The time has come for a reconsideration of Israel's Foreign Policy and the adoption of a policy of non-identification and full support for the just aspirations of the peoples of Africa and Asia."

About Ha-avoda's Lameyhevay also took a similar line:

If Israel's constructive work in Africa is continued and expanded with the same degree of sincerity, devotion and understanding shown until now, it may well prove more effective than Nasser's hostile mouthings. In view of Israel's political interests in Africa, which are of immeasurable importance, she must show more care and consideration in her decisions in the international sphere.

On 27 January 1961, Ha'aretz came out with a realistic approach to the whole situation:

Anyone who expected that Israel's help to African countries, and her cooperation with them would immediately allow her to break out of the political isolation imposed upon her by the Arab states can now perhaps claim to be
disappointed, but disappointment is the outcome of original undue pessimism and not of the latest development. There was never any reason to believe that our relations with the African States would bring us political salvation. But there is also no reason to believe today that these relations are of no value to us.

The reaction of Israeli Press towards the Belgrade Conference of non-aligned countries was also on the party line.40

Further, when the Government of Israel decided to reduce the level of its representation in South Africa, Iserthay commenting on the action said on 25 September 1968: "Israel's attitude is consistent with her need to establish ties of friendship with the countries of Africa and Asia and to present herself on the international scene as an independent, progressive and peace-loving country."

Herut on 29 September said that "the action is liable to make an impression on the African countries, but it creates a dangerous precedent of cynical opportunism that Israel cannot allow herself to accept."

Next day Davar said that it did not deny that one of the factors influencing Israel's policy towards South Africa "is her desire to win friendship of the countries of Africa and Asia."

Ha'atzofeh opined that it was a painful decision but as a small people surrounded by enemies, Israel had no alternative,

40. See Chapter VIII for details.
and because any other vote in the present circumstances would have given a weapon to Israel's mortal enemies who are plotting to destroy Israel."

Thus over the years the Israeli Press has taken a stand which favours close relations with the Afro-Asian countries. Thus as late as on 3 March 1966, Davar commenting on Israeli President Shazar's visit to Nepal said: "The visit emphasizes Israel's desire to strengthen her ties and nourish friendly relations with the large and important continent where she does not have many friends."

The Israeli Prime Minister Eshkol went on a tour to some African countries in May-June 1966. Commenting on the tour, the Israeli Press again expressed its attitude towards the Third World countries. There was no basic difference in the stand that it has been taking all throughout.

Al Hamishmar on 24 May 1966 commenting on Eshkol's tour said: "The bonds of friendship and aid which have been established between Israel and the African continent can serve as a basis for political efforts, designed to turn the African States into active factors in the 'tranquilization of our region and the preparation of the ground for peace."

Ha'aretz said:

Israel's African endeavour did much to open new horizons to the Jewish people in Israel....It may be said that our emergence to Africa has opened a new window for Israel to the outer world - alleviating the sense of encirclement, which sometimes turns into a siege complex
and variegating our cultural concepts. It is no exaggeration to say that our participation in African enterprises has added a new dimension to Israel's life.

Histadrut's Omer stated that these African countries know that Israel wants nothing of them but friendship and understanding for our position and policy.

Dreyer stated that the Premier's tour further illustrated the importance that Israel attached to its relations with the nations of the African continent.

Further, the same sentiment was expressed when the Israeli Foreign Minister Abba Eban went on tour of Far Eastern countries in February-March 1967.

Thus, Al-Hamishmer said: "The more our friendly ties grow with the nations in Asia and Africa who also maintain friendly relations with the Arab countries, the better the prospects that in due course an atmosphere of reciprocal influence and rapprochement will be created."

Similarly Omer came out with a realistic and clear stand on 3 March 1967:

The main problem of our policy in Asia is our relations with the neutralist states. They have influence over the Arab countries and are influenced by them, more or less, in their attitude to Israel. The main contribution Mr Eban's tour can make is an improvement in our relations with the neutralist states, two of which are included in his itinerary: Burma and Cambodia.

Haaretz also came out with its usual stand on 30 March 1967:
In our era, every country is important, the more so as the UN is based on complete equality. The furtherance of our relations with the countries of the Far East and the Pacific Ocean, though they will presumably be unable to tip the scales in our favour is likely to be of benefit to us and may well strengthen our international standing.

