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OVERVIEW

The chief aim of this work is to increase our understanding of the downfall of White South Africa and especially the seemingly all-pervasive role of the Jews, particularly in the post-1948 period. The history of modern South Africa can be viewed as a history of group competition. More specifically it is a history that has been dominated by the competition of ethnic groups. For that reason this work begins by exploring apartheid as a White, and specifically Afrikaner, group strategy. This work then explores the role of the Jews in the anti-apartheid movement and particularly within the opposition parties, the media, the Communist Party, and among the Black African nationalists.

This work challenges a rising cacophony of voices alleging that the West, and Whites in particular, have committed “suicide.” Whether it’s Paul Gottfried’s “decaying Protestantism,”¹ or Eric Kaufmann’s “liberal Anglo-Protestant elites, in conjunction with pro-immigration business interests,”² the message seems to be the same: Whites have done this to ourselves with little outside influence. Likewise Ilana Mercer alleged that “White Protestant societies don’t just die: they either wither from within.”³ Or, like South Africa, they are finished off by other White Protestant societies.

The reality is more complex. This work challenges any “verdict” that White ethnic groups have “committed suicide.”

The problem with such assertions of ‘White guilt’ is that White ethnic groups have in the past had powerful group identities and created social controls to maintain them. This was especially true in the case of South Africa. Further, how can it be “suicide” if indeed the Jews, who never belonged to a ‘White’ ethnic group, played a prominent role?

Unsurprisingly, the voices accusing Whites of bearing sole responsibility share one thing in common: they are almost always Jewish. If one recognizes the large role that Jewish groups have played in sabotaging of White society and delegitimizing its very right to exist, it becomes clear that Jewish individuals do indeed have a powerful incentive to downplay their own collective responsibility.

THE AFRIKANERS ASSUME CONTROL.

The National Party’s electoral victory of 1948 swept aside the English-speaking elite and initiated a half-century of Afrikaner leadership. The Afrikaner people went from a largely rural and blue-collar population to one that swiftly assumed leadership over all of South Africa. But this ethnic leadership did not go unchallenged.

The stakes for control of South Africa were high. As of 1981, this moderately sized nation possessed 86% of the world’s reserves of platinum group metals, 83% of chrome ore reserves, 64% of vanadium reserves, 49% of gold reserves, 48% manganese ore reserves, and 17% of uranium reserves. These percentages, combined with those of the former Soviet Union, formed nearly the entire world’s reserves of platinum group metals, vanadium, and manganese ore.4

The National Party, as already mentioned, was largely a political vehicle of the Afrikaner people. Its rise to power was preceded by the work of a private society known as the Broederbond which worked towards the expansion of Afrikaner influence. As noted by Alexander Steward,

the National party is unlike democratic parties elsewhere which speak for sections of the electorate or are motivated by particular social or economic goals. The National party is the volk in political action. The allegiance of the Afrikaner to his party is thus different from that of the Tory or Socialist or Liberal to his in Brit-
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ain, or of the Republican or Democratic to his in the United States. The party is not the instrument of the government or the parliamentary caucus or the professionals. It belongs to the volk: and unity does not come from monolithic regimentation or imperative blueprints, but from individual participation in the common cause of promoting the interests of Afrikanerdom. The party is not judged by its members against success or failure in reaching specific objectives: the touchstone is the well-being of the volk: and while that is being served, specific objectives may be revised, altered or abandoned.5

The Afrikaners, it will be argued, were pursuing a group strategy. Most simply they did so by engaging in “separation between themselves and other groups.”6 Further, they developed a “minimalization of conflicts of interest within the group.”7 In establishing various laws regarding marriage, residency, and political affiliation, they had also established effective group controls on individual behavior.8

Despite this legislation, South Africa did not function as a new “Reich,” as Jewish critics would later accuse..9 Apartheid critic Helen Suzman recalled, “It is perhaps ironic that a government as authoritarian as that of the National Party had a deeply rooted respect for the parliamentary system which provided me with a forum to challenge their policies and elicit information”10 And regarding Jews, apart from pre-apartheid immigration quotas enacted in the 1930s, “...there was no legislative discrimination against them.”11

The Afrikaners enjoyed the privileges of being White that had long been a part of South Africa. However, at the end of the Second World War approximately 73% of Afrikaners were in blue-collar occupations,
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manual labor, or agriculture while only 27% were in white-collar occupations. In 1939, it was estimated that Afrikaner control of commerce, mining, finance, and industry was only 8%, 1%, 5%, and 3%, respectively.

The social and economic standing of Afrikaners would change tremendously under apartheid. Following their political victory, the Afrikaners began a campaign of lifting their people out of blue-collar occupations and rural poverty. By 1977, the percentage of Afrikaners in White-collar occupations had risen to 65.2%. By 1964, Afrikaner control of Commerce, Mining, Finance, and Industry had increased to 28%, 10%, 14%, and 10% respectively. By 1975, 20.8% of private businesses (excluding farms), 18% of mines, and 38% of all posts in the professions were in Afrikaner hands. The Afrikaner insurance group Sanlam was now challenging the Anglo-American Corporation as the most powerful company in South Africa. The civil service, long the exclusive domain of English-speakers, had by the 1970s become 90% Afrikaans.

It was during this new period of Afrikaner leadership that the word apartheid became well-known. Many of the policies attributed to apartheid had in fact predated the term and were employed long prior to the National Party takeover. For instance, interracial marriages between Europeans and Black Africans had long been illegal in South Africa. During apartheid this would be expanded to apply to any a marriage between White and non-White.

Other legislation, such as the Group Areas Act of 1950, could also be seen in the context of appeasing poor Whites. This policy set aside areas of “residence, occupation, and trade” along racial lines. Its immediate purpose was to buy the vote of working-class Whites who often lived in racially mixed areas with colo reds, Blacks, and Asians.
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But apartheid was meant to go further. Dr. H. F. Verwoerd, third Prime Minister of South Africa in the post-1948 period, articulated that apartheid’s aim was to establish the total separation of races into their respective “homelands” over a period of decades. This would be complemented by a program of “separate development” within both White and Black areas that would make the system viable. He stated in the senate debates of 1948, “I want to state here unequivocally now...that South Africa is a White man’s country and he must remain the master here. In the Reserves we are prepared to allow the natives to be the masters... But within the European areas we, the White people of South Africa, are and shall remain the masters.”

His conception of separate development would enable Whites to retain, and even strengthen, their control within a majority of South Africa’s territory.

Taking into account the importance of Black labor to South African industries, Prime Minister Verwoerd outlined three stages. In the first stage of apartheid the movement of Black labor into White areas would be allowed to continue, thereby supplying the demands of industry. The influx of Black labor would stop once these demands had been adequately “saturated.” In the third stage, Whites would begin to replace Blacks as the primary source of labor in their respective areas and the Black population would be gradually repatriated into African homelands officially recognized by the South African government.

In response to accusations that the policies of apartheid would be economically unsound, Minister of Labor B. J. Schoeman replied, “What is our first consideration? Is it to maintain the economic laws or is it to ensure the continued existence of the European race in this country?”

But under Prime Minister Verwoerd, South Africa would achieve what some had called impossible. South Africa more than doubled its GNP and the economy was booming.

In 1961 it was argued that the colored South Africans, or mixed race persons, should be represented in parliament by coloreds themselves rather than Whites. On this issue Dr. Verwoerd believed that such
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small concessions would pave the way to full racial integration. He argued, “It is easy for this generation to protect itself. It is easy during the course of the next ten or fifteen years by means of gradual concessions, to continue living as always in the past, making money and being prosperous and avoiding unrest. But what then? Are not the children who come after us worth more than ourselves? The question we must ask is, what will happen to South Africa afterwards?”

However, not all of Africa was experiencing such growth. In 1958 there were only three independent African states. By the end of 1961 there were 26. Some African countries ceased to have any government whatsoever. Entire areas that had formerly been productive European colonies were now sliding into chaos. In 1960 Verwoerd urged White South Africans to support his policies by warning that, “If we do not take this step now, we ourselves may possibly, but our children certainly, will experience all the suffering of the Whites who are being attacked in and driven out of one African territory after the other.”

