THE ROLE REGIME TYPE PLAYS WITH RESPECT TO INTELLIGENCE COOPERATION: THE CASE OF SOUTH AFRICA AND ISRAEL.

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Magister Administration in the Department of Political Studies, University of the Western Cape.

By

Dean John Walbrugh

UNIVERSITY of the
WESTERN CAPE

Supervisor: Professor Joelien Pretorius

July 2019

KEYWORDS

South Africa

Israel

Intelligence Cooperation

Regime Type

South African State Security Agency (SSA)

Mossad

Culture

Identity

Realism

Liberalism

Constructivism

UNIVERSITY of the
WESTERN CAPE

ABSTRACT

This thesis explores the intelligence cooperation exhibited between South Africa and Israel during the time periods of apartheid (1948-1994) and post-apartheid (1994-2015). Regime type is explored as a factor impacting on the intelligence relationship in both periods. Pertinent to the case study is the fact that South Africa and Israel's regime type shared commonalities during the first period, but not the second. The thesis examines how these commonalities facilitated intelligence cooperation during apartheid, then turns to the question how the change in South Africa's regime type after 1994 (whilst Israel's remained the same) impacted on intelligence cooperation.

In order to understand the significance of South Africa's regime change on the intelligence relationship between the two states, a comprehensive theoretical framework is proposed in order to analyse how and why the internal policies of the two states redirected their intelligence relationship. Within this thesis, the concept of regime type is not used in a conventional way, it is framed through a constructivist notion that includes a focus on identity and how this shapes the two states' intelligence bureaucratic behaviour. This constructivist framing is in turn juxtaposed to two other International Relations (IR) theories, namely: realism and liberalism.

This thesis therefore explores how the system of apartheid in South Africa and a system that has been compared to apartheid in Israel brought the two states together on a national interest level. But, what constituted the perceived alignment of national interests and filtered down into a bureaucratic level is better understood through the constructivist notion of culture and identity that actually solidified the relationship. Culture and identity formed the basis of what made the relationship between the two states strong, and as per the focus of this thesis, manifested in intelligence cooperation between the two states that goes over and beyond what Realists would predict. Although liberalism can explain the apartheid relationship better, it cannot explain why the relationship was not severed after apartheid. Since the end of apartheid, the intelligence relationship has been deteriorating, but this has been a gradual process.

This study investigates how regime type impact on intelligence cooperation. It applies the three main IR theories in order to explain and understand the post-apartheid South Africa-Israel relationship. It finds that although Realism and Liberalism are useful, interpreting regime type in a constructivist way adds significantly to explanations of the role regime type plays.

DECLARATION

I declare that *The role regime type plays with respect to intelligence cooperation: the case of South Africa and Israel* is my own work, that it has not been submitted for any degree or examination in any other university, and that all the sources I have used or quoted have been indicated and acknowledged by complete references.

Dean John Walbrugh January 2019

UNIVERSITY of the
WESTERN CAPE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Firstly, a big thanks to my parents (Clive and Joan) for providing me with all the resources to reach this educational milestone, it is truly appreciated. I know there has been lots of sacrifices along the way on your behalf and I just want to say thank you for providing me with the necessary backing to allow me to be where I am today. Devon, Dale, Chanel and Taylor thank you for the support and always being there for me and supporting me in my choices and encouragement along the way. To Cindy, you were instrumental in my university career, helping me in the early parts of it to a monumental degree and for that I thank you. To my aunts, uncles and cousins for always being there with me on this journey and helping where needed.

To the Political Studies department: Prof. Pretorius, your patience and tutelage made this possible, this wasn't an easy road but as a supervisor you kept me on the right track. Thank you for providing me with the proper guidance that was needed to allow me to produce this paper, the guidance wasn't always what I wanted to hear but it was what was needed. So, all I can say is thank you and all your efforts were really appreciated. Prof. Piper, thank you for providing me the funding in the manner that you did, so I want to thank you for that from myself and my parents. Prof. Africa, thank you for always having your door open for me when it came to any issue throughout my time at UWC. Your calm and measured approach to not only teaching but the various problems I witnessed you solve has made me stop and think "how would Prof A handle this", something I will take with me going forward. Mr (or should I say Dr) Hoskins, our informal talks would always spark something intellectual or provide a little nudge about finishing my studies so thank you for that. Dr. Anciano thank you for always being available for advice on my thesis documentation and Meshay Moses for always assisting me where you could with my thesis. Lastly a special thanks to Nadia Jansen for everything you done throughout my time with the Politics department, I've always appreciated everything you did for me big or small.

Thanks to Best Beats TV for having amazing mixes that helped with all the long late nights and to all my friends, colleagues, acquaintances that have helped me achieve this, there has been too many to mention, thank you all.

Forever Grateful… Dean John Walbrugh

UNIVERSITY of the
WESTERN CAPE

Abbreviations

African National Congress	ANC
African Union	AU
Association of Southeast Asian Nations	ASEAN
Boycott Divestment Sanctions	BDS
British Exit from European Union	Brexit
Bureau of State Security	BOSS
Canadian Communications Security Establishment	CSE
Central Intelligence Agency	CIA
Convention for a Democratic South Africa	CODESA
Electronic Communications Security	COMSEC
Democratic Peace Theory	DPT
Department of Foreign Affairs	DFA
Department of Military Intelligence	DMI
Department of Intelligence and Security	DIS
Department of International Relations and Cooperation	DIRCO
Director-General	DG
Direccion de Inteligencia	DGI
Australian Defence Signals Directorate	DSD
European Economic Community	EEC
European Police	EUROPOL
European Union	EU
External Relations Department	ERD
Federal Bureau of Investigation	FBI

UNIVERSITY of the
WESTERN CAPE

Human Intelligence	Humint
Imagery Intelligence	Imint
Intelligence Services Council on Conditions of Employment	ISC
Inkatha Freedom Party	IFP
International Relations	IR
Islamic State of Iraq and Syria	ISIS
Israel Defense Force	IDF
Joint Standing Committee on Intelligence	JSCI
Kamitet Gosudarstvennoy Bezopasnosti	KGB
Main Directorate of the General Staff of the Armed Forces of the Russian Federation	GRU
Measurement and Signature Intelligence	Masint
National Communications Centre	NCC
National Executive Committee	NEC
National Intelligence Agency	NIA
National Intelligence Co-ordinating Committee	NICOC
National Intelligence Service	NIS
National Party	NP
National Security Agency	NSA
New Zealand Government Communications Security Bureau	GCSB
North Atlantic Treaty Organization	NATO
NATO Intelligence Fusion Centre	NIFC
Office for Interception Centre	OIC
Organization of African Unity	OAU

UNIVERSITY of the
WESTERN CAPE

Palestinian Authority	PA
Palestinian Liberation Organization	PLO
Politico-Military Council	PMC
Promotion of Access to Information Act	PAIA
Protection of Information Bill	PIB
Signals Intelligence	Sigint
South African Defense Force	SADF
South African National Academy of Intelligence	SANAI
South African National Defence Force	SANDF
South African Police	SAP
South African Police Service	SAPS
South African Secret Service	SASS
South African State Security Agency	SSA
State Security Council	SSC
Transkei, Bophuthatswana, Venda and Ciskei	TBVC
Umkhonto we Sizwe	MK
United Kingdom	UK
United Kingdom United States of America Intelligence Agreement	UKUSA (Five Eyes)
United Nations	UN
United Nations High Commission for Refugees	UNHCR
United States of America	USA
Zimbabwe African National Liberation Army	ZANLA
Zimbabwe African National Union	ZANU

UNIVERSITY of the
WESTERN CAPE

CONTENTS

Key Words	i
Abstract	ii
Declaration	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
Abbreviations	v
Chapter 1: Introduction	**1**
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Research Question and Proposition	3
1.3 Research Design and Methodology	3
1.3.1 Research Design	3
1.3.2 Method of Data Collection	5
1.3.3 Data Analysis	5
1.3.4 The ethical sensitivity pertaining to leaked documents	6
1.4 Significance of Study	6
1.5 Limitation of Study	7
1.6 Structure	7
1.7 Conclusion	8
Chapter 2: Theoretical Framework	**9**
2.1 Introduction	9
2.2 Conceptual Frameworks	9
2.2.1 Regime Type	9
2.2.2 Intelligence	10
2.2.3 Intelligence sharing/Cooperation and Alliances	13
2.2.4 Foreign Policy	15
2.2.5 Identity	16
2.2.5.1 Pariah State	17
2.2.5.2 Siege Mentality	17
2.3 Theoretical Approaches	18
2.3.1 Realism	18

UNIVERSITY of the
WESTERN CAPE

2.3.1.1 Neorealism (Structural Realism) 19
2.3.1.2 Realism and Intelligence Cooperation 21
2.3.2 Liberalism 25
2.3.2.1 Republican Liberalism 26
2.3.2.2 Democratic Peace Theory 27
2.3.3.3 Liberal Democratic Peace Theory and Intelligence Sharing 30
2.3.3 Constructivism 31
2.3.3.1 Culture and Constructivism 34
2.3.3.2 A constructivist interpretation of democratic peace theory 37
2.3.3.3 Constructivism, regime type and cooperation 39
2.3.3.3.1 UKUSA/Five Eyes 40
2.4 Conclusion 41

Chapter 3 South Africa and Israel 1948 to 1994 42
3.1 Introduction 42
3.2 Apartheid as a governing principle in South Africa and Israel 43
3.2.1 The international understanding of apartheid 43
3.2.2 Apartheid in South Africa 44
3.2.3 Israel and apartheid 46
3.3 Consequences of apartheid policies for South Africa and Israel 49
3.3.1 Hostile neighbourhoods 49
3.3.2 Sanctions, embargoes and international isolation 51
3.3.3 Siege mentalities 52
3.4 South Africa and Israel: Political relationship 52
3.5 South Africa-Israel intelligence relationship during apartheid period 58
3.5.1 South African intelligence sector 58
3.5.1.1 Bureau of State Security (BOSS) 58
3.5.1.2 National Intelligence Service (NIS) 60
3.5.1.3 The ANC's intelligence background 61
3.5.2 Israeli intelligence sector 63
3.5.3 Working together 66
3.6 The apartheid era draws to an end 70
3.7 Conclusion 72

UNIVERSITY of the

Chapter 4 The South African-Israeli intelligence relationship 1994 to 2015 **74**
4.1 Introduction 74
4.2 Regime Change and Intelligence in South Africa 1990-2015 74
4.2.1 Transition Period: 1990-1994 74
4.2.1.1 The effect of the transition on intelligence 77
4.3 Mandela era 81
4.4 Mbeki Era 83
4.5 Zuma Era 86
4.6 Regime and Intelligence in Israel 1990-2015 89
4.7 Intelligence relationship post-apartheid between South Africa and Israel 93
4.8 Conclusion 103

Chapter 5 Explaining the South African-Israeli intelligence relationship **103**
5.1 Introduction 103
5.2 The South African-Israeli intelligence relationship from apartheid to post-apartheid 103
5.2.1 Apartheid era alliance and alignment 103
5.2.2 Post-apartheid era tension and divergence 105
5.3 The role of regime type in the South African-Israeli intelligence relationship 107
5.3.1 A Realist Understanding of the Intelligence Relationship 107
5.3.2 A Liberal Understanding of the Intelligence Relationship 109
5.3.3 A Constructivist Understanding of the Intelligence Relationship 110
5.4 Conclusion 113

Chapter six Conclusion **114**
6.1 Conclusion 114
6.2 Future research 117

Bibliography 119
Appendix A: Interview Questions 138

UNIVERSITY of the

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

South Africa as an apartheid state[1] pre-1994 and Israel's use of apartheid policies (towards Palestine and Israeli citizens of Palestinian ethnicity) resulted in the two nations being singled out and isolated by the global community. South Africa was deemed as not meeting its obligations under the United Nations (UN) Charter and was thus labelled a threat to international peace and security. In 1962, the UN General Assembly passed a resolution that paved the way for voluntary boycotts, by requesting that member states break off diplomatic relations with South Africa (Barnes 2008: 36). Israel had been put in a similar situation, when its neighbours had enforced a boycott. The Arab League (22 Middle Eastern and African countries and entities) maintained an official boycott of Israeli companies and Israeli-made goods since the founding of Israel in 1948 (Weiss 2015: 10). Both nations were to various extents ostracised by the broader international community or parts thereof, a situation that academics have come to label "pariah status"[2]. Their common status and increasing pariah status led to increased bilateral relations between the two states and of particular importance, the close intelligence cooperation.