Thus on an analysis of the Israeli Press, we will find that over the years, they have been taking a stand favouring Israel's assistance to these countries. And though Israel has been rebuffed by these countries off and on, the Israeli Press has consistently advocated for the continuation of Israeli assistance to these countries.

We have observed above that the coverage the Israeli Press gives to Afro-Asian countries is not exhaustive, but it becomes apparent when we go through the editorials that Israel's relations with India get a prominent place in their comments. Thus on 25 April 1957 Lemmeroh said: "We, in Israel have adopted a particularly favourable attitude to India's struggle for independence and liberation. We have always had great respect for Gandhi and his methods of political struggle." The paper expressed surprise at India's opposition to Israel over the Arab-Israeli conflict. The editorial concluded by expressing the hope that India's leaders will ultimately take bolder decisions in their policy towards Israel which would be an important contribution to world peace.

Herut has always considered Nehru of India to be a pro-Arab (and anti-Israeli) statesman and has expressed its opinion about India's relations with Israel in very aggressive tones.
Thus on 16 June 1957, commenting on Nehru's visit to
Damascus, Perot said that Nehru has so far refused to take any
substantial step to relax the tension in the Middle East. "On
the contrary, everything he has done has poured oil on the Arab
flames and hardened their hearts against us." The paper mentions
Krishna Menon's speeches in the UN Assembly and Nehru's surrender
to Arab pressure in not inviting Israel to the Bandung Conference.
"In the dispute between Israel and the Arabs, Mr Nehru is not
neutral at all; he is party, an open and covert supporter of the
Arab's designs."

Similarly, Dever, on 14 July 1957, described the
"true neutralism" practised by India as being built on lin-
guistic flexibility which "proclaims principles in theory..., but does not insist on their being carried out in practice."
"Mr Nehru not only ignores the clear decision of the Security
Council, but does not attempt to extract the root of the evil:
Egypt's refusal to recognize the existence of Israel.

Lack of diplomatic relations between India and Israel
and Israel's frustration at the failure of its various efforts
at establishing such relations was expressed poignantly by
Mr. Baker when on 24 November 1959, while commenting on Nehru's
statement on relations between India and Israel, it said:
"Mr Nehru's statement for the first time shows the full measure of
his hypocrisy." After mentioning the efforts made by various
representatives of the labour parties to meet with Mr Nehru the
paper declares: "We do not know how many more slips in the
face we will have to receive from Nehru before we stop courting
him."
But there was always a fond hope that India will one day change its policy and will have friendly relations with Israel. Thus commenting on Nehru’s discussions with Eisenhower in December 1959, Ha’atzofeh in its issue of 14 December 1959 stated that though Nehru has until now “shown no understanding of Israel’s struggle”, India’s struggle with China is bringing about changes in Indian policy. “We are witnessing a decisive change in values in India’s policy towards the Soviet-Eastern world and because of this there is a possibility that she may change her attitude towards the Arab world and show more understanding of Israel’s position.”

The same hope was expressed by Lemerhay on 11 January 1962: “The military and political dispute between China and India and the subsequent internal changes in India may create the possibility for new developments in the relations between New Delhi and Jerusalem.” Expressing its optimism of the new situation the paper said: “The new situation would seem to justify a renewed effort on Israel’s part to put her relations with India on a more stable and stronger basis than they have been until now.”

But India’s relations with Israel never improved and even on Nehru’s death Israeli Press, though it paid handsome tribute to him, never forgave him for his attitude towards Israel.

Further in March 1966, when the Israeli President Shazar was on his way to visit Nepal, he was not accorded reception due to a Reqd of a State, during his stop-over in India. The whole of Israeli Press was very critical about India’s behaviour.
Thus, in spite of these various ups and downs, Israeli press has always been advocating for strengthening relations between Israel and the Afro-Asian countries.

But, for the first time the Israeli press seemed to have taken a very tough line when they commented on OAU's call (February 1968) for Israel's unconditional withdrawal. Even the independent Haaretz, which normally takes a very objective and unbiased attitude towards any particular issue, came out strongly with the comment that "it is time that Israel continues her relations with the Afro-Asian countries on the basis of reciprocity... We should give them to understand that Israel is not prepared to continue to dedicate efforts and knowledge, energy and money to their development, if in exchange she receives anti-Israeli demonstrations."