In the face of rising challenges to White inhabitants of Africa it became necessary for the Afrikaner-dominated National Party to issue appeals to the White population as a whole. In 1970 Whites comprised approximately 18% of the total population of South Africa. Of this, only 60% were Afrikaner. At a 1961 party congress Dr. Verwoerd stated, “I see the National Party not as an Afrikaans party, whatever it might have been in the past. I see it as a party which stands for the preservation of the White man, of White government, in South Africa.” Indeed, the National Party would soon be winning landslide elections among the all-White electorate. In the 1977 general elections the National Party won 134 of the total 165 seats in parliament.

These “universalist” appeals would also extend somewhat to the non-White inhabitants of South Africa. The official line of the government was that apartheid, and more specifically “separate development”, were the best option for all groups within South Africa. According to South African Minister of Information Dr. C. P. Mulder, South Africa had an exemplary record of “peaceful coexistence, stability, economic growth, and high standard of living.” He further rea-
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soned, “that is the reason why we have checkpoints on our borders, not to prevent people from breaking out, but to prevent people from illegally entering... I have never heard of free people voluntarily trying to slip into a police state...”

It should be noted that these claims were not empty rhetoric. Foreign Minister Eric Louw publicly argued that South African Blacks had been making steady gains under apartheid. Their rate of literacy had increased, larger percentages were enrolled in schools, and the Baragwanath Hospital serving the Black and colored residents of Johannesburg was the largest of its kind in Africa. All of this was noted in his speech to the U. N. On 11 October 1961. But these facts were too much for the U. N. Delegates to handle, and following his speech the U. N. Assembly voted to censure him. Israel supported the censure, one of only two “Western” states to do so.

The United Nations issued a resolution against South Africa in 1961. In October 1961 the Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko declared, “Monstrous examples of the mockery of the most elementary human rights are to be found in the Republic of South Africa.” South African Foreign Minister Eric Louw denounced the accusers of South Africa as themselves being dictatorships and one-party states. In response to the mounting criticisms from abroad, Dr. Verwoerd stated, “The crux of the problem is whether it is more important to be in the good books of world opinion than it is to make up your own mind as to how best you can ensure your survival as a White race in this country?”

Despite foreign protests, Louw was correct. The consolidation of apartheid policies continued to benefit Black South Africans for years later. Real earnings for Blacks rose by 51.3% from 1970 to 1976. In comparison, the real earnings of Whites rose by only 3.8% during those same years. The critics of apartheid were only too eager to ignore, and indeed censor, these inconvenient facts.
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This era was by many standards the high point of apartheid. It had been primarily Dr. Verwoerd who had, by the mid-1960s, developed apartheid into a coherent ideological system. But the system was strongly challenged from certain sections and it is in this context that the Jewish population of South Africa must be introduced.

**THE JEWS OF SOUTH AFRICA**

The Jewish population of South Africa was descended largely from Lithuanian Jews, known as Litvaks. As early as 1911 the Jewish community in South Africa was highly urbanized, with approximately 90% of Jews living in urban areas. Throughout most of the 20th century, South African Jews hovered between 2% and 4% of the White population. This was well under 1% of the South African population as a whole. In 1948 the Jewish population was estimated at 118,000. Even in 1980 the Jewish population remained between 110,000 and 120,000 while the total population of the country grew from approximately 15 million to 25 million.

Jews arriving in South Africa had one clear advantage: they were White. In the presence of a Black African majority, the differences between Whites appeared marginal. As Helen Suzman’s biographer noted, “Jews, by virtue of being White, were ... members of [the] ruling elite.” Indeed, Jews such as Suzman and anti-apartheid journalist Benjamin Pogrund were raised with Black servants in their childhood homes.

Jews were most prominent in the professional, managerial, and sales sectors of the economy. In 1970 the percentage of the Jewish population in each category was 24%, 23.1%, and 30.5% respectively. This represented 5.5%, 10.6%, and 10.7% of the White population in each sector. Some of the nation’s most important businesses were
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either owned or administrated by Jews including the Premier Milling Group, Anglo American Corporation, and the Liberty Life insurance company.\textsuperscript{44}

The Jewish community was also extremely Zionist. Its contributions to Keren Hayesod, the central fundraising organization of Israel, were per capita second only to the United States.\textsuperscript{45} Even South African Communist leader Joe Slovo remembered that his community “tended to combine a passionate devotion to the Soviet Union with Zionism and vicious racism towards the majority of the South African population.”\textsuperscript{46} The Habonim, a Zionist youth movement, was quite active in South Africa.

For the most part, the Jewish community voted for mainstream liberals. In 1974 Jews voted 51\% for the Progressive Party, a left-liberal party that opposed apartheid, 35.7\% for the United Party, and only 12.5\% for the National Party. As years went by the United Party decreased in power due to challenges from both left and right with multiple party splits.\textsuperscript{47} By the late 1970s the party had disbanded completely.

\textbf{Jews in the Opposition Parties}

The legal opposition to apartheid came originally from the left wing of the United Party. In 1954 political columnist Neels Natte noted the high proportion of “foreign names” in the left wing of the party such as Woolf, Miller, Bielski, Weiss, Nestadt, Einstein, Emdin, Taurog, Kowarsky, Meyer, Eppel, Fisher, and Sive.\textsuperscript{48} In 1959 this faction split to form the Progressive Party. Among those who led the split from the United Party was Bernard Friedman, a United Party MP. Friedman campaigned as an independent after resigning his positions in 1955, losing his re-election to another Jewish candidate. Friedman played an active role in the 1959 party split.

For over a decade the sole parliamentary opposition to South Africa’s apartheid policies was Progressive Party MP Helen Suzman. She was a graduate of Witwatersrand University where she had studied economics. In her autobiography she mentions influential professors
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such as Hansi Pollak, Julius Lewin, and Herbert Frankel — all Jews. Frankel provided her with a tutorship at the university upon her graduation. Among her students was the future Communist leader Joe Slovo.49

In 1953 Suzman was quite unexpectedly phoned by Dr. Reggie Sidelsky to run for election in an unopposed parliamentary seat on behalf of the United Party.50 In office she was informed that Harry Oppenheimer, chairman of the Anglo American Corporation, was “interested in getting the so-called ‘liberal wing’ of the United Party activated.”51 After winning her seat, Suzman used the position to publicly criticize the South African government and its policies — frequently demanding better treatment of political prisoners and voting against proposed apartheid legislation.

As mentioned by Suzman, Harry Oppenheimer had used his influence to build up the left-wing of the United Party before the split. He would come to play an “important role behind the scenes in the United Party.”52 After the death of his father, Harry Oppenheimer became Chairman of Anglo American Corporation in 1957. In 1961 he gave open support to the Progressives by stating, “the best thing you can do is vote progressive.”53

At first glance the splitting of the United Party appeared to be a setback for anti-apartheid groups. Were not the left-liberals weaker having divided themselves from the United Party? Suzman explained herself in 1960, “We have made the break not to split the opposition but indeed to become the only opposition.”54 In effect, by identifying themselves as the sole legitimate opposition to the Nationalist Party, the Progressives under Friedman and Suzman could seize a monopoly on the political opposition, shifting it in whatever direction they chose. It would now be Suzman, not the United Party, who would enjoy the support of foreign sympathizers such as Robert Kennedy. In 1966, he wrote a letter of support to Suzman in which he stated, “You are an inspiration to all of us.”55
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In 1950 the Group Areas Act was passed. In basic terms it established residential areas for the various racial groups of South Africa.\textsuperscript{56} Years later Helen Suzman received a phone call from a White constituent informing her that an Indian family had moved into their neighborhood. This was completely illegal under the Group Areas Act and the constituent told Suzman take action. Suzman, replied, “And I tell you, sir, that you are a racist. And I must also tell you that I have agreed to support your neighbor’s application to remain where she is.”\textsuperscript{57}

In 1962 Suzman addressed a seminar at Columbia University and recognized one of her former students, Eduardo Mondlane. He informed her that he had been teaching at Syracuse University but was “going back to Mozambique to drive the Portuguese out of there.” He then added, “I will go to South Africa to drive the Whites out of there too.” Far from denouncing him as a racist, she quite simply replied, “Not so easy.”\textsuperscript{58}

Politician Harry Schwarz helped create the Mahlabatini Declaration of Faith in 1974 which led to another party split in 1975. Schwarz then left the United Party and founded the Reform Party. It soon merged with Suzman’s Progressive Party and became the Progressive Reform Party.\textsuperscript{59} The remainder of the United Party simply disbanded. The ‘liberalistic left wing’ of the former United Party then became virtually the only legal opposition to apartheid.