UNIVERSITY of the
WESTERN CAPE

Apartheid officials' security concerns about the African National Congress (ANC) threat and the various continuous sanctions imposed by the international community led South Africa to seek out a close relationship, and Israel's problems made them the ideal ally. The South African government at that time maintaining power through military force needed all the arms it could get, and to the Israeli government, South Africa seemed like the perfect customer. South Africa was "a developing country with a defence-conscious, right wing government that did not have close ties to the Arab-Muslim block, this was a perfect match" in Israel's eyes (Polakow-Suransky 2010: 78). But, the South Africa-Israel relationship also involved a strong intelligence focus, with apartheid South Africa's National Intelligence Service (NIS) and Israel's Mossad engaging in intelligence cooperation.

---

[1] The 1976 International Convention on Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid, established by the United Nations declared apartheid as: "inhuman acts committed for the purpose of establishing and maintaining domination by one racial group of persons over any other racial group of persons and systematically oppressing them" (UN 1976: 2). In essence labelling a state that applies the above, as an apartheid state.

[2] See section 2.2.4 in chapter two as well as Lawal, L. (2012). Pariah State System and Enforcement Mechanisms of International Law. *Journal of Alternative Perspectives in the Social Sciences,* 4(1), 226-241. And Geldenhuys, D. (1997). US-South Africa Relations and the "Pariah" States. In G. Mills et al, *Pariah states in the post-cold war world: A conceptual exploration* (pp. 15-24). Johannesburg: The South African Institute of International Affairs.

In summation, the apartheid era relationship between South Africa and Israel had been based on perceived alignments that filtered down to develop the strong enthusiastic intelligence relationship depicted in chapter three. These were based on (i) the perceived alignment of political ideologies, these ideologies brought the two together out of necessity (essentially the beginning/formation of the relationship). (ii) The perceived alignment of a common identity, acknowledging the perceived identity that has been eloquently prescribed to both, developing a siege mentality and alluding to security reasons for the close co-operation (the strengthening of the relationship). (iii) The perceived alignment of interests leads to a partnership between military and intelligence departments of the two states (the culmination of the previous two steps in action).

With the changes experienced by South Africa, including the change from the NIS to NIA. The subsequent change led to a change in the intelligence relationship even though intelligence cooperation continued well into South Africa's democratic dispensation. However, recent leaks[3] reported by the news agency Al-Jazeera, suggest that intelligence cooperation is not what it used to be.

In 1994, South Africa transitioned to become a democratic state, while Israel still implemented similar policies as during the apartheid years towards Palestinians. This begs the question: Is the deteriorating intelligence situation between SA and Israel a belated result of SA's regime transition? International Relations (IR) theory shines light on the correlation between regime type and intelligence cooperation. Realism (by extension structural realism) predicts states will cooperate if national interests are served irrespective of regime type, awarding a minimal role to regime type. Liberalism (narrowed down to liberal institutionalism and democratic peace theory) predicts regime type matters if democratic peace theory is extrapolated to intelligence cooperation and that institutions play an important part in cooperation. Although these theories partially explain the South Africa-Israel case, neither of them definitively explains how intelligence cooperation manifested during both periods. The above prompted the researcher to look towards a constructivist lens and to focus on identity and culture in operationalizing regime type.

[3] The leaks pertinent to this thesis will be explored and outlined in chapter 4.

1.2 Research Question and Proposition

The overarching research question is: *Theoretically,* does regime type matter when it comes to intelligence cooperation between countries, with specific reference to South Africa and Israel? To answer this question, the following sub-questions need to be answered:

- What is the correlation between intelligence cooperation and regime type in historical perspective?
- How has the relationship between regime type and intelligence cooperation been theorised by Realist, Liberal and Constructivist scholars?
- How has intelligence cooperation changed between South Africa and Israel in the post-apartheid era?
- Can the transformation in relationship be attributed to the change in regime type that occurred in South Africa in the 1990s?

During the Apartheid era, South Africa and Israel shared intelligence with one another. The two nations enjoyed a general and beneficial relationship, however, post-1994 it becomes evident that there is a slow deterioration in the intelligence relationship between the two, from enthusiastic to perfunctory. This thesis proposes that this deterioration is the result of a change in regime type in South Africa. However, it defines regime type in a constructivist way that goes beyond the rationalist[4] definition of different regime types to include perceptions of a state's regime type, identity, interests and place in the world.

1.3 Research Design and Methodology

1.3.1 Research Design

This thesis will follow a qualitative research set, which involves "collecting information in depth but from a relatively small number of cases" (Burnham et al. 2008: 40). In this thesis only one case, namely- intelligence cooperation between South Africa and Israel over two time periods, is the focus. The splitting of the periods coincides with the hypothesis that during apartheid the two states were the same and post-apartheid they began to diverge away from each other. This research design is best suited for this thesis and research question particularly due to the emphasis on perceptions. This study places a major emphasis on the perception, both

[4] This depicts regime type from the perspective of democracy and non-democracy, and how power is obtained.

experienced internally by South Africa and Israel and that of the perception placed upon them by outside factors (i.e. systemic level). Coupled with the analysis of the three theories (Constructivism, Liberalism and Constructivism) on the single case study, which aims to provide a much more in-depth study. The method of analysis will involve interpretation of data (from two time periods: Apartheid and post-Apartheid) to answer the research question. In addition, there will be an element of comparison and contrasting with regards to intelligence cooperation between South Africa and Israel during the apartheid era and post-apartheid era. The time period corresponds with South Africa's change of regime and therefore the impact of South Africa's transition in its identity and culture and how these changes impact on intelligence cooperation will be a focus of comparison. The simple logic behind the start date of comparison between these two states are based on the fact that they were formed in the same year and thus by following their path, tracking the ups and downs of the relationship becomes easy. The reasoning behind choosing these two time periods are due to the fact that during the first period there was a clear beneficial relationship between the two states. During the second time period, the relationship is not on par with what has been experienced in the first, for this reason, these two periods are the best periods for this study. From a theoretical perspective, this thesis will undertake the examination of which theory (Liberalism, Realism and Constructivism) best explains the relationship in the time periods. The hypothesis is that, due to the change in regime, the introduction of an all-inclusive democracy, shift in identity and culture has changed the intelligence relationship between South Africa and Israel. This hypothesis would suggest an emphasis is placed on constructivism to lead the argument due to the concepts of identity and culture.

In order to understand the South Africa-Israeli intelligence cooperation and the impact of regime type on it, this should be done by approaching it from several different angles, this will be done through various means of primary and secondary data such as: leaked documents, various memoirs of intelligence agents, policy documents and an interview etc. The aim of incorporating these various viewpoints is to give the necessary form of validation to findings, especially when working with leaked documents as is this case in the study. The value of contrast (understanding the history of the intelligence relationship and how it has transitioned, in order to depict why it has changed) and the numerous primary and secondary sources, is in an attempt to counter the secrecy that surrounds the intelligence sector. A limitation and reality this study finds itself in, is that it is situated in a classified space and that has had limitations in relation to access to raw data (South Africa intelligence documents in relation to Israel) and

access to key respondents. Therefore, the ideal means of data verification would be to implement triangulation to its peak, however within this study it is hindered, even though one key interview was conducted and numerous autobiographies (by key intelligence figures) accessed (as well as other primary and secondary data), there was still a clear limitation in relation to triangulation and therefore cannot be effectively enforced. However, the researcher is confident that even though triangulation is not possible, the amount of data available from numerous sources are enough to validate the information and findings drawn.

1.3.2 Methods of Data Collection

Data was collected through a desktop study and one interview. The desktop study which included secondary data sources, such as books and journal articles, revolved around the key concepts and theoretical frameworks (the focus of chapter two). Primary sources including official documents pertaining to the South African intelligence sector, as well as the Mossad website that includes the Israeli intelligence mission statement (among other objectives) were also accessed. The key documents that speak to the relationship between South Africa and Israel are leaked intelligence documents as published by Al Jazeera.

Although the researcher set out to conduct 'elite interviewing' that focused on decision makers and those with high levels of knowledge on the subject matter, gaining interviews with those associated with the South African intelligence sector was unsuccessful. The only interview was with Mr. Sasha Polakow-Suransky[5].

1.3.3 Data Analysis

In relation to the interview conducted, a thematic analysis was implemented. The aim was not to gain intelligence or sensitive material regarding South Africa and Israel's relationship but instead to unpack the relationship South Africa and Israel had and has now. The rest of the data was also analysed in a qualitative method, with the data being analyzed via content analysis. According to Weber (1990: 9) "content analysis is a research method that uses a set of procedures to make valid inferences from text". This was instrumental in analyzing the conceptual and theoretical frameworks, and applying these to the two time periods of the case study.

[5] Sasha Polakow-Suransky published "the Unspoken Alliance: Israel's secret relationship with apartheid South Africa. Mr Polakow-Suransky was able to obtain documents and interviews relating to the intelligence relationship, hence his insights were pertinent to the thesis.

1.3.5 The ethical sensitivity pertaining to leaked documents

This thesis makes use of leaked documents that have been compiled by the National Intelligence Agency (NIA) and State Security Agency (SSA) and leaked on Al-Jazeera News Network. It formed part of Al-Jazeera's investigation into the secretive intelligence field all over the globe[6], with this thesis analysing leaks pertaining to South Africa and Israel only. Leaked documents provide an inside account as to how the South African government rated its dealings with its Israeli intelligence counterparts. Particular attention was paid to a document labelled *South African government 'Geopolitical country and intelligence assessment' of Israel*. The importance and relevance of this particular leaked document is that, it provides access to information that would otherwise not be publicly available. What must be recognised about these leaked documents is that they do not provide names or information that makes identification of any individual possible. The question remains whether a leaked classified document is in the public domain and how researchers should incorporate information in these documents into the bigger picture of collected data.