Gehel's Ha'Yom came out with its usual scathing criticism of the government and the tone of assertion was distinctly discernible; "Gehel believes that the OAU resolution takes the backbone out of the political theories built up over the years by the architects of Israel's regime, who wanted to regard Israel 'as an intrinsic part of the Afro-Asian region,' despite the fact that the majority of its Jewish population was linked with West European culture. The paper concluded: "The time has come for those who are advocating Israel's integration in the Afro-Asian world, to draw the necessary conclusion."

Ha'tzofeh said:
Iven if the representatives of those African states that maintain friendly relations with Israel claim that they did not oppose the anti-Israeli resolution, proposed by Algeria because they realize that a resolution passed by the UN has no value and is not liable to cause real harm to Israel, we ought not to pass over their behaviour in silence.

The 

ime also commented in the same vein: "The time has come to drive home to our friends in Africa that we are not prepared for a one-sided friendship and that anti-Israeli resolutions are incompatible with the cordial relations prevailing between us."

The urge and pleading for assertion is only too clear. 

Lerner also follows the same line but warns against any hasty actions by the Government of Israel. Thus on 3 March 1963, it said:

Perhaps the time has come for Israel to be more selective in her aid to, and cooperation with certain countries of the African continent. However, it would be a grave mistake, if not downright folly, to sever the ramified links which Israel has forged in Africa with great effort and persistence for more than ten years and to abandon this continent to the hostile influence of the Arab States.

Davie's stand is equally assertive: "Israel must demand from her friends in Africa - those who dissociated themselves from the resolution and those who refrained from supporting it - that they clarify their stand and put the Secretary's distorted and tendentious statements in the right light."

Thus, it appears that the Israeli Press wants to impress upon the Government that it is time that the Government
of Israel asserts itself. And that may be, because of the fact that Israel has consolidated its military position in the Middle East and its survival and security is, for the time being at least, not in danger.

But that has not made the Israeli Press to deviate from its stand about the continuation of Israeli assistance to the Afro-Asian countries of the Third World. The Israeli Press simply wants the Israeli Government to tell these countries that Israel should not just be taken for granted.

Attitude of the Israeli Academicians towards Israel's relations with the Countries of the Third World

"University teachers in Israel are more politically active than their colleagues in most competitive polities. Many are members of parties, a few of the Knesset as well." 41 But as far as Israel's relations with the Third World countries are concerned not many academicians have been very articulate during the period under discussion (up to 1968). As a matter of fact: "The School Curriculum in History and geography practically ignores Asia (and Africa), and concentrates almost exclusively on Europe. Only recently were Asian (and African) studies introduced at Israeli universities. The Hebrew University pioneered and it is now being followed by other institutions of higher education." 42

41. Michael Brecher, n. 1, p. 168.
42. Heron Medzini, "Reflections on Israel's Asian Policy", Midstream (New York), vol. 18, no. 6, June-July 1972, p. 32.
It may be noted in this connection that compared to the huge amount of literature available on Israel's Foreign Policy in general, scanty little is available with regard to Israel's relations with the Third World. And of the literature that is available on the subject, some portion is written by the Government officials - and Government's attitude we have been talking all along - and some literature is available in the newspapers like Jerusalem Post and Ha'aretz. But we have also talked about the attitude of the Press towards Israel's relations with the Third World. Moreover, some articles relating to this subject that have appeared in the magazine New Outlook (Tel-Aviv), normally take the Mapam-approach to the subject - and we have already talked about Israeli Political Parties' attitude to the Third World.

It is true that in Israeli academicians have been active in articulating their opinion in various policy matters, like they did in 1962 when some twenty scholars mostly from the Hebrew University, urged "the Israeli public to act while there is still time against this terrible eventuality (nuclear weapon in the Middle East)."42a Similarly, in 1966 also, in an open letter, 170 faculty members, from the various universities of Israel, criticized Government's economic aid negotiations with Germany as presenting the Jewish tragedy "in a manner lacking self-

42a. New Outlook (Tel Aviv), vol. 5, no. 4 (44), May 1962, p. 12.
But on no occasion have the Israeli academicians, as a group, articulated their views about Israel's relations with the Third World. Moreover, one interesting point that may be mentioned in this connection is that when the present writer approached some prominent Israeli academicians who have been working on Israel and also on the Middle East, they requested to be excused saying that they are not competent to talk on the subject. The fact is that the Israeli academicians have normally been so much obsessed with the problem of Israel's survival and the problem of peace in the Middle East that very few academicians have turned their attention towards Israel's relations with the Third World countries. Ultimately, in our search to find out Israeli academicians who have articulated their views on the Third World through articles, books, radio- and television interviews, public lectures etc. - and whose views are taken note of by the Ministry for External Affairs, we could find eight scholars whose views may be regarded as 'input' into the decision-making process of Israel's policy towards the Third World. Apart from consulting all the materials that these scholars have written on the subject, the present writer had interviewed all of them. Our discussion in this section is primarily based on the writer's interviews with these eight scholars.