As seen earlier, the Jews had played a large role in left-wing circles that formed the early Progressive Party. They also predominated in the Party’s later years. In 1986 for instance, sixteen of their representatives on the Johannesburg City Council as well as the mayor were Jewish. As many as nineteen out of thirty-eight Progressive Party candidates in the country’s 1977 municipal elections were Jewish.\textsuperscript{60}

Despite these limited successes, Jews were never a numerically large population within South Africa, and their possibilities for direct political organization were thus limited. In fact, the percentage of Jews within the total population was relatively shrinking over the years but remained stable in absolute terms. In 1960 Jews comprised 3.7 per
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cent of the White population. In 1970 this fell to 3.1 percent and in 1980 fell further to 2.6%. However, other factors would amplify Jewish influence considerably.

**THE SOUTH AFRICAN CULTURE OF CRITIQUE**

South Africans were confused by the negative reaction to their country in America and Europe. “It is strange to find a mass of distortions about South Africa and its racial policy in Europe” wrote Dr. A. B. Du Preez. Why would the West condemn South Africa? It was one of the West’s staunchest anti-Communist allies. But, Dr. A. B. Du Preez began to uncover the truth when he found “time and again when the sources are probed, that the information is based on British newspaper reports.” He continued, “It transpired also that these false and misleading reports originated from South Africa itself.”

But the negative reports were also coming from a specific part of the South African press: the English-language press. Jan Burger noted, “Whenever the plight of Natives is brought to their notice, the English-language press, true to their tradition of fighting for the underdog, take up the cudgels on their behalf. This does not happen in the Afrikaans Press.” It cannot be stressed enough how hostile the English-language press was to South Africa. In 1957, South African Prime Minister Strijdom “described the English-language press as South Africa’s greatest enemy.” Even supporters of South Africa had to rely upon reports originating in the highly critical English-language press of South Africa.

The role of the English-language press would play a huge role in shaping world opinion of South Africa and its policies. As David Harrison wrote,

For years the English newspapers had chronicled the errors and abuses of Apartheid; for years they had backed the parliamentary opposition, giving them a hearing far beyond their numbers. Since most visitors, tourists, businessmen, politicians and journalists were unable to read Afrikaans, many of the impres-
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sions they carried away with them were those they found in the English press.\(^\text{66}\)

By 1973 plans had been made by members of the South African government to establish pro-South African newspapers in English. The covert effort was an attempt to build better relations with foreign countries that had been turned against South Africa. A major scandal erupted when this effort was exposed.\(^\text{67}\) Prime Minister Vorster and others were implicated in the scandal and forced to step down.

But who owned the English-language press of South Africa? Surprisingly, it was largely owned and controlled by Jews. South African journalist Irwin Manoim stated in a 1995 interview,

> The interesting thing is that the media in this town was originally Jewish. The Argus Company was started by a Jew called Saul Solomon and the Rand Daily Mail by a Jew called Freeman Cohen. I know all this because I did my Master’s degree on the history of journalism in South Africa. A key period during the 1930s was when Isidore Schlesinger started a rival company to take on Argus. Schlesinger ran the media in South Africa — cinema, music; he was our local approximation of those three Jews who have just taken over America — Spielberg, Katzenberg and Geffen.”\(^\text{68}\)

Indeed, it is difficult to find information on South Africa’s anti-apartheid movement without consulting Jewish sources. At one point, the Argus Group controlled 17 of 20 English-language newspapers. It was owned by Anglo American.\(^\text{69}\) Many of these sources are quite congratulatory on the role of the Jewish press in undermining South Africa’s security and public image. In Richard Pollak’s work on the role of the press in South Africa he accuses the state-controlled South African Broadcasting Corporation of being “a one-channel propaganda machine.” Meanwhile, he lauds the Jewish newspapers in their effort to “stand almost alone between the Afrikaner government and
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totalitarian darkness.”\textsuperscript{70} The government-controlled television corporation, says Pollak, was a “cyclops of the state” offering “one part news to three parts propaganda.”\textsuperscript{71}

As early as 1897 South African Olive Schreiner had written a “screech disguised as a novel” titled \textit{Trooper Peter Halket of Mashonaland}. The purpose of the novel was to portray European, especially British, imperialism in Africa under Cecil Rhodes as the rule of blood-thirsty tyrants. This novel was to become the \textit{Uncle Tom’s Cabin} of the British anti-imperialist movement.\textsuperscript{72} Although Stefan Kanfer identified Schreiner as having Jewish origins, her father was a Lutheran convert from Germany and her precise ethnic background seems unclear. It is clear, however, that Jewish activists later promoted her work. Olive Schreiner’s biography would be co-written by Ruth First, the daughter of South African Communist Party treasurer Julius First.

Ms. First was a contributor to \textit{The Guardian}, a South African newspaper. It would become “a central part of the liberation movement” in South Africa.\textsuperscript{73} Among its contributors were, besides First, Brian Bunting, Michael Harmel, and Lionel Forman.\textsuperscript{74} The four-page editorials were written by Jack Simons.\textsuperscript{75} In contrast to this large Jewish presence at the paper, the first editor-in-chief was journalist Betty Radford. She was the wife of George Sacks who had helped found the paper with Ray Alexander.\textsuperscript{76} Much of the \textit{Guardian}’s support came from Jewish traders and shopkeepers who provided the paper’s initial funding.\textsuperscript{77} The \textit{Guardian} would appear under various names until it was finally banned in 1963. It was “the sole newspaper allied with the African National Congress.”\textsuperscript{78}

Nadine Gordimer, who had written the foreword to a later edition of Ruth First’s biography of Olive Schreiner, would criticize apartheid in her own novels. Born to Jewish parents, she was awarded the 1991
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Nobel Prize in Literature in part for “taking the question of the justification of the privileges of White people — even benevolent White people — to its extreme.”

For years the policies of apartheid were challenged by the Rand Daily Mail. Like virtually all of the English-language press in South Africa, it was owned by the Anglo American Corporation, controlled by the Oppenheimer family. As the years went on the Rand Daily Mail suffered from declining White readership due to its highly critical stance on South African apartheid. As anti-apartheid activist Gill Marcus articulated in an interview, “You need to create a societal norm, or community norm, that reinforces the right to take positions that are not necessarily popular.”

Editor Laurence Gandar would be chosen lead the Mail in a campaign against apartheid. Surprisingly, Gandar was a soft-spoken man, shy and reserved. Many on the staff of the Rand Daily Mail attributed this to a kind of ‘coldness’ from Mr. Gandar. He was not viewed in any way as a “courageous visionary” set upon launching a campaign against South African apartheid. Gandar had been recruited from the public relations department of the Anglo-American Corporation. When Mail journalist Benjamin Pogrund told Anglo-American Chairman Harry Oppenheimer about Gandar’s plan to launch an anti-apartheid campaign, Oppenheimer commented, “Oh, is Laurie going to show some courage?” Interestingly, like Betty Radford, Gandar was another non-Jew heading a paper largely owned and staffed by Jews.