The information contained in leaked documents becomes public knowledge and allows the researcher to pose questions based on this public knowledge to the potential interviewees. As long as referring to the leaked documents do not pose a risk to an individual or state security, which the leaked documents in this case do not, therefore using them does not incur an ethical impediment. When it comes to the credibility and quality of the data obtained through leaked documents, Michael (2015: 5) makes the argument that leaked documents "are no more pressing for leaked information than for most formally released information. Interview and archival research are fraught with potential data quality pitfalls". In the case of this leaked document to verify its authenticity and reliability, sections of the leaked data should be compared to data made available by other sources in order to corroborate the data.

1.4 Significance of the Study

This study aims to fill a gap in the literature regarding the motivating factors behind intelligence cooperation. The body of literature speaks to intelligence cooperation largely does so from a one dimensional rationalist perspective with its emphasis on states' self-help motivation in the case of realism and mutual benefit in the case of liberalism. The realist view of intelligence

[6] These included papers written by Britain's MI6, Russia's FSB and Australia's ASIO (as well as South Africa and Israel).

cooperation is especially reductionist in its explanation of how national security purpose drives intelligence cooperation irrespective of regime type.

The proposed study finds its niche within intelligence cooperation literature by looking at the cooperation between South Africa and Israel within the intelligence field from a constructivist perspective juxtaposed with a realist and liberal perspective.

Constructivists argue that identity matters and is mutually constitutive with culture, including bureaucratic culture. By looking at the case of South Africa and Israel, the study aims to interpret how perception around South Africa's post-apartheid identity brought about by the state's transition to democracy impacted on these states' intelligence relationship. Why states' cooperate is a key question in International Relations, including in the sphere of intelligence and there is more to the answer than national interests and mutual benefit.

1.5 Limitations of the Study

The limitations in relation to this thesis are two-fold, namely around the written data sources and the fieldwork. Intelligence as a field of human activity is by nature secretive and documents are often classified. The time period to declassify primary documents of South Africa-Israel intelligence cooperation is prohibitive, however the author is of the opinion that enough information exists through previous studies and leaked documents to answer the research question. The leaked documents was analysed critically, and corroborated to its full extend by the various primary and secondary sources.

UNIVERSITY of the
WESTERN CAPE

In the fieldwork, the limitations regard access to key respondents and the information they were able to provide. However, the limitation of struggling to attain the necessary data and information from the intelligence field was alleviated by plenty of published works in the field as well as leaked documents. Numerous former intelligence agents have also published books or memoirs about their time in the intelligence field, which have been consulted.

1.6 Structure

This thesis consists of six chapters and will proceed as follows: Chapter one has provided the setting, the research question, the research design, limitations as well as the significance of the study. Chapter two will provide the necessary conceptual and theoretical framework in order to understand the case study, it will outline the concepts and theories that will be incorporated and applied as a lens in making sense of the case study in later chapters. Chapter three depicts the relationship between South Africa and Israel during apartheid, with particular attention placed on the progression of the intelligence relationship. Depicting how the two interacted

during the peak of the relationship, and then tracking the regression of it as apartheid drew to a close. Chapter four ultimately continues where chapter three left off, to explain the reason behind the regression as well as map out how this regression is being acted out. Chapter five will analyse the intelligence relationship as presented in chapters three and four in the context of the theoretical framework provided in chapter two to determine the role of regime type in the intelligence relationship between South Africa and Israel. Chapter six will be a summation of the argument, highlighting the main conclusions and providing a brief outline of future research that can build on the foundation that this thesis provides.

1.7 Conclusion

This chapter gave the rationale for the study by providing a brief context of the (intelligence) relationship between South Africa and Israel and situating the research question – does regime type matter for intelligence cooperation between states – in this context. This chapter outlined the research design and data collection and analysis methodology. It also made clear what limitations were encountered during the study. The subject of the following chapter is to elaborate a conceptual and theoretical framework that will be applied in the study to the intelligence relationship between South Africa and Israel with the aim to answer the research question, namely what role regime type plays in intelligence cooperation between states.

UNIVERSITY of the
WESTERN CAPE

CHAPTER TWO: CONCEPTUAL AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Introduction

In an effort to understand the intelligence sharing relationship between South Africa and Israel during the periods of apartheid and post-apartheid, particular theoretical lenses will be applied. However, as Coetzee (2011) argues, in certain settings a mono-theoretical perspective cannot provide as complete an understanding of the study object as when a multi-theoretical perspective is incorporated. This thesis will implement a variant of multi-theoretical approach. With the above in mind, the three mainstream[7] international relations (IR) theories, namely Realism (including Neorealism), Liberalism (Liberal Institutionalism and Democratic Peace Theory) and Constructivism are outlined here. What these theories have to say about intelligence cooperation will frame the analysis of the case study. The hypothesis of this thesis indicates that Constructivism will play a leading role in the theoretical understanding, particularly in relation to the case study. Therefore, the use of a multi-theoretical approach will highlight the strengths of using Liberalisms and Realism in relation to intelligence cooperation, however, it will be by the means of proving or disproving the hypothesis, thus applying the variant of multi-theoretical approach.

UNIVERSITY of the

The chapter will subsequently be divided into two sections. Section one provides the conceptual framework by outlining the key concepts used in the thesis, e.g. foreign policy, pariah states and regime type (among others). Section two provides the theoretical framework by outlining the mainstream IR theories with the aim of understanding how these theoretical approaches can be used to explain how regime type impacts on intelligence cooperation.

2.2 Conceptual framework

This section seeks to provide an outline of the key concepts that will be encountered in this thesis.

2.2.1 Regime Type

Firstly, a regime would be described as a form of government/political order, as well as an alliance of dominant ideological, economic, and military power actors, co-ordinated by the rulers of the state (Mann 1993: 18). What often separates and categorizes regimes, is how rulers/leaders of a state obtain their power, for example, whether the citizens of the state elect

[7] Traditionally there has been two central theories within IR: Liberalism and Realism, however Constructivism in recent years has been elevated to the same level culminating in three mainstream IR theories. The reasoning behind this is that these theories have been widely accepted, and provide a relevant view of the world in relation to IR (McGlinchey, Walters & Gold 2017: 4).

their leaders through free and fair elections which is the cornerstone of democracy. When power is passed on through a family line, the regime type is a monarchy. Power taken through a *coup d'état* reflects a military dictatorship of sorts. A political regime has a set of rules that identifies it: who has access to power; who is allowed to select the government; and under what conditions and limitations on authority is exercised (Kailitz 2013: 39). Regimes are distinguished by the different methods of political power maintenance: hereditary succession or lineage (in monarchies); the actual or threatened use of military force (in military regimes); and popular elections (in democratic party regimes) (Kailitz 2013: 40). In liberal democracies free and fair elections are not only an institutional feature of liberal democracy, but also the procedural legitimation of the rulers to rule and the legislators to legislate (Kailitz 2013: 46).

In order to be characterized as a modern political democracy, the following eight conditions need to be present. The first four of these will be labelled electoral dimensions of democracy: free, fair, competitive and inclusive elections. The remaining four are referred to as constitutional dimensions of democracy: freedom of organizations, freedom of expression, right to alternative information and freedom from discrimination (Wigell 2008: 236). However, for the purpose of this thesis, regime type will be articulated through a constructivist lens too, which looks at the commonalities revolving around common identity, norms and cultures as the identifier of a regime between countries. Importantly, the manner in which the global community portrays and categorizes a state, impacts on how their regime type is constituted, as well as how this constructivist view of regime type can be used to explain the relationship between South Africa and Israel during apartheid.

2.2.2 Intelligence

Intelligence[8] as a process is the art of taking raw information, analysing it, then placing it within the appropriate context and using it to draw conclusions with regards to certain situations of significance to a particular state (Walsh 2006: 626). Intelligence as a product, can be defined as information pertinent to a government developing and applying policy to advance its national security interests and to develop measures to deal with threats to those interests from genuine or potential adversaries. Intelligence is a distinctive kind of knowledge that has been put through a systematic analytical process in order to support a state's verdict and guide policy

[8] Intelligence within this thesis may be referred to within the context as a process but may also refer to intelligence as a product (information of a special kind).

makers (Hannah, O'Brien, and Rathmell 2005: iii). It may also be defined as the production of unbiased information *vis-a-vis* threats towards the national vision of a state.

The way in which the concept 'intelligence' is used can be broken down into three categories:

- As a process: data is refined into usable forms (reports etc.) for decision-makers, and it is also a structure of organizations that collects and processes information. It is this relationship between processes and structures that determines the successful outcome of the intelligence activity (Hannah, O'Brien, and Rathmell 2005: IV);
- As an organization: it refers to the various functional structures (like the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the US) that exist to undertake the intelligence process and
- As a product delivered to policy-makers: its aim is to provide intelligence on foreign or external threats, intelligence on threats to internal security and intelligence-led advice on policy and decision-making (Hannah, O'Brien, and Rathmell 2005: IV).

Intelligence, when understood in systems terms, can be framed as a cycle that involves the following steps. The first step is the announcement of distinctive requirements needed by the 'consumer'. What will become evident in this step is the clear-cut objectives the information should assist in achieving. In relation to the case study, the 'consumer'-the apartheid South African government, needs information pertaining to ANC members stationed in neighbouring African states and the contacts they keep, would be what a 'consumer' requires. The second step involves the collection of information, which could be through a variety of methods such as: open-source collection; clandestine collection; human intelligence (Humint); signals intelligence (Sigint); imagery intelligence (Imint); and measurement and signature intelligence (Masint) (Hough and Du Plessis 2002: 11). In this respect, the South African *White Paper on Intelligence (1995)* states that the collection of intelligence is not linear, based on the fact that as it may be gathered by covert (secret) or overt (open) means, from a range of sources, human (spies) and non-human (artificial intelligence: computer programs and algorithms) (RSA 1995).

There is also a distinction to be made in relation to domestic intelligence and foreign intelligence, within South Africa but also as a global trend. Domestic intelligence gathering and analysis places an emphasis on government organizations to gather, assess and act on information about individuals or organizations within that states borders (Jackson 2009: 3). Domestic intelligence has similarities with that of traditional law enforcement structures, however, one key differentiator is the intelligence approach to prevent future events (using the

previous sentence indicators). Therefore domestic intelligence places emphasis on identifying individuals or groups that might be planning violent actions and to gather information that might indicate potential changes in the nature of the threat to the country more broadly (Jackson 2009: 3). Foreign intelligence particularly in South Africa follows the same mandate as that of domestic intelligence, however, its jurisdiction is strategic locations and movements of groups that are of potential danger to that state, outside of that states border. These two streams of intelligence is in most states separated, using the case study, Israel has its domestic intelligence branch- the Shabak and its foreign intelligence- the Mossad. South Africa (post-apartheid) has the State Security Agency (SSA) which is the umbrella intelligence department for its foreign intelligence- the South African Secret Service (SASS) and its domestic intelligence- the National Intelligence Agency (NIA)[9].

It should be noted that intelligence may be divided into strategic, operational and tactical intelligence. Strategic intelligence places a greater emphasis on the overall trends of target activities, as well as the planning of military objectives dealing with national security to provide a basis for policy and legislative review (McDowell 2009: 17). Operational and tactical intelligence are part of a similar focus, which is on identification, targeting, detection and intervention actions against specific targets, operational may be at a group level, whereas tactical focusses on the individual (McDowell 2009: 17).