42c. In Israel, there are three academic type groups interested in foreign policy. They are: the Israel Political Science Association, the Foreign Policy Association, and the Institute for International Problems.
They are: Professor Z.Y. Hershlag, Head of the Department of Developing Countries, Faculty of Social Sciences, Tel-Aviv University; Professor Dan Avni Segre of the Van Leer Institute, Jerusalem, Dr. Levtzion, Head of the Department of African Studies, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, and Dr. (Miss) Gittelson and Mrs. Naomi Chazan, Lecturers in the same Department of the same University; and Dr. Kerem Medzini, Dr. Ran Kochan and Dr. Rudner from the Department of Asian Studies at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. All these scholars have quite a few publications to their credit in their respective fields of specialization. They are generally asked to comment on topics related to Asia and Africa by the Kol Yisrael (Israel Radio) and the Israeli Television. All of them contribute articles to the Israeli newspapers. Professor Hershlag has edited a research project entitled "Israel-Africa-Cooperation", which has now been published in a book form. 

Professor Hershlag and Professor Segre differed in their opinions when we wanted to know from them the relative weight of "altruistic motives" as compared with "self-interest oriented motivations" in Israel's massive diplomatic involvement and co-operation programmes with the Third World countries. To Professor Hershlag, the Israeli co-operation programme is

42d. Z.Y. Hershlag, ed., Israel-Africa Cooperation, Research Project, Progress Report, Department of Developing Countries, Tel-Aviv University, Tel Aviv, 1970.
highly motivated by genuine altruistic feelings which sometimes even override strict pragmatic interests. Professor Segre, on the other hand, believes that the motivation, essentially is political - 'to win friends and influence people'. Both the Professors talked of strategic, economic, emotional and political motives; but they differed in priorities, though Professor Hershlag firmly opined that "there is no all-purpose list of priorities; the order of priorities must be flexible and adapted to the changing conditions of both Israel and the recipient countries". To Professor Segre, the desire to get out of Israel's isolation (including economic blockade by the Arabs) in the world was another prime motive for Israel's going out to the countries of the Third World.

On the question of why Israel has failed to have major diplomatic breakthrough in Asia, both the Professors came out with the oft-repeated arguments like Asians' lack of knowledge about the Jewish connection with Palestine; Asians' perception of Zionism not as a nationalist movement but as an imperialist one; insignificant number of Jewish population in the Asian countries; absence of anti-semitism in Asia etc. Both of them opined that "probably the Zionists had no other option but to align themselves with the colonialist Powers in the initial stages of their movement,"

Professor Hershlag and Professor Segre are of the opinion that in return for her assistance, Israel expects
some response favourable to her, from the Third World countries in the political sphere. When pointed out that that does not speak of "altruistic motives" Professor Hershlag said that Israel would continue her assistance even if the response of the Third World is not favourable to Israel in the political sphere.

Asked to comment on non-alignment and the role of the non-aligned countries in World Politics, both the Professors expressed their doubt as to whether these countries could really play a positive role in international relations. All the same, they said, the existence of a non-aligned group of countries is a fact of the present international scene and there is no reason why Israel should not try to get into this group; after all, they feel, Israel is more 'non-aligned' than many of the non-aligned countries. While pointed out that Israel's stand on racialism, colonialism etc. does not coincide with the non-aligned countries, Professor Segre replied that after 1962, Israel's stand on these issues has been very clear.

As for how far Bandung debacle was responsible for Israel's massive diplomatic offensive in Africa, the two Professors widely differed in their opinions: "When Israel with her 2 million inhabitants, found herself singled out at the Bandung Conference of 1955 as the major danger for 2 billion Afro-Asians, most of the African States were not yet born. It was understandable, therefore, that the
Government of Israel should try to establish friendly rela-
tions with the peoples of that continent", said Professor
Segre. But Professor Hershlag maintained that "Bandung or
no-Bandung, Israel would have gone to Africa in any
case".