Benjamin Pogrund was one of the more notable journalists working for the Rand Daily Mail. Highly conscious of his Jewishness, Pogrund had been a member of the Habonim in his youth and maintained a strong Jewish identity. He remembered his parents’ friends had been exclusively Jewish with the exception of a few customers who stopped by their house. After graduating from university he was attracted to
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the liberal disposition of the Rand Daily Mail and convinced his friend, American journalist Hank Margolies, to secure an interview via one of his contacts on the staff. Margolies “delivered an embarrassingly flattering spiel” despite knowing very little about Pogrund.\textsuperscript{86}

In 1960 Pogrund highlighted police brutality in his coverage of the so-called Sharpeville Massacre. As thousands of protestors converged on a police station and hurled stones, South African police opened fire and killed dozens. As he approached the area, Pogrund’s own vehicle came under attack from rioters and was forced off the road. Sharpeville proved to be a major embarrassment for South Africa. In Pogrund’s words, “a generation grew up identifying Sharpeville with apartheid repression.”\textsuperscript{87}

Pogrund and others at the Rand Daily Mail reprinted Helen Suzman’s parliamentary speeches in the paper. Through these efforts Suzman could reach “hundreds of thousands of South Africans.”\textsuperscript{88} In a 1995 interview, Suzman explained her association with the press,

I was fed information by the newspapers, for example, which wasn't allowed to be quoted unless it came from parliament because of the constant States of Emergency, in which the press was stifled.”\textsuperscript{89} She also noted that, “of course my effectiveness in opposition was very much due to the support I got from the press. You know, if I had just been attacking these guys in parliament without anyone else knowing about it, it would have had no effect. But it had such wide publicity in the press.\textsuperscript{90}

Another contributor to the Rand Daily Mail was Jewish-German émigré Franz Auerbach. In 1967 he wrote a criticism of the South African Prime Minister for the Rand Daily Mail titled “Vorster needs lessons in history.” Although he had intended to write under a pseudonym, the editor accidentally identified him by name. Under South African law it was illegal to “express oneself as a government worker on a party-political matter in the public press.” Auerbach was fined R100. Editor Laurence Gandar promptly gave Auerbach the money.\textsuperscript{91}
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In 1960, Auerbach authored a study that “showed how race prejudice was being inculcated by the educational system.” One must wonder if this was inspired by the American study cited a few years earlier in *Brown v. Board of Education*, titled “Effects of Prejudice and Discrimination on Personality Development.” That study, unsurprisingly, had been commissioned by the American Jewish Committee.

In the late 1960s Anthony Jacob’s book, *White Man, Think Again*, was published in South Africa. It included such statements as, “The Africans, of course, do not comprehend Anglo-Saxon ideals.” Auerbach immediately contacted the Publication Controls Board and filed an application to have the book banned for bringing “all non-White inhabitants of South Africa into ridicule and contempt” — then illegal under the Publications and Entertainment Act of 1963. The Publications Act did not allow any publications ‘harmful to the relations between any sections of the inhabitants of the Republic’ including anti-Semitic writings. The PCB complied with South African law and promptly banned the book. Although some of his colleagues had been against using the law to limit freedom of speech, Auerbach stated, “I believe there should be curbs on hate speech.”

When the *Rand Daily Mail* was later threatened by a takeover by pro-government interests, Anglo-American Corporation created a protective trust which kept the *Mail* free from outside control. This was necessary due to the paper’s declining income — a problem created both by its extremely hostile stance towards the government along with loss of advertising revenue to television. In return for the financial security bestowed by Harry Oppenheimer’s economic empire, the *Rand Daily Mail* praised Oppenheimer for his “brilliant talents” and pleaded for him to reenter the South African parliament in “the wider interests of the country.”

**The Communist Party**

The Communist Party of South Africa was a stalwart enemy of the Afrikaner government. The first years of Afrikaner rule in South Africa began with a series of legislation including the Suppression of
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Communism Act in 1950. The Communist Party, riding high on the expansion of Communist parties around the world following the Second World War, was caught by surprise. It promptly disbanded itself and began forming underground cells.  

At the time of its dissolution the Communist Party was not a mass organization, nor would it become one in later years. It was estimated that at the time of its banning there were 150 Whites, 250 Indians, and 1,600 Africans within the Party. The White membership provided a majority of the leadership for the party for a combination of reasons. Many of the Communist “bosses” were often quite wealthy, had professional occupations, and owned large amounts of property, and were most often not Black Africans. It was “from their expensively furnished drawing rooms” where they “worked out a strategy for the African to follow.” But who were these oddly affluent revolutionaries?  

Like many other countries, the South African Communist Party had a predominately Jewish membership. For years the sole Communist MP was Sam Kahn. One of the more popular Communist Party speakers was immigrant factory owner Solomon Buirski. During the Party’s underground period in the early 1960s Ben Turok was alleged to be managing the party’s finances. As Taffy Adler stated, “Jewish Communists, although they denied it, were very firmly Jewish.”  

It could be argued that the Communist Party, just as the National Party had been, was a vehicle for ethnic interests. Most Jewish Communists married other Jews. The few exceptions such as Lionel Bernstein and Ronald Kasrils, had married White women. The adoption of “universalist” rhetoric and otherwise non-ethnic ideological platforms should not blind us to the fact that such power structures can often
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operate in a hegemonic and indirect fashion to serve ethnic interests.\textsuperscript{104}

In later years Joe Slovo would become the General Secretary of the SACP and Jack Simon would be recognized as the party’s leading theorist.\textsuperscript{105} Joe Slovo had first heard of communism from Dr. Max Joffe who frequented the boarding house Slovo lived in.\textsuperscript{106} Slovo would later marry Ruth First, the daughter of Communist Party treasurer Julius First. Commenting on her parents’ Jewishness, Shawn Slovo stated, “For both Ruth and Joe, the food they ate, the friends they had, their cultural interests, intellectual curiosity were all part of their Jewishness. We were brought up as atheists. But it’s a cultural inheritance. And that’s how Joe became a Communist, through his involvement with Jewish organizations.”\textsuperscript{107}

The Communist Party, while numerically small, possessed several advantages that other groups in South Africa did not. For one, its mostly-Jewish leadership was recognized as White and thus it possessed all the opportunities available to other Whites in South Africa. This would in fact be quite crucial to the temporary success of subversive activities during the early 1960s, as will be later shown.

Secondly, the Communist Party had powerful allies abroad including China, Cuba, East Germany, the Soviet Union, and other Communist-led nations. South African Communist Ronald Kasrils believes that individual members of the South African Communist Party working in London must have handled millions of dollars for the movement.\textsuperscript{108} Much of that came from foreign support.

Thirdly, aside from foreign aid, the Communist leadership was quite economically successful. Julius First, one of the Party’s treasurers, owned a furniture factory.\textsuperscript{109} His daughter Ruth was well educated, having attended the University of Witwatersrand.\textsuperscript{110} She would later marry Joe Slovo, another Jewish Communist, who was a practicing lawyer. One of Ruth First’s fellow students at university was Har-
old Wolpe, a lawyer. Bob Hepple, another lawyer, would help Slovo aid the defense of their fellow conspirators. They would later work closely with Denis Goldberg, an engineer, in setting up an underground headquarters and clandestine munitions factory. The economic affluence and social standing of these individuals gave them huge advantages over the African nationalists they would later support.

**Jews and African Nationalists**

As mentioned, the Communist Party had been banned in 1950. By this time it had made the “cornerstone of its strategy” the takeover of African organizations, especially the ANC. The advantages held by the Communists allowed their expansion of influence into non-communist organizations. But, this influence was not without opposition. Many African nationalists distrusted the Communists and viewed their status as White “bosses” within the movement as an intrusion into Black politics. Nonetheless, the dependency of African movements upon Jewish funding and expertise would increase with time. We must now shift to the African movements themselves and particularly Nelson Mandela.

A young Nelson Mandela traveled to Johannesburg seeking work after being expelled from school and fleeing an arranged marriage. His friend Walter Sisulu recommended him to Lazar Sidelsky, one of the founders of Witkin, Sidelsky, and Eidelman, a Jewish law firm in Johannesburg. Mandela was hired as an articled clerk and Sidelsky generously waived the usual premium.