UNIVERSITY of the
WESTERN CAPE

The third step is analysis, the process of transforming raw data into actionable, compact, reliable and refined data. The final step is that of dissemination, getting the intelligence to the relevant individuals or organizations timely to formulate an actionable plan based on the intelligence (Hough and Du Plessis 2002: 12). In essence, intelligence revolves around the identification and assessment of threats and intelligence agencies' capability of warning the state, and to a lesser extent society. It revolves around actual or potential threats, risks, hostilities, dangers and crises that may influence national security interests (Hough and Du Plessis 2002: 8). Intelligence should also assist good governance by highlighting the weaknesses and inaccuracies of government. The above implies that intelligence is not only an input into policy formulation, but also provides a critical review of policies and inputs relevant to effective policy implementation. However, a classical view of intelligence proposes that it should not be involved in identifying options or opportunities for policymakers, nor conduct

[9] The post-apartheid intelligence sector will be discussed in detail in sections 4.3, 4.4 and 4.5

audits on policy objectives. In this view intelligence should portray the facts and identify trends for the policymakers only (Hough and Du Plessis 2002: 10).

The White Paper on Intelligence 1995 is the foremost document pertaining to intelligence in South Africa and defines it as "the product resulting from the collection, evaluation, analysis, integration and interpretation of all available information, supportive of the policy and decision-making processes pertaining to the national goals of stability, security and development" (RSA 1995). The above definition articulates that the "national goals" could be geared towards obtaining it through a countries' foreign policy goals, these policies dictate the path intelligence flows and follows. This definition also constitutes a new contemporary way of looking at intelligence and understanding intelligence, moving away from the reliance on Humint, by the South African government.

Similarities can be observed with the definition provided by James Walsh (2009: 5-6), where intelligence is defined as "the collection, protection and analysis of both publicly available and secret information with the goal of reducing decision makers' uncertainty about a foreign policy problem." According to this definition intelligence is there to aid in clearing up uncertainty with respect to foreign policy. However, intelligence is but one instrument in the successful implementation of domestic and foreign policy and for it to be of importance to policy makers it needs the following attributes: accuracy, relevance, predictive capacity, an element of warning and timeliness (RSA, 1995).

UNIVERSITY of the
WESTERN CAPE

2.2.3 Intelligence Sharing/Cooperation and Alliances

Intelligence sharing occurs when one state (the sender) provides intelligence/information in its possession to another (the recipient). States share intelligence with other states with the expectation that the sharing will be reciprocated, essentially implementing the notion of *quid pro quo* (Walsh 2009: 6). Intelligence cooperation could be understood as an "accord among national governments or intelligence agencies, working together to collect, protect and analyse information to reduce decision makers' uncertainty about foreign policy" (McGruddy 2013: 214). When an agency works closely with another, based on the reality of intelligence being secretive, something mundane as divulging who exactly you are cooperating with could be detrimental for that state's foreign policy.

Therefore, cooperating with a state that an ally may see as a threat could place their 'own' state at risk; hence most intelligence liaisons are kept secret. It is for the above reasons that intelligence liaison necessitates an appropriate amount of diplomacy and bargaining, with an

ideal combination providing a suitable and mutually beneficial intelligence cooperation in an effort to protect both states. A benchmark definition for intelligence cooperation is presented by Richelson (1990: 307), which states it is "an arrangement by a government to exchange intelligence with a foreign government or permit another nation to establish intelligence facilities on one's territory", in the hope of reaping potential benefits. Sharing of intelligence between national governments is at the centre of their attempts to cooperate on contemporary problems such as preventing the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and stopping the activities of terrorist groups and drug traffickers (Walsh 2007: 151). The above essentially changed the way intelligence is perceived as there was a shift from a 'need to know' to 'need to share' in relation to acquiring as much information, that is available pertaining to your state to feel secure (Aldrich 2018: 447).

Grounded in the fact that the intelligence sector is overshadowed by secrecy, two common explanations for cooperation are given: mutual trust between participants and the development of institutions and practices designed to bestow information about compliance (Walsh 2009: 5). The latter addresses the structural principle discussed later in this thesis. There are occasions when states share intelligence with allies or use intelligence sharing to develop relations with a state that it sees as a potential partner (this goes back to the *quid pro quo* notion). Foreign policy (described below) plays a leading role within intelligence sharing. What often occurs from sharing intelligence is that it can afford decision makers new perspective on the problems they face and the likely effects of the policies they select (Walsh 2009: 6). It is therefore clear that the more information made available, the more options or avenues to pursue, this would propose the underlying reasoning behind intelligence sharing.

Clough (2004: 605) is of the opinion that what essentially propels the depth and breadth of international cooperation in strategic intelligence is that of a perceived threat. Clough is depicting that the relationship between the sharing states has a strong reliance on the resources necessitated to impart intelligence on a perceived threat, against the potential risks inherent in cooperation. There could also be a rationale made for relationships being developed in order to gain unwarranted *quid pro quo*. This is achieved by a portion of intelligence being passed from one country to a second, the second country then in liaison with a third shares that portion of intelligence, allowing the third party to think the second country is the original source of the intelligence in order to seek a favourable relationship with the third party (Clough 2004: 608). States might also not want to share information, because the recipient is not interested in the other state's intelligence offer. The recipient may for example feel the intelligence department

of the sending state is not on the requisite level to trust its intelligence or has a reason to falsify intelligence (due to political motivations).

Intelligence liaisons are a delicate matter; it is not simply an exchange of information on matters of mutual concern. It is an instrument of state-to-state relations. It is an instrument of influence that reflects the political, intelligence and security distresses and interests of the participating governments (Gilder 2012: 322). The conduct of intelligence liaison must be carefully managed to guarantee it appropriately reflects the policies of the particular governments. Therefore, the intelligence and security concerns are indeed mutually shared, undue influence is curtailed and that the liaison channel itself does not become a possibility for espionage (Gilder 2012: 322).

2.2.4 Foreign Policy

Foreign policy can be described as "a complex system of agencies and actions intended to alter the behaviour of other states and allow their own state to adapt to the global environment" (Mansbach and Rafferty 2008: 347). It could also be seen as "decision making, that is how individuals in leadership and policy-making positions respond to factors and conditions outside the state" (Mansbach and Rafferty 2008: 347). Based on these two definitions, foreign policy is about interpreting what transpires abroad and putting the necessary steps in place in order to follow and respond to global trends. It may also refer to the "sum total of activities by which international actors act, react and interact with the environment beyond their national borders'. (Hough and du Plessis 2002: 9)". Intelligence are used to inform foreign policy, which is in turn informed by foreign policy in that a country's foreign policy priorities will determine what information demands are made on intelligence officials and who they need to and can share intelligence with.

As defined by Lansberg (2006: 250), foreign policy is "a purposive or goal-orientated course of action, pursued by decision makers of a state, based on sets of social values, to solve matters of public concern, on the basis of clear goals to be achieved". Foreign policy is thus policies aimed towards foreign interested parties, they could be state or non-state actors with the goal of securing economic, political and social interests (Hill 2003: 312). Essentially these are policies developed that are either for the benefit of the home country or benefit of the object country by making the home country that more appealing to the object, e.g. when countries reduce taxes or tariffs in order to stimulate greater trade.

Foreign policy analysis is often done at three levels, namely the individual, state and system level. Kenneth Waltz (1959: 16) identified the three images-three levels of analysis to follow in order to understand how a state may act. The first level revolves around the individual, the traits/behaviour of the human, particularly of leaders determine the actions of a state. The second level revolves around the internal structure of the state, the variant of regime type it has instilled. The third level pertains to the global system and how this system constrains the individual and state level. Of particular importance for this thesis, is the manner in which certain actions impact at a certain level and the reason behind that.

2.2.5 Identity

The concept of identity will be associated with various aspects within this thesis, namely: national identity and organizational identity. Identity refers to the way individuals and groups define themselves and how they are defined by others, usually on the basis of race, ethnicity, religion, language, and culture (Deng 1995: 1). It may also refer to the ways in which "individuals and collectives are distinguished in their social relations with other individuals and collectives" (Jenkins 1996: 4). Essentially these common traits associate actors with each other, which allow bonds to be formed and relationships to flourish. National identity shifts away from the individual and describes the "condition in which a mass of people have made the same identification with national symbols" (Bloom 1990: 52). Therefore, national identity is judged to involve some sense of political community. Political community in turn implies at least some common institutions as well as a definite social space (Smith 1991: 9). In essence national identity transcends merely identifying with someone who shares similar traits, to cluster those with similar traits and beliefs with that of the nation[10] or political community. Therefore, national identity comprises of both cultural and political identity and is located in a political community as well as cultural one (Smith 1991: 99). Organizational identity refers to what members perceive, feel and think about their organizations; this often links with organizational culture. It is often assumed to be a "collective, commonly-shared understanding of the organizations distinctive values and characteristics" (Hatch and Schultz 1997: 357). The notion of identity will be expanded on from a practical perspective and how it impacts on the various levels under the Constructivist section.

[10] "Nations must have a measure of common culture and civic ideology, a set of common understandings and aspirations, sentiments and ideas, that bind the population together in their homeland." (Smith 1991: 11)

2.2.5.1 *Pariah State*

The concept of the pariah state and its relation to South Africa and Israel could be seen as the catalyst that drove the two states towards one another during the apartheid era and therefore needs to be elaborated on. A pariah state may portray one or more of the following characteristics: it is a nation whose legitimacy and constitutional status within its borders are questioned (Harkavy 1981: 136). As a result of laws implemented within their borders; the greater global community refuses to engage with them. It may be a small or weak nation that is potentially out-numbered by its surrounding adversaries, placing it in an exposed position. A pariah state gains its title when its conduct is considered to be out of line with that of international norms of behaviour (Harkavy 1981: 136). Pariah status may be incurred by a nation whose legitimacy is questioned on the grounds of self-determination conflicts and racism and/or a nation that has poor diplomatic leverage and is therefore not considered a good alliance partner by major powers. Essentially a pariah state is a small power with only marginal control over its own fate, whose security dilemma cannot easily be solved by neutrality and a lack of big power support (Harkavy 1981: 136). The Penguin Dictionary of International Relations (1998) defines a Pariah state as "an international state/actor which by virtue of their political systems, ideological postures, leadership or general behaviour suffer from diplomatic isolation and widespread global moral opprobrium".

A pariah state often loses all credibility within the global community and for this reason, trade and cooperation declines to a point where a state is severely isolated and often left to cooperate with states in a similar isolation context. What often becomes a by-product of this isolation especially amongst those pariah states who share a common identity, is that they are urged closer towards each other. The rationale for South Africa's tag as a pariah was due to its racial repression of non-whites especially the black majority, called apartheid (this will be addressed further in chapter three) and the subsequent isolation that came with this apartheid policy. Although Israel's status as a pariah waxes and wanes, it relates to its treatment of Palestinians which has been compared to that of the apartheid government prior to 1994 in South Africa.