Talking about Israel's military aid to the Third
World, Professor Hershlag maintained that, if the military
factor were the dominant motive for Israel's co-operation
with the Third World countries, the highest priority should
have been assigned to the East African States due to their
possible role in the Israeli-Egyptian conflict; but Israel
has been extending assistance to all the countries who have
asked for it. He feels that Nahal and Gadna could profi-
tably be used in these countries.

As to the role of the Third World countries to bring
about a settlement of the Arab-Israeli dispute, both the
Professors expressed doubt about such a possibility. "In
order to have peace in the Middle East, both the parties
involved in the dispute will have to talk to each other.
Israel will only be glad if the Third World countries make
the Arabs talk to Israel", said Professor Segre.

Both the Professors again agree on the point that
Israel's programme of co-operation has paid her well in the
political sphere. "Israeli efforts at co-operation in Afro-
Asia met with some measure of success and much talk about
success. On the political level, Israel used the African vote at the UN to help neutralize that of the pro-Arab Communist bloc while an increasing number of African countries turned to Israel for military expertise", said Professor Segre. Further, Professor Segre maintained that after the June War of 1967, relations between Israel and the Third World are deteriorating for a couple of reasons, prominent among them being "Israel's demand for frontier changes which touched on the sacrosanct principle of the holiness of the 'colonial frontiers' of the African States, included in the Charter of the O.A.U."

And finally, both the Professors believe that for her national interest Israel should continue to make efforts to have friendly relations with the countries of the Third World.

Now, all the three teachers from the Department of African Studies of the Hebrew University, Dr. Levtzion, Dr Gittelson and Mrs Chazan believe like Professor Segre that Israel's massive diplomatic involvement and co-operation programme are motivated primarily by the desire to "win friends and influence people". They agree that the "Arab factor" was always in the minds of the Israeli policy makers. So, in order to "jump over the Arab fence", Israel put meticulous efforts to have friendly relations with these countries. All three of them are of the view that the minimum Israel expects, is to have a "presence" in Africa so that the African countries can see the Israeli point of view in any issue and Israel's peculiar position in the Middle East. So, thwarting Arab propaganda is also a factor. Further, to break Israel's
isolation in the world, it was necessary to have as many friends as possible. So Israel made an effort to establish diplomatic relations with these countries along with their independence. They further agree that Israel policy makers never overlooked the vast economic potentiality of having relations with these countries. On the humanitarian aspect, Levtzion tends to put greater emphasis than Dr Gittelson and Mrs Chazan.

All three of them again are of the same opinion that in return for Israel's co-operation, assistance and aid, Israel just needs friendship. While asked "friendship for friendship's sake?" Dr Levtzion replied that the very concept of friendship is the result of a feeling of insecurity. Israel's quest for friendship should be looked at from this perspective.

As for role of the non-aligned Third World countries, Dr Levtzion and Dr Gittelson feel that they cannot play a significant role in international relations. Mrs Chazan thinks that their influence is not negligible. But all three of them said, with the same amount of emphasis, that Israel wants to get into the non-aligned world because it is genuinely non-aligned. The non-aligned countries can bring about peace in the Middle East by taking Israel in, and by doing so, they will let the Arabs know that Israel is a part of the Afro-Asian non-aligned group, and thus the Arabs will not be able just to throw Israel away. As for how far Bandung Conference was responsible for Israel's massive diplomatic efforts in Africa, Levtzion is of the opinion that there is no direct relation between Bandung and Israel's efforts in Africa. But both Mrs Chazan and Dr Gittelson believe that Bandung debacle for Israel was a major reason for Israel's major diplomatic offensive in Africa.
As for military aid they maintained that mobile and ground guns may be fruitfully used in Africa.

And finally, all three of them agree that Israel's diplomatic relations and the programme of co-operation have paid Israel well in the political level. Mrs Chezzen cited the example of the reactions of the African countries in the United Nations at the Fifth Special Emergency Session of the General Assembly in June-July 1967. According to her, the mere fact that twenty of the thirty-two African delegations did support Israel's position indicates that Israel's efforts have paid off.

Now, to find out the attitude of Israeli academics towards Israel's relations with Asia, Dr Medzini, Dr Ron Kochar and Dr Rudner from the Department of Asian Studies at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, were interviewed.