It was here that Mandela met his first White friend — Nat Bregman. A cousin of Sidelsky, Bregman was an eighteen-year-old articled clerk and member of the Communist Party. It was Bregman who first introduced Mandela to Communist-organized social gatherings. It was at these multiracial gatherings that Mandela met such figures as Michael Harmel, a member of the Communist Party’s central committee for nine years until its dissolution in 1950. Initially, Mandela was hostile to Communists and especially their influence within groups such as the African National Congress, of which Mandela would become involved.
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Mandela pursued a Bachelor of the Arts degree by correspondence while working at Sidelsky’s law firm. Following his final examination he enrolled part-time as a law student at the University of Witwatersrand and met fellow students Ruth First, Harry Schwarz, and Harold Wolpe. Schwarz recalled Mandela as being a reserved student and not a frequent participant of discussions. All of them would become prominent opponents of apartheid.

After passing a qualifying examination, Mandela began his first employment as a lawyer under another Jew, former Communist Hyman Basner. It was in this new capacity that Mandela began to know affluence. He discarded his old patched clothing and bought fashionable suits from a tailor named Alfred Kahn. Despite being married, Mandela also began having an open affair with one of the secretaries at his office, much to the shock of his wife.

Before going into Mandela’s political development, it is necessary to take notice of several things. Even at this early stage he was heavily dependent upon Jewish connections to succeed. His contacts with Sidelsky’s law firm had given him the opportunity to earn a small wage while studying law and they paved the way for his later rise to prominence. If Mandela’s personal development seemed to hinge upon Jewish connections, then his political existence would come to absolutely depend upon them.

Mandela, along with his friend Walter Sisulu, formed the Congress Youth League, a branch of the ANC in the early 1940s. They represented a growing faction within the ANC urging for more aggressive action against apartheid including civil disobedience, boycotts, and mass strikes. By 1949 the Congress Youth League was gaining momentum within the ANC. Mandela’s group presented a blistering criticism of ANC policies to the president, Dr. Albert Xuma. At the next election they supported Dr. James Moroka, a wealthy and successful Black doctor, to challenge Xuma’s leadership. Moroka was elected president of the ANC in 1949 and a new course for the organization was decided upon. The ANC then adopted the “Programme of Action” to replace earlier ANC policies.
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In 1952 the ANC embarked upon the Defiance Campaign. The ANC then changed from an organization of 7,000 into a mass movement of perhaps as many as 100,000 members.\textsuperscript{121} But this new political agitation veered into illegal demonstrations and unruly behavior. In 1956 the ANC adopted the “Freedom Charter” to replace the earlier “Programme of Action.” The Charter was a collection of demands that was drafted into a document by Lionel “Rusty” Bernstein. Bernstein was not only a Jew, he was also a member of the underground Communist Party’s central committee and its chief propaganda expert. Mandela and the rest of the ANC leadership adopted Bernstein’s document with few changes.\textsuperscript{122}

In a June 1956 newspaper article Mandela defended the far-left positions of the Freedom Charter. He declared that the “nationalization of the banks, the gold mines and the land” would strike a “fatal blow” at the “financial and gold-mining monopolies and farming interests that have for centuries plundered the country and condemned its people to servitude.” Mandela then argued that the realization of their goals was impossible unless “these monopolies are smashed and the national wealth of the country [was] turned over to the people.”\textsuperscript{123}

The influence of “Whites” and Communists within the movement was becoming too much for some within the ANC. During the 1956 ANC conference meant to ratify the Freedom Charter, a group of Africanists “kept up a noisy barrage of attacks … with shouts of ‘Africa for the Africans!’” The Africanists demanded a return to the Programme of Action adopted in 1949 and for a purified all-African movement that defined South Africa as belonging only to Blacks.\textsuperscript{124}

Due to the ANC’s confrontational tactics and its new program to nationalize South African industries, its leadership was arrested in 1956 and accused of having adopted “a policy to overthrow the state by violence.”\textsuperscript{125} The defendants were also accused of belonging to a Communist organization. There were 156 defendants in the trial, including 105 Blacks, 21 Indians, 7 coloreds, and 23 Whites. Of the Whites, more than half were Jewish. They were Yetta Barenblatt, Hy-mie Barsel, Lionel Bernstein, Leon Levy, Norman Levy, Sydney Shall,
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Joe Slovo, Ruth First, Sonia Bunting, Lionel Forman, Isaac Horvitch, Ben Turok, Jacqueline Arenstein, and Ronald Press.\textsuperscript{126}

Jews were prominent not only as defendants but also as defense counsels and fundraisers. In the initial stages, the defense included Jews Maurice Franks and Norman Rosenberg. At the most critical stage of the trial the defense was conducted by Jews Israel Maisels and Sydney Kentridge. The idea for a defense fund for the accused was originally conceived in part by Alex Hepple. It was the most successful appeal launched during the 1950s and represented the first major international response to apartheid.\textsuperscript{127} Of the defense fund’s twenty-two sponsors; seven were Jews. Two of the four trustees of the defense fund, Dr. Ellen Hellman and Alex Hepple, were also Jews.\textsuperscript{128} The trial would last until 1961.

It was during this time that the strong Jewish presence within the anti-apartheid movement became noticed by the public. Part of a letter to the editor of the \textit{Tansvaler} published in 1956 read,

\begin{quote}
That the support of the Jews is readily granted to the powers which aim at the downfall of the Boer [Whites] must be deduced from the behaviour of the Jews.... When photographs appear in newspapers of resistance processions, or of joint singing and dancing with the ‘Africans’, or of the ‘Black Sash’s’ slander tableaux, the Jewish facial type is in the majority. When a book is published on the ‘bad conditions’ in South Africa, the writer is ten to one a Jew. Under petitions protesting against the Boer’s policy there always appear numbers of Jewish names. Jewish professors, lecturers, doctors, rabbis and lawyers fall over one another in order to sign. Behind the tables in the street collecting signatures against the Boer’s policy a Jewish lady is usually enthroned.”\textsuperscript{129}
\end{quote}

Important events were unfolding during the trial. In 1959 the Africanist faction split from the ANC and formed the Pan Africanist Con-
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They had decided that Africa would be liberated by Africans without the influence of Jewish ‘Whites’ and the Communist Party. Its leadership decided upon a campaign of mass resistance to apartheid policies, especially the system of pass-laws that applied to Blacks. On 21 March 1960, the PAC organized a general protest urging Blacks to burn their passes and present themselves for arrest en masse. Robert Sobukwe and other leaders of the PAC led from the front and were among those arrested.

The appeal was largely unsuccessful throughout the country but in Sharpeville the organizers successfully organized thousands of Blacks into a violent mob. The police were already nervous after the recent murder of nine policemen outside Durban only two months prior. When the massive crowds at Sharpeville began to mob the police lines and throw stones, the police opened fire. What followed was the death of 69 Blacks, known as the Sharpeville Massacre.

Mandela, however, accused the PAC of having co-opted the ANC’s idea and dismissed the PAC’s sacrifices as “a blatant case of opportunism.” The ANC followed the 21 March protests with an anti-pass campaign of their own on 28 March. On 30 March the government declared a state of emergency and on 8 April both organizations were banned. The PAC, however, was not totally defeated. They would soon begin forming a military wing known as “Poqo,” a Xhosa word meaning ‘alone’ or ‘pure.’

On 29 March 1961 the court acquitted Mandela and other defendants. The long treason trial was now over. Mandela, however, immediately went underground. A call for a general strike was issued but proved disappointing due to the government’s preventative measures. It was this failure that directly led to Mandela’s advocacy of violent methods. It proved highly ironic that Mandela would now embrace a violent campaign despite having “just emerged from a
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marathon trial, the outcome of which had depended on convincing a panel of judges about the ANC’s commitment to non-violent methods.”

It was in these circumstances that Mandela would now come to fully rely upon his Jewish contacts, especially those in the underground Communist Party. The Jews in his inner circle embraced the new campaign of violence enthusiastically. Joe Slovo became “the key figure in devising the party’s military armed struggle” and was chosen as Chief-of-Staff of the new armed wing, known as Umhonto we Sizwe, or MK. The MK’s constitution was largely drafted by Mandela, Slovo, and Bernstein.