2.2.5.2 *Siege Mentality*

Often as a consequence of a state achieving/obtaining pariah status, it develops what is called a siege mentality. The concept signifies a (mental) state in which group members hold a central belief that the rest of the world has negative behavioural intentions towards them (Bar-Tal and Antebi 1992: 633). Due to the isolation experienced as a pariah state, paranoia builds up as a

result of being a state of questionable practices, which leads to the global community pushing for change which fuels the siege mentality. When paranoia occurs, a siege mentality is often used as a galvanising tactic (towards the population), that the outside world is threating their way of life. It often galvanises more than the internal population, often resulting in those with similar siege mentalities banding together out of solidarity with what they believe is correct, in relation to what is being done internally (that caused the pariah status that led to the siege mentality).

2.3 Theoretical Approaches

The intention in this section is to outline the three mainstream IR theories, Realism, Liberalism and Constructivism, and their take on the role that regime type plays in intelligence cooperation between states. The resultant theoretical framework will be applied to the case study in order to explain the intelligence relationship between Israel and South Africa in the analysis section of this thesis.

2.3.1 Realism

The concept of realism within IR is based on an "approach to global politics derived from the tradition of power politics and belief that behaviour is determined by the search for and distribution of power" (Mansbach and Rafferty 2008: 19). Within the 'search for and distribution of power' "states are condemned to operate within an environment deprived of trust and each state is the sole guarantor of its own survival and security" (Mearsheimer 1990: 12 in Coetzee 2011: 70). Realists understand a state (x) should not place trust in another (y), as y would simply garner that trust for y's benefit and x's detriment. Therefore realists 'rationally' place major emphasis on power and security, especially who has it and how it is maintained, which is then perpetuated in the way states interact with one another. Realism concludes that international relations are necessarily conflictual and that international conflicts are generally resolved by war (Jackson and Sorensen 2016: 62). Realism as a mainstream IR approach has a number of characteristics:

- States are the principle/central actors in a world without an over-arching government;
- States are unitary and rational actors driven by self-interest;
- States operate in international anarchy and thus face threats from other states;
- Within this self-help system, states are both offensively orientated and defensively orientated (Peou 2002: 120).

For Realists international cooperation is extremely difficult to achieve. Effectively states deal with or do whatever needs to be done, in order to place the state in a favourable position. Thus, state behaviour exemplifies the notion of egoism that predicts that self-interest will drive political behaviour. Even if conditions may favour altruistic behaviour, it is human nature for egoism to trump altruism (Wohlforth 2012: 36).

Moving from human nature (a Classical Realist notion) to the structure of the international system is a Neorealist pursuit that frames power and security as evident in global politics through the notion of anarchy. Neo-realists argue that the anarchic nature of the international system, with no higher authority above sovereign states ultimately results in "the anarchical nature of the international system entails a self-help system in which all states, regardless of domestic ideological considerations, are forced to provide for their own security" (Coetzee 2011: 8). Mini battles amongst states to establish power ensue, spurred on by a notion of international politics as a zero-sum game where the gain of one actor is equivalent to the loss by an other actor (Mansbach and Rafferty 2008: 21).

2.3.1.1 Neorealism (Structural Realism)

In relation to Realism, Neorealism sees anarchy as a situation where actors have to survive and therefore compete in what can be described as a self-help system. This is composed of a system that is defined as a set of interacting units, at one level, a system consists of a structure and this structure is the systems-level component, this allows the unit to become distinct instead of being part of the mere collective (Waltz 1979: 40). At another level, the system consists of interacting units with the aim of this theory to show how the two levels operate and interact with one another, with the objective to show how the structure is distinct from the level of interacting units (Waltz 1979: 40).

Neorealists' also place emphasis on gains when it comes to interpreting relations, and argue that states have to concern themselves with actors that might resort to deceit in order to gain at the former's expense. Like classical realism, they argue that a state's interests is foremost, hence "states seek cooperation to achieve common interests but without a higher agency to enforce their agreements, cheating is both possible and profitable" (Mansbach and Rafferty 2008: 257). However, they attribute cheating to the structure of the international system and focus on the continuities and changes of this system, not human nature. These structures dictate directives when it comes to national interests of a state as well, the national interests and structures lead the decision makers on a set path and the decision makers are merely along for

the ride. And as a result what we see is that the structure then contains elements at the unit level that may be affected by certain characteristics of the structure at the systems level (Waltz 1979: 46). What is noticeable is that structures do not directly lead to one outcome but rather another as structures affect behaviour within the system (Waltz 1979: 73). The effects are brought about in two areas: through the socialization of the actors and through competition among them, where, socialization limits and moulds behaviour and socialization encourages similarities of attributes and behaviour, as does competition. The structure of any social system contains three elements: material conditions, interests and ideas. For analytical purposes it is useful to treat the three elements as separate 'structures'; material structure, structure of interests and ideational structure. For without "ideas there are no interests, without interests there are no meaningful material conditions, without material conditions there is no reality at all. The task of structural theorizing ultimately must show how the elements of a system fit together into some kind of whole" (Wendt 1999: 139).

Policy makers would serve the interest of their state by maintaining and improving interest, foremost security, rather than serving the interests of individuals or groups. Therefore the main point of foreign policy in relation to realist theory is to advance and defend the interests of the state (Jackson and Sorensen 2016: 62). What this translates into is that officials who act on behalf of the state would deal with their foreign counterparts even if at an individual or state level there was conflict or a clash of world-views. Here the 'pragmatic' side of realism becomes evident; individuals will not let their personal conflicts or views spill over into the system level. It is evident that interactions accordingly take place at the level of the units. In the same way, states will engage for the benefit of national interest irrespective of state-level factors such as governing ideology or domestic politics. When deciding whether to interact with other state actor's security is the trumping factor, meaning that survival of the state in an anarchic system determines cooperation, including intelligence cooperation. This anarchic system portrays a state of nature that is a state of war, this does not indicate that war constantly occurs but rather that due to each state deciding for itself whether or not to use force, war may break out at any time (Waltz 1979: 102). Waltz divides theories of world politics into two levels of analysis: the level of states and the level of the international system. The level of states which he calls 'unit-level' explains outcomes by reference to the attributes or inter-action of the system's parts. The level of the international system which he calls the 'systemic' or 'structural' explain outcomes by reference to the structure of the system (Wendt 1999: 145).

WESTERN CAPE

In essence regime type matters as far as operationally applicable, a different regime may make the cooperation harder, but that is the only impediment for realists, not because it is morally wrong. It is evident that the structure of international politics limits the cooperation of states, and this could be explained by two factors; the resulting factor of a self-help system is that units spend a portion of its efforts in not extending its own good but rather by means of protecting itself against others. This in turn instils a sense of insecurity that places uncertainty in the intentions of others and works against cooperation (Waltz 1979: 105). Secondly, in any self-help system, units worry about their survival and often firms survive and prosper will depend on their own efforts. Indicating that whether it be states or corporations, they will need to rely on the means they can generate and arrangements they can make for themselves. Waltz tries to maintain a clear distinction between systemic and unit-level theorizing, he argues that the study of interaction between states should be seen as unit-level rather than systemic theory, applied to international politics rather than foreign policy.

When two or more states coexist in a self-help system and one with no superior agent to come to the aid of the states that may be weaker, it describes the constraints that arise from the system that those actions produce and will indicate the expected outcome which is the formation of balances of power (Waltz 1979: 118). However, even though states may be disposed to react to international constraints and incentives in accordance with the theory's expectations, the policies and actions of states are also shaped by their internal conditions (Waltz 1979: 124).

WESTERN CAPE

2.3.1.1 Realism and Intelligence Cooperation

James Walsh in his book '*International Politics of Intelligence Sharing*' (2009) imparts a rather realist understanding in relation to intelligence sharing. He imparts that there is a lack of supervision (a mediator to intervene when rules are broken) in the context for cooperation to take place (as a result of an anarchic global state). Realism rationalizes the pursuit of self-interest over moral concerns. This pursuit is best summed up in a passage by Phythian (2009) stating that: "If we were to ask why states regard intelligence as being necessary, we could answer that intelligence is the agency through which states seek to protect or extend their relative advantage in a society that has no greater safety measure." Hence intelligence is about gaining intelligence and knowledge which the actor hopes will provide the relative gains over another actor. Intelligence may provide a state with the relative security it seeks (or provide information that may provide security).

That in turn means that for safety and power's sake, states may out of necessity cooperate with an autocratic state or manipulate a fellow democratic state to achieve its goal. Demarcations of states as democratic or not (in other words, regime type) are of little consequence as no-matter what category, intelligence cooperation will be desirable and engaged in if it assists the security prerogative of states.

Several examples confirming the realist perspective on intelligence cooperation emanate from the USA. In its efforts to combat the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS), the USA actively co-ordinated with Kurdish forces. This occurred when Kurdish fighters shared information with the USA-led coalition to co-ordinate ground and air strikes against ISIS in the Syrian border town of Kobani (Svendsen 2016: 266). A liberal would be surprised that a democratic state such as the USA would cooperate with the Kurds who is an enemy of a USA ally, Turkey (a fellow democratic state). A realist however, would understand that security must be emphasized, even if that means cooperating with an allies, enemy.

Another example comes from the so-called 'War on Terror'. Despite the fact that its rationale is fraught with the notion of a clash of Western and Islamic civilisations[11], the USA cooperates with Muslim countries, such as Pakistan, Egypt and Saudi Arabia in intelligence to combat terrorism. Realists do not find such cooperation strange; security interests trump all other considerations. Intelligence services and bureaucratic departments of states, even those with a long standing tradition of hostility towards each other, may cooperate on an *ad hoc* and informal basis (Aldrich 2010: 22). Even a state such as Iran has become a key ally to many democratic countries in certain contexts such as the USA and Australia, in their efforts to combat ISIS. The main reasoning behind this move from the USA and Iran is that the two states are the group's main targets. This requires the USA to work with Iran to push back ISIS in Iraq, sustain their military progress, and stabilize Iraq's political situation (Tabatabai and Esfandiary 2017: 129). Australia has implemented "an informal arrangement with an emphasis on tracking Australians who go to Iraq to fight for ISIS" and sharing intelligence on foreign terrorist fighters (Mullen and Joseph 2015). Such a plurilateral cooperation system, typically occurs through loosely structured, informal networks (Rudner 2004: 195). These systems are based on specific threats or issues of common concern, which frequently result in information sharing mechanisms being more discretionary.

[11] See e.g. Barber's Jihad vs McWorld and Huntington's Clash of Civilizations

A Realist view of the impact of regime type and intelligence sharing highlights potential practical (rather than normative) issues. For example, Byman (2017: 2) reflects on the conundrum that the USA faces in relation to intelligence cooperation with autocratic ally states in the developing world. These allies often politicize their security institutions to maintain power. Internal communication and information sharing may end up being poor and security services are often pitted against one another. These regimes often lack democratic legitimacy, corruption flourishes by design and many senior leaders are chosen for loyalty, not competence. However, these challenges do not pose a principled problem with cooperation, rather a practical one.

Another example that illustrates the Realist view on the role regime type plays in intelligence cooperation is provided by Brown and Farrington (2016), who compares two dyadic relationships pre-World War 2: a mixed dyad relationship between Germany and Finland on the one hand and a democratic dyad relationship between Finland and Britain. They conclude that the former relationship (Germany and Finland) was stronger and more enduring (Brown and Farrington 2016: 5). The Germans and Finns started intelligence cooperation in 1938, they had direct and large scale exchanges of intelligence that occurred every two or three days (Brown and Farrington 2016: 5). What made this relationship meaningful to the Germans was that the Finns were reciprocating the trade of intelligence; this was not something they had with other partners at that time. On the other side of the spectrum there was the relationship between the British and the Finnish which was a democratic dyad. But, in 1941 the British were fed up with the Finns sharing intelligence with the Germans and started to share intelligence with the Soviets about the Finns. So despite being a democratic dyad, the relationship between the two was neither deep nor enduring. Advocating that the realist view of national interest takes precedence over the liberal view (discussed below), indicating that regime type matters.