Dr Medzini was critical of the government saying that "after so many years of Israel's ties with Asia, there is still a tendency in Israel to give this continent a low priority". But all three of them tend to agree, in general, with the line the government has pursued. Even Dr Medzini, speaking about the earlier period of Israel's relations with Asia, said that "under the circumstances prevailing at that time, may be, the things could not have been otherwise".

All the three teachers maintained that Israeli policy makers could see that salvation did not lie with the Third World. All the ingredients necessary for Israel's survival and
continuation as a sovereign independent country - fragments, economic help, Jews and political support - come from the West. Moreover, there was the simple physical human lack of contest. There are practically no Jews in Asia. So, all of Israel's efforts had to be diverted towards the West. Further there was an a priori psychological inclination on the part of the Israeli elite and Israeli political elite to associate themselves with the more advanced West. Thus, the Third World could not possibly have come to gain a prominent priority in the calculations of the Israeli policy makers.

But at the same time they maintain that it would be wrong to state that the Third World was ignored. After all, Israel made serious attempts to have good relations with India and Burma. It was thought that India would be a gate for penetration into Asia because the Israeli policy makers looked upon India as a power par excellence. As for Burma, Dr. Reh Kohen maintained that it was a "historical accident". His assessment is that "it was a love-affair. It ended like a love-affair."

Talking about the motives behind Israel's assistance programmes to the Third World countries of Asia, all three agreed that the primary reason is to win friends and influence people. They maintain that the political reason is dominating but there are other motives also. Then all three of them talked about the "missionary" zeal of the Jews. Then there was the pride in unique Israeli achievement. Israel thought that the ability to offer assistance to these countries was
the only field in which it had an advantage over the Arabs.

Further, the economic benefits that might accrue out of friendly relations with these countries was also a major factor — there was the possibility of Israeli trade getting stimulated, but the primary factor was political. Israel wanted to get out of the political isolation and to jump over the Arab fence. It also wanted to enhance its international prestige.

All three are of the same opinion that in return for Israel’s assistance programme, Israel does not expect much from these third world countries except this friendship.

As for the non-alignment of the Third World countries, to Dr Kochen “it is a convenient gimmick”; to Dr Rudner “it is a big bluff” and Dr Medzini does not think it to be a “force for peace” nor is it a stabilizing factor. But, all the same, Israel wants to get into the society of these non-aligned countries. Why? According to Dr Medzini, Israel’s foreign policy is dominated by the Arab factor. Thus acceptance by the non-aligned society would mean the acceptance by the Arabs. So, to find a way to the Arab world, Israel wants to get into the society of the non-aligned countries. Dr Rudner sees no reason why Israel should not be in. It is a question of identification - Israel has no choice. Dr Ran Kochen maintained that Israel wanted to get into the society of non-aligned countries because Israel is non-aligned. But, as a matter of fact, Israel gave up the attempt after the Belgrade Conference in 1961.
All the three teachers said that they do not think that Israel's friendship with the Third World countries will bring about a solution to the Arab-Israeli dispute. Dr Ren Kochen thinks that the Third World countries are "too weak, too pre-occupied with their own problems, and too disinterested in the Middle East problem". Further, they are too aware of the limited role they can play in the Middle East conflict. Moreover, substantial number of countries have preconceived opinion that they support the Arabs without any other considerations. Dr Medzini.. thinks that the hostility of the Arab countries may be blunted, and the Arabs may be persuaded by these countries to be more moderate but they will not be able to bring about a solution. Rudner says: "I have given up hopes; they refuse to be involved."

As for the place of Bandung Conference and the Sinoi expedition in Israel's efforts to have friendly relations with the Third World, Dr Kochen stated that Bandung brought the awareness of the existence of the Third World to the Israeli public at large. Israelis could see the potential growing importance of these countries in the international arena - Israeli public realized that there is something else also in the world apart from the West. As for Dr Rudner, "Bandung was the landmark of disappointment. Israel for the first time was confronted with the reality of frustration and fatalism." To Dr Medzini. Bandung showed that "another avenue to reach the Arabs was closed. It was a crude blow - it created a negative image of the Third World in the Israeli mind."
Talking about the Sinai campaign, Dr. Medzini said:

It is ironical, but Israel's brilliant victory in the Sinai war, more than any other factor, raised her prestige in Asia. In spite of the wave of protests that poured from Asian capitals, and UN denunciations, Asian leaders were impressed. Israel's impressive military gains, more than her achievements in science, industry, agriculture, the cooperative movement, the Kibbutz and the Moshav, influenced the leaders of the smaller Asian countries to turn to Israel. 43

All the three agree that Israel's relations with the Third World countries have enhanced its international standing.