A suitable location for the headquarters of the MK was found in the Johannesburg suburb of Lilliesleaf. It had been bought as the headquarters for the underground Communist Party in July 1961. Harold Wolpe, with the cooperation of Michael Harmel, had bought the property by setting up a dummy company and providing Harmel with a false name. The farm was occupied primarily by Arthur Goldreich, his family, and Black farm workers. Goldreich had spent his youth in the Palmach, a branch of the underground Jewish army in Palestine. Except for the farmworkers, all were Jews and members of the Communist Party.

The new campaign was no small undertaking. World War II veteran and Communist Party member Jack Hodgson would become the MK’s first instructor in explosives. He and others manufactured bombs for the MK and tested them at a brickworks east of Johannesburg owned by the brother of Wolfie Kodesh, a Jew and fellow member of the Communist party.

But this was only the beginning. At a newly acquired property in Krugersdorp, Denis Goldberg was given responsibility for manufacturing the arms requirements of the new underground organization. Goldberg, a thirty year-old engineer, acquired production materials under a variety of pseudonyms. The planned production was to include 1,500 timing devices for bombs, 48,000 land mines, and 210,000
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hand grenades.\textsuperscript{144} The funding for all of these activities came, of course, from the underground Communist Party and their sponsors abroad.\textsuperscript{145}

The early stages of the campaign were more akin to a terrorist plot. It was reasoned that bombing attacks on infrastructure and government targets would drive away foreign capital and bring South Africa to its knees.\textsuperscript{146} However, the bombing campaign and public declaration of the MK’s existence had to be delayed. The reason was that the ANC’s president, Albert Luthuli, was traveling to Oslo to receive the Nobel Peace Prize! The award ceremony was held on 11 December 1961. The terrorist attacks began five days later.\textsuperscript{147} By July 1963 the sabotage campaign hit nearly two-hundred targets including “communications and transport facilities, fuel dumps, utilities, and government buildings.”\textsuperscript{148}

Mandela had been in hiding since March 1961. He had been provided with a support committee to arrange for “safe houses, transport, and reading material.”\textsuperscript{149} Jews such as Wolfie Kodesh and Bob Hepple were a part of this committee. Mandela, in fact, spent two months living in a small bachelor apartment rented by Kodesh under a false name.\textsuperscript{150} Mandela also met with his second wife at Arthur Goldreich’s house in Parktown. For a while Michael Harmel was also a member of his support committee.\textsuperscript{151}

Mandela traveled abroad shortly after the beginning of the bombing campaign, leaving in January 1962. To his surprise the PAC was actually more popular abroad than the ANC, which was widely seen as a Communist-dominated organization. After returning to South Africa Mandela was caught and arrested on 5 August 1962.\textsuperscript{152} His legal advisers were undercover Communists and co-conspirators Joe Slovo
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and Bob Hepple. He was sentenced to three years for inciting the 1961 strike and two for traveling abroad without documents.\(^{153}\)

The South African government claimed the ANC was a body of “Communists and terrorists.” Curiously, in Brian Lapping’s history of apartheid he dismisses these claims as “mere propaganda.”\(^{154}\) Yet, while Mandela was incarcerated, the plans for a full-scale guerilla conflict were being drafted. Joe Slovo and Govan Mbeki, a close friend of Slovo’s wife, developed a plan known as ‘Operation Mayibuye.’\(^{155}\) Meanwhile, Arthur Goldreich was busy traveling to sympathetic states such as China, East Germany, and the Soviet Union.\(^{156}\) Goldreich managed to successfully lobby for approximately $2.8 million in aid from the Soviet Union and its allies.\(^{157}\)

In 1963 the South African authorities raided the Lilliesleaf farm and arrested nineteen leading members of the ANC and MK. Among those arrested were five Whites: Lionel Bernstein, Hilliard Festenstein, Denis Goldberg, Arthur Goldreich, and Bob Hepple. Shortly thereafter, James Kantor and Harold Wolpe were arrested in connection with the Liliesleaf raid. They were all Jews.\(^{158}\) The raid and subsequent arrests would prove a devastating setback to the “African” liberation movement.

Shortly after being arrested, Harold Wolpe and Arthur Goldreich were left in the custody of a young guard. He was promised a handsome bribe in return for allowing them to escape, which they did. It was during this escape that they were hidden by Barney Simon, a fellow Jew. Simon, like Benjamin Pogrund, had been a member of the Habonim in his youth and edited *The Classic*, the “first nonracial literary magazine” in South Africa.\(^{159}\) Two days later Wolpe and Goldreich parted ways with Simon and eventually fled abroad.\(^{160}\)

The MK Regional Command, Natal, was Ronald Kasrili’s area of responsibility. Another South African Jew, he had been forced to flee the country with his girlfriend Eleanor Anderson after one of his fellow terrorists, Bruno Mtolo, was caught during what his comrades as-
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sumed was a drinking binge in town. Mtolo had visited the MK headquarters in Rivonia earlier in 1963.\footnote{Meredith, \textit{Nelson Mandela}, 259.} Mtolo already had an extensive record of petty crimes and agreed to become a state witness within mere hours of his arrest.\footnote{Kasrils, \textit{Armed and Dangerous}, 53.} Kasrils would play a role in coordinating the movement with Joe Slovo while in exile.

Nelson Mandela was ultimately dragged into the new Rivonia trial owing to the seizure of a number of documents in his handwriting obtained from the Lilliesleaf raid.\footnote{Meredith, \textit{Nelson Mandela}, 247.} The seized documents also included the plans for ‘Operation Mayibuye.’ Two of the three defense lawyers, Arthur Chaskalson and Joel Joffe, were Jewish. The head prosecutor, Percy Yutar, was also Jewish. In a 1988 interview, Yutar claimed that he had deliberately reduced the charges against the defendants from treason to sabotage with the intent to save the accused from the death penalty.\footnote{Shimoni, \textit{The Case for South Africa}, 66.} However, on 11 June 1964 Mandela, Sisulu, and Mbeki would be sentenced to life imprisonment.\footnote{Davis, \textit{Apartheid’s Rebels}, 18.}

The Africanists fared even worse. In 1962 the PAC’s second-in-command, Potlako Leballo, was released from prison. At a press conference Leballo declared that in 1963 the PAC would lead a full revolution, in contrast to the ANC’s futile efforts. Within days the authorities had raided his offices and seized the PAC’s membership lists. It was later announced that 3,246 of the PAC’s underground had been arrested.\footnote{Ibid., 19.} In the 1970s the PAC would largely crumble due to infighting. This, combined with the effectiveness of South African security forces, would leave the ANC as the vanguard of Black politics.\footnote{Ibid., 33.}

**Jews and the Movement in Exile**

Much of the Black leadership of the ANC was neutralized after the Rivonia trial. The remainder, men such as Oliver Tambo, would rebuild the organization after fleeing abroad. Tambo, one of the founding members of the Congress Youth League, had until 1963 acted as merely the ANC’s foreign diplomatic representative. However, during his period abroad he would become the leader of the ANC in exile.\footnote{Davis, \textit{Apartheid’s Rebels}, 22.}
London became the “ANC’s exile capital.” Joe Slovo, Jack Hodgson, Yusuf Dadoo, and Ronald Kasrils operated at the London headquarters with others such as Gill Marcus. Marcus remained in exile for 21 years working closely with Slovo. In an interview Marcus stated, “… because of the work that I was doing, which was information for the movement, I always had a lot of contact with him.”

For a while, Ronald Kasrils and his wife lived in Golders Green, a Jewish Suburb of London. Kasrils, with dark curly hair and white skin, was not what most people expected an “African” guerilla to be. Anti-apartheid activists in London were confused by this very un-Black African rebel. Likewise, when he traveled to the Soviet Union for military training he was asked by Russians, “Why aren’t you Black?”