For the duration of the Nazi era (1938-1945) it was evident that regime type did not play a significant role in relation to where information was received from, as evident by the British exchanging and receiving information from the Soviets (Bock 2015: 898). However, the British was left frustrated by this relationship as they felt the Russians would grasp ample information, while at the same time refuse to cooperate technically with the British. This cooperation was only feasible due to the mutual threat the two nations had in the form of Nazi Germany. Due to this common threat, the British provided the red army (Russia) with what it required (intelligence resources and military equipment) in order to wear down and defeat their common enemy (Bock 2015: 904).

It appears as if the Russians had no intention of conserving the reciprocity between the two nations in order to achieve maximum benefits between the two. The British would ultimately see the Russians as a collaborator that had no inclination and was under no obligation or pressure to reciprocate the sharing with the British. A realist perspective provides one of the reasons why the Anglo-Soviet relationship ended in 1945, namely the removal of the German threat which was their sole reason for cooperating.

Realists also observe that when there is an uneven power balance this may also lead to an unequal intelligence cooperation relationship. This inequality was evident with the Soviet Union and their relationship that existed with the less powerful states of the Eastern European Bloc (Poland and Romania) prior to 1989 which had seen an unequal intelligence relationship. The Eastern Bloc states were relatively weaker than the larger Soviets and were thus incapable of refusing to share intelligence with the Soviets, if they did refuse there were penalties that came with refusal (Manjikian 2015: 702). However, regime type again is not a factor.

Similarly the formation of the Kilowatt Group seems to confirm a Realist understanding of the role of regime type in intelligence cooperation. Following the attacks at the 1972 Munich Olympic Games by a Palestinian terrorist organization, Israel suggested the formation of the group which consisted of 24 member services: EU member states, Canada, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, the USA (CIA and FBI), Israel (Mossad and Shin Bet) and South Africa. This group would exchange on a non-reciprocal basis, information on terrorists and terror organizations (particularly that of the Palestinians). Lefebvre's (2003: 531) interpretation of the fact that South Africa and Israeli intelligence groups were included in this democratic and Western dominated group is that regime type does not play that large a role when it comes to intelligence sharing. It is understandable that close allies routinely exchange intelligence through various channels, such as bilateral and multilateral arrangements. However the depth and breadth of these exchanges will depend on whether the two potential partners share a common perception of a threat, not regime type (Lefebvre 2003: 531). This is essentially the main argument of realism regarding intelligence cooperation, that sharing is optimal when there is a common threat evident.

Realists argue self-interest, which has the adverse effect of distrust, culminating in vigilance whether cooperating with a democracy or an authoritarian regime and their respective intelligence agencies. A realist would understand the actions taken by the USA National Security Agency (NSA), when they were exposed for spying on German officials, particularly

intercepting German Chancellor Angela Merkel's cell phone communications (Tapper 2015). The NSA had been spying on German ministers in addition to Merkel as well as the German free press under the guise of national security. Providing an indication that democracies, particularly liberal democracies, that are seen as allies (the USA and Germany) are not provided with trust and that national security takes precedence irrespective of regime type.

2.3.2 Liberalism

Liberalism places major emphasis on the individual in relation to world affairs; it recognizes that individuals are self-interested and can be competitive up to a point (Jackson and Sorensen 2016: 97). However, liberal scholars believe that cooperation is of advantage to the individual and the greater good. For that reason conflicts can be circumvented by achieving mutually beneficial cooperation, not only within states but across international boundaries as well. Liberals' outlook in relation to cooperation is that in the long run, cooperation based on mutual interests will prevail (Jackson and Sorensen 2016: 98). They also hold a view of history as progressive equating progress to a better life for at least the majority of individuals. This rationale is applied in foreign policy-making, which leads to greater cooperation among actors in international affairs.

Liberalism as a theory is comprised of certain assumptions in relation to international relations, namely:

UNIVERSITY of the
WESTERN CAPE

- Despite the anarchic nature (realism) of the international system, transnational interactions between actors in the global system will subvert perpetual competition;
- Liberals try to explain peaceful relations between countries by looking at the values they share;
- For liberals, morality plays a significant role within international affairs;
- For liberals, the state is an important actor within international affairs but is not necessarily the most important one and it is also not a unitary actor, but comprised of sub-state level actors; and
- The constant change within the international system provides progress for the better (Nel 2006: 33-34).

In relation to IR, liberalism seeks to explain how "human reason, progress, individual rights and freedoms can give rise to more peaceful interstate relations" (Walker and Rousseau 2016: 22). Liberals believe that democracies will behave differently in relation to non-democracies: "First and most importantly, democratic states are less likely to initiate and escalate conflicts

with other states (known as the democratic peace theory). Second, democratic states are more likely to engage in international trade and investment, and the resulting interdependence will contribute to peace. Third, democratic states are more likely to seek cooperative solutions through international institutions." (Walker and Rousseau 2016: 22). The liberal view includes the state level of analysis, namely that the regime type of states matters for their relations with other states.

Hence cooperation between a democratic and autocratic regime did not lead to greater intelligence cooperation over time. The absence of democratic norms, such as structural and normative attributes on the side of the Russians can elucidate why even though the German threat was large, the Anglo-Soviet cooperation was rather shallow (Brown and Farrington 2016: 1). Based on this lack of structural and normative attributes, autocratic dyads are more probable to experience the shallowest levels of cooperation in comparison to democratic and mixed dyads.

2.3.2.1 Republican Liberalism

Liberalism has brought with it what can be described as peaceful restraint, however, this restraint only seems to work in liberal's relation to other liberals'. This is evident by the fact that liberal states have fought numerous wars with non-liberal states (Doyle 1986: 1156). But in relation to international relations Immanuel Kant's theory on liberal internationalism provides an important analytical theory of international politics. In Perpetual Peace written in 1795 (Kant 1970: 93-130), Kant provides us with an interactive nature of international politics, with the aim of indicating that you cannot study the systemic relations of states, nor the varieties of state behaviour in isolation from each other. However, liberal institutionalism puts forward that domestic and international institutions play a central role in aiding cooperation and peace between nations. Kant argues that perpetual peace will prevail if three "definitive articles" of peace are adhered.

The first definitive article requires that states are 'republican', by republican Kant suggests that as a political society they must have solved the problem of combining moral autonomy, individualism, and social order (Doyle 1986: 1157). Essentially within each state legislative power and executive power are separated, with these domestic institutions, war becomes harder as the citizens would have to approve of it. Kant indicates that Liberal republics will establish peace among themselves by means of the 'pacific federation' which is described in his second definitive article. The second definitive article portrays republics joining and forming a large

federation of fellow republics, who would abide by the same rules as the other, which would likely prevent war and bring with it more republics (renouncing the right to wage war with one another). The third definitive article sets forth a law (by extension international law) to work in conjunction with the pacific union, this law would encourage republics to treat others in what he calls 'universal hospitality' (Kant 1970: 106). This universal hospitality will see citizens being able to travel freely and conduct business in other states, further reducing the impetus for inter-state conflict. In theory, the 'pacific federation' should continue to expand and grow, incorporating more and more republics, increasing relations between these states and reducing conflict. Ideally for Kant, the world would be filled with republics who are joined together by their commonalities, this would lead to the republics treating each other in a manner that will see peace prosper and see how an international/systemic level structure can positively impact an individual level.

Kant continues to explain that the first source of the three definitive articles derives from a political evolution. He labels it "asocial sociability" which draws men together in order to fulfil needs for security and material welfare (Kant 1970: 110-11). As a result, violent natural evolution tends to lead towards liberal peace due to 'asocial sociability', this inevitably leads towards republican governments and republican governments are a source of the liberal peace (Doyle 1986: 1160). The source for the second definitive article is the separation of nations that asocial sociability encourages by the development of separate languages and religions. Due to the fact that over time, in liberal states, culture grows and men gradually move toward agreement over their principles, it leads to mutual understanding and peace (Kant 1970: 114). Therefore, it is evident that a separate peace exists among liberal states, the political bonds are a remarkably firm foundation for mutual nonaggression. However, in relation to non-liberal states, liberal states have not escaped from the insecurity caused by anarchy in the global political system. As the very grounds that establish peace amongst liberal states i.e. constitutional restraint, international respect for individual rights and shared commercial interests, these establish grounds for conflict in relations between liberal and non-liberal societies.

WESTERN CAPE

2.3.2.2 Democratic Peace Theory (DPT)

The core assumption of DPT is that a world where every state is a democracy, this would be a world of perpetual peace (Weart 1998: 3). Owen (1996: 122) in Coetzee (2011: 5) argues that liberalism is the cause of this kind of democratic peace, because democratic institutions are "a product of, and inextricably linked to, liberal ideas". Immanuel Kant argues in *Perpetual Peace*

(1795, in Humphrey 2003) that "the civil constitution of every state should be republican" as this will lead to perpetual peace based on the fact that if citizens are to choose whether to go to war or not, they will choose peace. And, the opposite is true in relation to a "constitution that is not a republic" where the choice is left to a ruler who would not suffer the consequences of war and thus makes it an easier decision to go to war.

The liberal explanation of democratic peace has two strands: one centres on "structures" (the structural principle) and the other on "norms" more generally 'culture' (normative principle). It should be noted that, the structural and normative explanations cannot be neatly separated from one another, as they are two ends of a spectrum. At one end explanations emphasise the-collective and formalized, at the other end they emphasise the individual and internalized (Weart 1998: 6). Due to these strands (structurally and normatively), democracies will find it easier to cooperate with one another.

Structural explanations of democratic peace propose that various structures within democratic governments and their entire societies inhibit war between democracies. These include:

- Constitutional checks and balances that restrain leaders, who may seek to lead a nation into a needless war;
- The entire complex structure of democratic civil society;
- The process of elections and the institutions of representative government (Placek 2012: 1).

WESTERN CAPE

Inasmuch as DPT proposes that democracies are more peaceful than other forms of governance or political systems especially towards other democracies, it prioritizes the state level of analysis and accentuates regime type (democracies and non-democracies) in explaining peace among states. In this sense, it is constructive for the thesis to determine DPT's supporting premises and apply them to explore what Liberalism proposes about the role of regime type in intelligence cooperation.

The reason why peaceful resolutions between democracies are common, is based on democratic institutions themselves, the checks and balances implemented in the branches of government. In a state where opposition political parties are allowed and can raise dissenting arguments, the decision to go to war may be slowed down or nullified. This is not the case in states where opposition parties and dissent is curtailed. However, because democracies understand that structural restraints are limited in non-democracies, they may resort to war more easily than in relation to a fellow democracy.