Further, all the three teachers agree that in spite of occasional disappointments that Israel has to suffer from these countries from time to time, it will be in Israel's interest to continue to make efforts to have friendly relations with these countries. And all the three teachers agree that India's refusal to have diplomatic relations with Israel has been a major setback for Israeli diplomacy in Asia and they believe that unless vital changes of circumstances take place in the Middle East, Indo-Israeli relationship is not likely to improve.

**Israeli Students' opinion about Israel's relations with the Third World**

In order to find out Israeli Students' opinion about the country's relations with the Third World countries of Asia and Africa, an opinion survey was conducted by the present writer. Our decision to have a survey of the Students' opinion regarding Israel's relations with the Third World was based on the facts:

43. Meron Medzini, n. 42, p. 29.
(1) All the students who come to the University have the right to vote.

(2) All the students who come to the University do so after undergoing three years of compulsory military training (service). Thus, by the time they come to the University, they normally form their own political opinion.

(3) Israeli students, like the Israeli public, are politically very conscious.

(4) The opinions of the students of the University are informed opinions. For all these reasons, their opinion will be an input into Israel's foreign policy decisions.

44. A questionnaire was prepared for this purpose. Our problem was to whom should we give the questionnaire, that is, how to find out a cross-section of the Israeli students which will be the true representative Israeli students' opinion. After prolonged discussions with a number of Professors from the Hebrew University, it was decided that the students of the four universities of Israel, namely, the Hebrew University, Tel-Aviv University, Haifa University, and the Bar-Ilan University, will represent the students' opinion of the entire student community of the country.

The response to our survey was very enthusiastic. It proved our contention that Israeli students are politically very conscious.

In answer to the questionnaire, it was revealed that in general the students knew about Asia and Africa, had some ideas about the cultural and political development of these countries, and the students seemed to have realised these countries' political influence in the international arena, and in the UN. And, all the students know about the Department of International Co-operation in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs - that this Department manages Israel's assistance programmes for the developing countries.
Israeli students were almost unanimous (95%) in holding the opinion that Israel offers assistance to the Afro-Asian countries because of political reasons. The same percentage of students held the opinion that they favour giving aid to these countries. In return, they want friendship from these countries. There were very few students who spoke of economic reasons and Israel's desire to be "light unto nations" in connection with Israel's assistance to these countries.

Further, some of them did not favour Israeli assistance to the developing countries because these countries have taken anti-Israeli stands on various occasions; but they are a minuscule minority. The overwhelming majority of the students are for extending aid to these countries and for political reasons.

As for whether Israel has benefited from this assistance programme to the Afro-Asian countries, fifty six percent students believe that Israel has "somewhat" been benefited. Twenty six per cent of the students believe that Israel has been rebuffed. Eleven per cent believe that Israel has not been benefited and seven per cent believe that the assistance programme has benefited Israel.

The Israeli students are further almost unanimous (93%) in holding the opinion that they do not consider the Third World countries either as a force for peace or as a potential force for peace.
As for military aid to those countries, opinion was divided almost on three distinct lines. Twenty-nine per cent of the students believe that the image of Israel in the minds of the Afro-Asian countries, with regard to military assistance that Israel gave, is that of a friendly country sharing its know-how. Thirty two per cent of the students believed that it would create an image of Israel as a country pursuing its self-interest in countering Arab influence. And thirty one per cent of the students said that the image is of a country demonstrating its military efficiency. The rest of the students believed that this will create an image of Israel as an imperialistic country.

Most of the Israeli students believe (69%) that not much economic benefit will accrue from Israel relations with these countries. Twenty six per cent of the students thought that fairly well amount of economic benefit will accrue from Israel's relations with these countries. Fifty three per cent of the students think that Israel's continued assistance will help it to get into the Afro-Asian bloc of countries. Forty-two per cent think that it might probably help. Rest are of the opinion that it would not help.

It is true that the influence of a party's opinion (or for that matter of the Press or of the academicians or of the students), is at no time decisive. But the opinions of the parties, the Press, the academicians and the students of Israel (as discussed above), all taken together constitute a vital input into the foreign policy system of Israel.