Controlling the movement from abroad would prove a challenge, especially for the movement’s “White” leadership circles. Not only were the Black Africans distrustful of the influence of Whites and Communists, but they were often completely inept in combat situations. Nonetheless, larger numbers of Black Africans would join the struggle against apartheid as international condemnation against it grew.

The Africans themselves made poor revolutionaries. In the Belgian Congo, Che Guevara had led a small force of Cubans into the newly independent Congo to help fight “Western imperialism.” What he found among the Africans was universal superstition, unreliability in combat, and downright incompetence. Guevara noted that the African rebels placed a great deal of importance upon dawa, or magical protection, which shielded the rebels from harm. Ronnie Kasrils also noted these superstitions during his training of African rebels in East Germany.

Guevara’s experiences in the Congo are mentioned because his reports provide an extremely useful account of what African rebels were like in the 1960s. Guevara goes so far as to say, “the Congolese revolution was doomed to defeat by its own internal weaknesses.” For one thing, the African rebels seemed preoccupied with prostitutes and
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alcohol. He noted that the leaders of these rebel movements “spent the day drinking until they got in the most incredible state, without even bothering to conceal it from the population because they considered it the natural thing for “men” to do.” In combat, the rebel soldiers would fire their machine guns with eyes closed, or simply run away. In one incident a rebel dropped a lit match and the area caught on fire. The fire reached an ammunition dump and the entire camp erupted into explosions and gunfire.

These were by no means the only such incidents in Guevara’s journal. They were in fact quite characteristic of his entire experience in the Congo. By his own words Guevara, the professional revolutionary, is implying that the Africans, or at least the Congolese, were incapable of organizing a revolutionary movement. These events were occurring contemporaneously with the formation of the South African underground movement and strongly suggest that without aid from non-Africans, the movement could not have had impact.

There were still problems even after the ANC leadership regrouped abroad. From late 1985 to mid-1987 Umkhonto we Sizwe rebels laid landmines in the countryside intended to destroy military patrols, but mostly killed farmers, Blacks, and children. It decided to abandon the landmine campaign when these unintended consequences became glaringly apparent.

In another incident a member of the ANC’s underground armed faction went to a disco and brought a woman home at gunpoint. Afterward, she led the police back to the spot which was discovered to be the location of a guerilla safe house and a gun battle ensued. Ronald Kasrils recalls reading a different version of the story in a newspaper. In this story, the underground fighter had gone to a notorious disco named Club 702. He began a fight with a young woman’s boyfriend, left the club by taxi, and then argued with the taxi driver about fare in front of his safe house. It was followed by a police raid that led to multiple arrests.

\[175\] Ibid., 28.
\[176\] Ibid. 48.
\[177\] Ibid.
\[179\] Ellis, Comrades against Apartheid, 139.
\[180\] Kasrils, Armed and Dangerous, 168.
In addition to the general ineptitude of Africans, there was again a growing tension between the Communists and the Black Africans. In 1975 the ANC exiles were hosting a funeral for one of their own in London. The Africanist-leaning faction took this as an opportunity to express their dissatisfaction at the lack of free speech within the ANC. They also accused the Communists as having hijacked the movement itself. These men, called the 'Gang of Eight,' would be expelled from the ANC for their actions.\(^{181}\)

After the 1976 disturbances in Soweto, a new generation of Black youths had joined the ranks of the ANC to fight apartheid. Many of them were sent north to train in Angolan guerilla camps. By 1981 these fighters had been waiting five years for a full campaign against South Africa but were instead diverted into fighting fellow Blacks of the Angolan anti-communist UNITA forces. In 1981 a spy-scare swept over the guerilla camps in Angola. The campaign was launched against “dagga smokers” but was often a pretext for eliminating critics of the ANC leadership. By April 1981, security commissions had been established in every camp headed by a security officer.\(^{182}\)

The dissatisfaction among African guerillas was widespread in Angola. In 1977 at a camp in Quibaxe, Ronald Kasrils oversaw the arrival of fourteen recruits. They had joined the struggle following the Soweto Uprising against the forced imposition of the White man's language; now they would be digging trenches for a White man in Angola. They felt tricked. It wanted to take the fight to the enemy or be sent home. Because the former was not happening, the spokesman of the new recruits angrily pointed his finger in the direction of Kasrils and shouted, “We want to go home now, now, now!” A fight ensued. Tensions were defused and the would-be mutineers were detained. Allegations would later be made that the group had been tortured, but Kasrils denies it.\(^{183}\)

In August 1983 the ANC leadership launched an offensive against the anti-Communist UNITA forces in Angola. By January 1984 there were reports of ANC troops fighting for days without food. They were tired, hungry, and had no desire to kill other Blacks. They demanded an immediate offensive against South Africa. Hundreds of troops then broke into open mutiny. They elected a “Committee of
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Ten” and established a list of demands. One demand was for the election of new leadership within the movement. Another demand was immediate investigations into the security department and the “re-education” center called Quatro — where beatings, starvation, and torture were commonplace.\textsuperscript{184} The incident proved an embarrassment to the ANC, but it soon outmaneuvered the dissenters and broke the rebellion.

The true extent of Communist influence within the ANC was exposed by Bartholomew Hlapane in his testimony to a U. S. Congressional panel in March 1982. Mr. Hlapane had joined the ANC in 1948 with the aim to “achieve democratic rights for the African people through peaceful means.”\textsuperscript{185} In 1955 Hlapane was recruited into the underground SACP by Joe Slovo. The Communist Party expanded its influence while underground by conspiratorial means. Their method was to become involved with mass organizations, even simple community organizations, and to identify “people who are influential, who are clever, and who could be recruited as members of the party.”\textsuperscript{186}

This information is corroborated well by the activities of others such as Billy Nair. Following the suppression of the South African Communist Party, Billy Nair, an ethnic Indian, used the South African Indian Congress (SAIC) and the South African Congress of Trade Unions (SACTU) to recruit for the SACP. During large meetings and discussions Nair would identify individuals who might be receptive to Marxist ideas and siphoned them into the underground SACP organization.\textsuperscript{187} By these covert means the SACP could retain a presence within the South African anti-apartheid movement.

But how much influence had the Communists achieved? Among the twenty-two members of the ANC National Executive Committee, Hlapane identified no less than seven Communists by name. They were Dan Tloome, Josiah Jele, Joe Slovo, Reginald September, Thabo Mbeki, Stephen Dlamini, and John Nkadimeng.\textsuperscript{188} This was nearly a third of the top leadership of the ANC.
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Upon being asked why he had turned against his former comrades, Hlapane responded that he found the Communists to be dishonest. They promised, he alleged, to take care of Hlapane's family and others after they had been arrested by the state. He claimed this never happened. Instead, women and children starved. The Communist leadership then fled abroad while the remnants of the ANC suffered imprisonment. Finally, Hlapane added, “I decided to pull out and openly cooperate with the police, because innocent people were being arrested and did not know that the Communist Party had, in fact, captured the leadership of the African National Congress.”189 Within months of his 1982 testimony, Hlapane would be assassinated by Umkhonto we Sizwe.190

Two years later another purge of the movement would begin. By 1984 the South African government had decided to create a three-chamber legislative body composed of Whites, Coloreds, and Indians. Blacks would also be allowed to vote in local elections outside of their homelands. The election turnout for coloreds and Indians was low, but the new body met for the first time in September 1984. Within days a wave of violence was launched against these “Uncle Toms.” On 3 September the newly elected deputy-mayor of Sharpeville was hacked to death on his front doorstep. Two Blacks were burned to death while trapped in their cars, a few more were strangled behind a plundered garage, a man burned to death in a liquor store, and many buildings and cars were set on fire.191

Between September 1984 and February 1985 the South African government reported that five Black councilors and four Black policemen had been killed, over one hundred Black councilors had been attacked, over fifty Black police officers had been injured, and one hundred and forty-seven Black councilors had been forced to resign. The “growing army of young Blacks” was spurred into violence against its own people by groups like the ANC who viewed the participants of the new elections as being sell-outs to apartheid. Their violence would now serve the purpose of the ANC and its foreign backers. Much like the American race-riots of the 1960s, these were claimed to be politically motivated but mostly hurt Blacks themselves. In the same period over one thousand buses serving Blacks had been badly damaged or
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burned. Nine clinics for Blacks had been destroyed. One hundred and forty-three Black school buildings had been destroyed.\textsuperscript{192}

The violence did not abate. In July 1985 a young girl was stoned, stabbed, and beaten at a funeral in Duduza. She was then covered in sticks and grass which were set on fire. She had been suspected of being a police informer. But by 1986 the most popular form of punishment for informers, real or imagined, was “necklacing.” The assailants would fill a rubber tire with gasoline, place it over the victim, and light them on fire.\textsuperscript{193} This violent purging of political competition allowed the ANC to maintain a dominant position within the apartheid movement even as it remained in exile.