It is assumed that liberal democracies are more peaceful and law-abiding than other political systems. However, what is being proposed is not that democracies never go to war, but that democracies do not fight each other and are thus by extension more cooperative towards each other (Jackson and Sorensen 2016: 110). The principles of democracy encourages peaceful international relations which liberals hope will lead to a more democratic world. Liberals see IR not merely as state to state relations but also transnational relations (relations between people, groups and organizations belonging to different countries) (Jackson and Sorensen 2016: 99). It is therefore understood that the absence of war between liberal states is the result of liberal ideology on states' behaviour, this behaviour predicates states as "reasonable, predictable, and trustworthy, because they are governed by the citizens' true interests" (Owen 1996: 124 in Coetzee 2011: 76). Essentially liberals advocate the agenda of cooperation over conflict to the point that it is beneficial towards the individual. Therefore, a liberal state will favour a state that is not violating human rights, morality will trump state interests. However, this may just appear at face value, a state may indicate that they are not in relations with a state that violates human rights, but backroom deals are a common occurrence.

Interventions conducted by democratic coalitions are, when compared to non-democratic coalition operations, about 5.8 times more likely to end in success rather than continue (Pilster 2011: 73). Empirical evidence indicated that military interveners are more likely to build coalitions with their democratic allies and that military interventions by democratic coalitions will end rapidly with success for the interveners (Pilster 2011: 74). The problem that non-democracies face, is found within problematic civil-military relations, non-democratic leaders are significantly less likely to grant their armed forces the discretion necessary for the success of multilateral operations.

In the relationship between regime type and alliance formation, democracies are the more valuable allies in the coalition operations (Pilster 2011: 77). Therefore, the concept of DPT asserts that it matters profoundly what category of states are involved in any interaction. Democratic states, it is contended, behave differently than non-democratic or autocratic states do (D'Anieri 2012: 119), therefore, democratic states make ideal partners. This differs profusely in relation to what realism argues on the same topic, in that the category of regime (regime type) does not have a bearing on whether to cooperate or not. Democratic peace theory is thus seen as the ideal comparative measure in relation to two states that are identical in structure, and indicates how these states could strive in intelligence sharing, which is what the next section deals with.

2.3.2.3 Liberal Democratic Peace Theory and Intelligence Sharing

Ryan Bock provides the key Liberal argument about regime type and intelligence sharing by using DPT's central tenet that liberal democracies are less likely to fight interstate wars against each other compared to states who are not democratic (Bock 2015: 892). This essentially falls under the main hypotheses of this thesis, which argues that depending on what form of regime states are, that will determine who and how much intelligence you share. He argues that the same factors that make democratic dyads more peaceful than mixed or non-democratic dyads are present in the configuration of regime types within an intelligence relationship.

The structural and normative/cultural factors that underpin why democracies hardly ever go to war with each other also result in intelligence services of democratic regimes being more cooperative toward each other than to the intelligence services of non-democratic regimes. This is primarily due to the assumption that democracies act differently in relation to autocratic counterparts than they do toward other democracies. Key issues that would enhance the differential treatment from a Liberal perspective is that it is expected that democratic processes (oversight and checks and balances) will prevail in the intelligence agencies of democracies and not in those of non-democracies. For this reason DPT has been incorporated and selected as the liberal argument within this thesis, in relation to intelligence cooperation. The cooperation with non-democracies are limited by perceptions that non-democratic agencies do not share democratic values and the subsequent intelligence provided to them by agencies in democracies may lead to human rights abuses. Another concern is that the intelligence provided by democracies are being used to suppress the citizens of non-democracies and that if that were to be made public, it could be detrimental to the image of the democracy. The same concern is not there when agencies in democracies cooperate, these key issues will in essence push democracies to cooperate with other democracies and share intelligence more freely. Examples of democratic states with deep intelligence sharing arrangements abound.

In 2006, as an intelligence sharing initiative, the NATO Intelligence Fusion Centre (NIFC) was established with the purpose of the centre to share, not to protect (Gordon 2015: 3). Gordon (2015: 3) states that "in addition, as bureaucratic and security hurdles were surmounted, seven non-NATO members, such as Finland and Sweden, who regularly participated in peacekeeping and other international operations could participate in the NIFC for specific missions." Even though Finland and Sweden were not NATO members they were ultimately still accommodated due to their democratic status by NIFC as the structures found within these countries allowed for - "bureaucratic and security hurdles to be surmounted".

Within the UKUSA[12] (the United Kingdom-United States Intelligence Agreement), the highly trusted partners receive intelligence in real-time and on a frequent basis. An example of this is the "ECHELON" system between the UKUSA SIGINT agencies, which provides a network for intelligence sharing spanning collection centres worldwide, this enables the agencies to collect a significant amount of communications (Sepper 2010: 162). This system allows the stations of each partner agency to function as "components of an integrated whole" (Sepper 2010: 162), thus indicating that networks function efficiently when composed of partners that can be trusted to abide by the set standards. A liberal explanation of this level of cooperation points to the democratic nature of all those involved.

DPT holds that democratic political institutions make democracies more attractive alliance partners and hence they are most likely to ally with one another (Horowitz and Tyburski 2016: 177). Democracies have greater public accountability, which makes democracies less likely to back out on publicly built and formalized commitments (i.e. banking on reliability). Reliability and consistency are important characteristics that states look for in allies, including intelligence partners. Therefore regime type plays a vital part in the predictability of a potential partner's future behaviour (Munton and Fredj 2013: 670). These theoretical mechanisms imply that democratic regimes should be more likely to ally with one another than with authoritarian regimes and that more authoritarian regimes should be likely to ally with democratic regimes than with authoritarian regimes (Horowitz and Tyburski 2016: 177).

WESTERN CAPE

2.3.3 Constructivism

Constructivism comprises of the following core claims:

- What is often seen as natural occurrences, are in fact socially constructed factors that can be reconstructed and deconstructed (Nel 2006: 56).
- States are the principle units of analysis for international political theory for some constructivist, such as Alexander Wendt (Zehfuss 2001: 39), but for others, such as Nicholas Onuf (1989), sub-state actors and individuals are important units to analyse as meaning-makers.
- The key structures in the state system are intersubjective, rather than material.

[12] UKUSA will be elaborated on further, later on in the chapter, under "Constructivism and Democratic Peace Theory".

- State identities and interests are in important part constructed by these social structures, rather than given exogenously to the system by human nature or domestic politics. (Zehfuss 2001: 39)

What the above articulates is that states are the centre point when it comes to how interactions between states can be understood, but what happens at the individual and state level is important in terms of the agent-structure debate. Agents (states, but also groups and individuals that comprise the state) make up the structures and can diachronically change the nature of structures through performative action and practices. Constructivists therefore focus on social identities of individuals and/or states, as Alexander Wendt put it, "Identities are the basis of interests" (Wendt 1992: 398). At a systemic level (which has a major impact on the state), the systems implemented are essentially constructed rather than merely fed in naturally. Normative structures[13] may condition the identities and interests of actors, but those structures would not exist if it were not for the knowledgeable practices of actors, therefore constructivists contend that agents and structures are mutually constituted (Reus-Smit 2005: 197). Constructivists tend to be interested in macro-level structures, and within that the constitutive effects of structure on identity and interests (Wendt 1999: 144). The primary value-added of a constructivist approach to culture lies in the analysis of constitutive effects at the micro- and especially the macro-levels.

UNIVERSITY of the

Constructivist studies of social norms are usually clustered into three areas: 1) normative behaviour, which describes how an extant norm influences behaviour within a community. 2) Socialization, this is how an extant norm or nascent norm from one community diffuses and is internalized by actors outside that community. 3) Normative emergence, this depicts how an idea reaches intersubjective status in a community. While constructivists know that social norms are always being reconstituted in the dynamic interplay of agents and social structures known as mutual constitution, social norms do elicit common behavioural expectations such that they are recognizable as relatively stable shared ideas (Hoffmann 2010:5). Put simply, social norms were treated as independent variables- explanations for varied behaviours observed in world politics.

Constructivism claims that people act in accordance with their perceptions of the world. These perceptions are shaped by experience and changing social norms. Once it is known and understood 'who they are' at state level, it becomes easier to understand their interests and this

[13] Detailed explanation of normative structures will be provided further in the chapter.

would lead to policies being forged to pursue those interests. However, unlike realists who presuppose that identities and interests are 'givens' that remain largely unchanged, constructivists view identity formation as a crucial and dynamic process. For constructivists, interests are not inherent or predetermined, but rather are learned through experience and socialization (Mansbach and Rafferty 2008: 34).

Where realists assume that states are selfish and rationally maximizing their gains, constructivists view actors as social in the sense that their ideas and norms evolve from within a social context. As a result, identities change over time in the course of interaction and evolving beliefs and norms, and as a result, so do interests. Constructivist scholars all emphasize the importance of culture and identity, as expressed in social norms, rules and understandings. They argue that the social and political world is made up of shared beliefs rather than physical entities (Mansbach and Rafferty 2008: 34); this should be the starting-point for analysis.

Constructivists study change through the analysis of social interaction and have demonstrated that ideas matter in international relations. They have shown that culture and identity help define the interests and constitute the actors in international relations. Within IR there are important debates raised by constructivists, about social theory and about the different ways in which ideas can matter in IR (Jackson and Sorensen 2007: 176). Constructivism, therefore, is characterized by an emphasis on the importance of normative as well as material structures, particularly on the role of identity in the shaping of political action, as well as on the mutually constitutive relationship between agents and structures (Reus-Smit 2001: 188). Due to the structure of any internalized culture, it is associated with a collective identity, a change in that structure will involve a change in collective identity, involving the breakdown of an old identity and the emergence of a new. Hence, identity change and structural change are not equivalent, this is due to the fact that identity formation happens ultimately at the micro-level and structural change happens at the macro, but the latter supervenes on the former (Wendt 1999: 338). And that the international environment is created and recreated in the process of interaction and that actors' identities are not given but are developed and sustained or transformed in interaction (Zehfuss 2001: 319). According to Wendt, it is the intersubjective, rather than the material aspect of structures which influence behaviour. Actors acquire identities, which Wendt defines as 'relatively stable, role-specific understandings and expectations about self' (Zehfuss 2001: 319). Therefore, identity is a property of international actors that generates motivational and behavioural dispositions, thus identities are significant because they provide the basis for

UNIVERSITY of the
WESTERN CAPE

interests. Interests in turn, develop in the process of defining situations, therefore, identities are the basis for interests and therefore more fundamental.

According to Wendt, international politics is an on-going process of states taking identities in relation to others, then casting them into corresponding counter-identities and playing out the result. The international system would not be played out in different cultures of anarchy were it not for different conceptualisations of identity, hence identity matters not merely when we look at specific states (Zehfuss 2001: 321). Identity relates to the intersubjective aspect of structures and therefore its significance establishes the move away from a materialistic argument and towards the claim that reality is constructed. Identities and interests are not only created in such interactions, they are also sustained that way through repeated interactive processes stable identities and expectations about each other are developed, thereby actors create and maintain social structures which subsequently constrain choices (Wendt 1999: 331). The claim that 'anarchy is what states make of it' revolves around the idea that identities are socially constructed and may be changed, even if such identity transformation is not easy. Although Wendt (1999: 366) argues that there is no contradiction between rationalist and constructivist models of the social process, he does uphold a difference in analytical focus between the two. Constructivist models will thus be useful when we have reason to think that identities and interests will change, therefore the possibility of identity change establishes the difference between rationalism and constructivism (Wendt 1999: 367).