\textbf{THE ANC TAKES POWER}

In August 1985 State President P. W. Botha delivered what became known as the “Rubicon Speech.” In it he stressed that he “was not prepared to lead White South Africans and other minority groups on a road to abdication and suicide.”\textsuperscript{194} Botha made a public offer to consider Mandela’s release from imprisonment on the condition that he renounce violence. Mandela quite simply replied, “I am not a violent man.”\textsuperscript{195}

State President Botha stated that he and the National Party were pursuing the policies that had been chosen by the majority of White citizens and he did not have the power to go against their will by bowing to foreign pressure. In 1987, only a tiny minority of Whites wanted a racially mixed parliament and “majority rule.” The actual amount of support for these policies was 3% among Afrikaners and 11% among English-speaking Whites.\textsuperscript{196} Botha then declared, “Destroy White South Africa and our influence, and this country will drift into faction strife, chaos and poverty.”\textsuperscript{197} His words would prove prophetic.
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But other parties were already making decisions. After the “Rubicon Speech” of P. W. Botha, Harry Oppenheimer sent Anglo-American executives to an informal talk with ANC representatives.\(^{198}\) Shortly after, Gavin Relly, Oppenheimer’s long-time secretary and then chairman of Anglo-American, led a small group of businessmen to meet with Oliver Tambo and Thabo Mbeki in Zambia. The businessmen flew to Lusaka to meet with Oliver Tambo, among other ANC leaders, and discuss the future of the country.\(^{199}\)

Another Jewish businessman, Tony Bloom, the head one of the five largest companies in South Africa — Premier Milling Group, drew up a manifesto signed by 92 of the country’s top businessmen calling “for an end to apartheid and for government negotiations with Black leaders.” Bloom advocated “gentle affirmative action”, the abolition of all statutory discrimination, and the release of Nelson Mandela.\(^{200}\)

The decision to release Mandela and unban anti-apartheid political groups was likely the result of growing foreign pressure. The United States Congress enacted the Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act in 1986. These sanctions were supported in the United States by The National Jewish Community relations Advisory Council despite President Reagan’s attempted veto.\(^{201}\) The director of the Religious Actions Center, Rabbi David Saperstein, also pressed for sanctions.\(^{202}\) It is difficult to see whose interests were served by such harsh actions. In a South African survey of 1004 Black coal miners conducted by a third party research organization, only 28 percent of union workers supported sanctions. Among non-union workers the support was as low as 13%.\(^{203}\)

While in prison in 1990, Mandela had written, “The nationalization of the mines, banks, and monopoly industries is the policy of the ANC, and the change or modification of our views in this regard is inconceivable. Black economic empowerment is a goal we fully support and encourage, but in our situation state control of certain sectors of the economy is unavoidable.”\(^{204}\) Two weeks later, Mandela would be released by F. W. De Klerk, the man who had replaced P. W. Bo-

---

\(^{198}\) Kanfer, *The Last Empire*, 353.
\(^{200}\) Shimoni, *Community and Conscience*, 194.
\(^{201}\) Ibid., 152.
\(^{202}\) Ibid., 153.
\(^{203}\) Giliomee and Schlemmer, *From Apartheid to Nation-building*, 178.
Underground political organizations were unbanned. Mandela’s supporters such as communists Slovo, Karsils, and Marcus would be allowed to return to the country.

Mandela had an astounding change of heart upon being released from prison. After Mandela and Mbeki began holding regular meetings with former Anglo American and De Beers chairman Harry Oppenheimer, they reversed the ANC’s economic position. In his first post-election interview as president Mandela stated: “In our economic policies … there is not a single reference to things like nationalization, and this is not accidental…” Following the 1994 election, the ANC even submitted its economic program to Oppenheimer “for approval.”

Among other things, between 1997 and 2004 eighteen state-owned firms were sold by the South African government, raising $4 billion. Even stranger, the Minister of Finance elected during the 1994 elections was none other than Gill Marcus, the communist anti-apartheid activist. In fact, it was under this new leadership that the central South African Reserve Bank was privatized. Marcus became Deputy Governor of the Reserve Bank in 1999, and its Governor in 2009.

CONCLUSIONS

There are a number of recurring themes that stand out when considering the Jewish role in South Africa. Among the most noticeable are the prominence of ethnic nepotism among Jews, especially in systems of patronage, and also in the tendency of Jewish groups to promote non-Jews into figurehead positions. Both of these fit well into the overall picture of Jewish group behavior that is well documented in histories such as Neal Gabler’s *An Empire of Their Own* (on Hollywood and the entertainment industry) and Kevin MacDonald’s *The Culture of Critique*.

Remember that the Communist Party, despite claiming to represent broad sections of the population, was largely a Jewish affair. The leadership of the Communist Party had often been members of Communist families. Ruth First, for instance, was the daughter of Com-
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munist Party Treasurer Julius First. Her husband, Joe Slovo, had likewise risen into the party from a Jewish social milieu.

Many of the Jewish Communists themselves had come from Eastern European radicals escaping the forces of the Czar or other reactionary powers that had attempted to stamp out revolutionary movements. Wolfie Kodesh had come from such a family. Communist Party member Ray Alexander herself had been a first-generation Jewish South African that had trained with Latvian Communists in the late 1920s.

Recall also that the left-wing of the United Party, later to become the Progressive Party, had a Jewish “vanguard.” The rest of the United Party often shared “wide areas of agreement” with the National Party “on the emotional question of social and residential segregation.” It was apparent also, as recalled by Suzman, that Harry Oppenheimer had used his influence to build up the left-wing of the United Party before the split. He would come to play an “important role behind the scenes in the United Party.” After the death of his father, Oppenheimer became Chairman of Anglo American Corporation in 1957. In 1961 he gave open support to the Progressives by stating, “the best thing you can do is vote progressive.”

The second trend that stands out from this research — also noted in Kevin MacDonald’s work on Jewish radicals — is a tendency to put non-Jews into figurehead positions within the most radical and critical organizations that nonetheless relied heavily, if not wholly, on Jewish support. In this the most prominent example is Nelson Mandela and the ANC. It would be more than fair to suggest that the ANC was merely a Communist front. Mandela’s entire development was guided by Jewish “handlers.” From his early legal career to his adoption of terrorist tactics to his eventual imprisonment, Jews provided indispensable support. Even after he was released from prison, the grey eminence of Harry Oppenheimer persuaded him to change his far-left economic viewpoint in favor of privatizations.
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But Mandela is certainly not the only example of this trend. The Communist-pioneered newspaper *The Guardian* relied primarily upon Jews for funding and writing. The editor-in-chief, however, was Betty Radford. It was exactly the same for the *Rand Daily Mail*. The non-Jewish editor was for many years Laurence Gandar, a man who had formerly worked for Anglo American. He would absorb much of the blame for the *Mail’s* critical stance despite the fact that Jewish journalists were submitting the critical accounts.

In retrospect, the group behavior of Jews in apartheid South Africa conforms very closely to patterns that emerged during the United States Civil Rights Movement and continue to emerge in Europe’s current drive towards a non-White multicultural entity. Understanding Jewish influence on the decline of the West and responding to it effectively will likely prove decisive factors in whether Whites once again establish the integrity of their nations — or continue to be out-maneuvered and ultimately dispossessed.