WESTERN CAPE

For the purpose of developing a Constructivist theoretical framework of the role of regime type in intelligence sharing, which can be applied to the South Africa-Israeli case study, this section turns to a discussion on culture, including organisational and political culture.

2.3.3.2 Culture and Constructivism

Culture in its simplest form can be described as:

- Enduring over time;
- Modifiable, however, this is not easy to achieve;
- Shared, often taken for granted and is a frame of reference;
- Having a symbolic dimension that manifests itself in language and behaviour;
- Socially learned and transmitted and provides meaning for those involved; and
- Helping denote organizations' uniqueness and identity (Doherty, Horne and Wootton 2014: 129).

What these descriptions portray, not only within everyday culture use but within organizational culture, such as government bureaucracies, is that there is a certain way things are done. This 'way' is learned and passed on from one generation to the next (transference). A basic analogy would be a relay race in athletics, where a baton in passed from one individual to the next. In order to be effective in the race, the baton needs to be passed on effortlessly to the next person. An organization usually employs the same socialization into organization culture. Mapping culture within an organization provides the following characteristics:

- Ethical codes;
- Basic assumptions;
- Norms of behaviour;
- Beliefs, values and attitudes;
- Artefacts, symbols and symbolic action;
- Rites, rituals, ceremonies and celebrations;
- Jokes, metaphors, stories, myths and legends; and
- The history of the organization, its heroes and villains (Doherty, Horne and Wootton 2014: 130).

What the above describes to us is how surface manifestations such as artefacts, symbols and symbolic actions; rites, rituals, ceremonies and celebrations; jokes, metaphors, stories, myths and legends; and the history of the organization, its heroes and villains, transfer culture onto the individual by immersing them within it (Doherty, Horne and Wootton 2014: 130). By grasping who the heroes are by virtue of commemorative art or quotes, small customs that has continued through the years and stories of years past is how an individual is brought into a specific culture through audiovisual stimuli. What this depicts is how at an individual level, the influencing of a person may impact what occurs at state and even the systemic level. Whereas, basic assumptions reflect the deepest levels of organizational culture that can be passed on with not much effort put into passing it on. What is meant by the above sentence is that, when something is so clear-cut that it allows an individual to automatically assumes that it should be done, it shows that everyone is observing this basic assumption and that's how entrenched it is within the organization.

Beliefs differ from values because they may have been inherited, and may never have been questioned (Doherty, Horne and Wootton 2014: 135). Therefore, beliefs cannot be transferred immediately, they would need to be ingrained over time and those who hold them may find

them hard to explain. Values on the other hand can be expected to be embraced immediately as they are concerned with what ought to be done. The beliefs of organizations tend to reflect the beliefs of the wider society to which their staff and their clients belong. They may not be aware that they hold the beliefs as it has been embedded within them for such a prolonged period. Within an organization and by extension alliances, social interaction can lead to similar views in relation to the context that the organization or alliance finds itself in. This is a benefit towards both organizations and alliances, as common outlooks build bonds and camaraderie. Socialization can be promoted by allowing substantial meetings among the elites, promoting side-by-side working relations with counterparts (Duffield 2018: 275).

What is evident in relation to the cultural web within an organization is that it is resistant to change. Even when new management comes in and wants to shift directions, the web usually survives or morphs rather than transform completely. Transformation of culture takes time and is more successful if changes are made to all strands of the web and not specific parts only (Doherty, Horne and Wootton 2014: 131). When there is a failure to enact changes to the organizational culture, it may be due to changing authority (the power structures), changes in systems of control and reorganizing the organisational structure (Doherty, Horne and Wootton 2014: 132). The heart and soul of the organisation is essentially the stories, myths, rites and rituals, values, beliefs and symbols and heroes and these take more effort and time to change. In sum, culture is more than a summation of the shared ideas that individuals have in their heads, but a 'communally sustained' and thus inherently public phenomenon (Wendt 1999: 164). This view reifies culture making it impossible to explain its production in anything but functionalist terms, collective knowledge structures depend for their existence and effects on micro-foundations at the unit- and interaction-level; without agents and process there is no structure (Wendt 1999: 164). Constructivism can show that culture not only causes but also constitutes agents, therefore, its value-added over rationalism is twofold. It aids in looking at the causal effects on the properties of agents and it helps us think about constitutive effects on behavior and properties. In order for culture to have causal effects on or interact with agents, there must be some sense in which agents and their properties do not depend conceptually or logically on culture for their existence (Wendt 1999: 167). The importance of this relates to the transition period of South Africa and how tough it will/can be to change the culture of an organization.

The notion of political culture is especially pertinent to the context of this thesis in that it seeks to explain and specify how people affect their political system and vice-versa (Chilton 1988:

419). It is defined by Verba (1965: 513) as "the system of empirical beliefs, expressive symbols, and values which defines the situation in which broader political action takes place". Political culture also relates to the shared values and beliefs of a group or society regarding political relationships and public policy and therefore is a key motivator of political behaviour. Political culture could be construed as a system which incorporates political symbols, and within this system nests a more inclusive system that could be labelled political communication (Chilton 1988: 425). Within political culture, especially within South Africa, political communication plays a pivotal role in framing the political landscape.

The concept of political culture can be measured by an extensive range of indicators. Two focal indicators are political tolerance and trust. Without tolerance of political opponents, there cannot be free and fair elections. Without trust in institutions, the political participation of minorities becomes problematic (Garcia-Rivero et al 2002: 163). Consequently, political culture may or may not be compatible with the structure of the political system. Therefore, different cultures fit different regimes, which gives rise to the idea that only a certain type of political culture (civic culture) is appropriate to democracy. Civic culture is a participatory political culture in which the political culture and political structure are compatible (Garcia-Rivero et al 2002: 167). Essentially all strands of culture intertwine in order to determine and frame the psychological structure of a state or organization. When political culture changes this often leads to changes in regime type and vice versa.

UNIVERSITY of the
WESTERN CAPE

2.3.3.3 A constructivist interpretation of democratic peace theory

To complete the constructivist dimension of the theoretical framework relating regime type and intelligence cooperation proposed in this thesis, this section turns to the two explanatory factors why democracies are said not to go to war with each other, namely the normative and structural explanations.

The normative explanation depicts how democracies might maintain peace based on their citizens norms of behaviour, their values and beliefs, and their cultural traditions in general. The normative argument holds that the citizens and their leaders in democracies respect the institutions of democracy not only in their own country but in other countries as well. In terms of normative factors, war is less likely based on the shared democratic values present, which lead to democracies expecting their counterparts to uphold their end of a relationship (trust). This is essentially a constructivist explanation based on the emergence of a shared identity among democracies and a shared norm that another democracy can be trusted (D'Anieri 2012:

122). Indicating that norms instituted at an individual level impacts the shared identity among democracies and vice-versa, which in turn impacts how the state interact at a systemic level. Constructivism relies on the norms and shared understandings of legitimate behaviour by individuals and groups in a democracy, although material factors also play a role. The emphasis on norms and rules can be distinguished from instrumentally rational behaviour in that actors try to do the right thing rather than maximizing or optimizing their given preferences (Fierke 2007: 170). Rather than emphasizing how structures constrain, as rationalists do, constructivists focus on the constitutive role of norms and shared understandings, as well as the relationship between agency and structure.

We can now juxtapose a Realist explanation why democratic dyads share intelligence more successfully with a Constructivist one. Realists emphasise instrumental value of similar values of openness that makes sharing easier and intelligence received better, rather than the normative aspect of sharing intelligence, because there is a norm of sharing intelligence based on a culture of trust among democracies. But, Constructivists go further in arguing that collective ideas and norms play a key role in producing identities and interests that may align. As will be discussed in chapter five, in the South African-Israeli case study, this is an important aspect that helps explain the intelligence relationship between these states during apartheid.

Anthony Giddens (1984) propose the concept of structuration as a way of analysing the relationship between structures and actors or agents, which is useful for a constructivist interpretation of structural explanations of democratic peace. According to Giddens, structures do not determine what actors do in any mechanical way, an impression one might get from the neorealist view of how the structure of anarchy constrains state actors. The relationship between structures and actors involves intersubjective understanding and meaning. Structures do constrain actors, but actors can also transform structures by thinking about them and acting on them in new ways (Jackson and Sorensen 2007: 163).

For neorealists, identities and interests are given; states know who they are and what they want before they begin interaction with other states. For a constructivist like Alexander Wendt (1992), who famously noted that "anarchy is what states make of it", structures are not a given, but constituted by the ideational dimensions. The very interactions with others generates and represents one structure of identities and interests rather than another; structure has no existence or causal powers apart from this process (Jackson and Sorensen 2007: 186). From interactions with structures, states are socialised to understand that a chosen identity comes about by

following the norms associated with that identity (Flockhart 2012: 86). This reinterpretation of democratic peace theory allows the constructivist framework to extrapolate about regime type and intelligence cooperation beyond democratic dyads. The emphasis on identity formation in interaction with another state will be employed to help explain South Africa and Israel's intelligence relationship during apartheid and why the relationship changed thereafter.

The concept of culture has a major influence within the theory of constructivism; cultural structure consists of beliefs, ideas, understandings, perceptions, identities interlocking with one another. It is common within IR scholarship to use cultural concepts like norms, rules, and institutions to treat cooperative relationships, which might be seen as a normatively integrated society of states (Wendt 1996: 49). The structure of the state system contains both material and cultural elements, however the relationship between these elements within a constructivist viewpoint is that priority is given to cultural over material structures, on the grounds that actors act on the basis of the meanings that objects have for them.

Within constructivism we note that the meaningful behaviour, or action, is only possible within a social context, which ultimately permits actors to develop their relations with and understandings of others through norms and practices. The concept of norms involves identity, doing so by specifying the actions that will cause others to recognize that identity, and respond to it appropriately (Turner 2004: 43).

UNIVERSITY of the
WESTERN CAPE

2.3.3.4 Constructivism, Regime Type and Cooperation

When it comes to regime types and sharing of intelligence, depth and breadth of exchanges will depend on whether there is a perception of a common threat. But unlike Realism, constructivism looks to the inter-subjective and structuration processes of identity formation and identification and alignment of interests to understand how threats come to be identified as common in the perception of two states.

Theoretically, any tendency of similar ideological regimes to form alliances depends on whether their goals relative to one another tend to be perceived as less threatening and more aligned than the goals of other types of regimes. Similar regimes are less likely to ally to the extent that similar allies have objectives and policies that pose a threat, and may therefore use an alliance and its benefits to threaten a one-time ally (Horowitz and Tyburski 2016: 178). Therefore, it may be that some types of authoritarian regimes are more likely to ally with one another against common threats, much like democracies. Regime type could be understood not only as a set of distinctive political institutions, but may also be associated with substantive

objectives and policies that creates a perception, that a given alliance choice is more or less desirable. This perception may be confirmed or proven wrong through subsequent interaction.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) is an example of when democratic states effectively come together in defence of fellow democratic states against autocratic states. NATO's institutional design is one of inclusivity, it is open to all European countries as well as the U.S and Canada. Excluding geography, the main criterion for partnership requires members to have a common identity based on liberal norms (Schimmelfennig 2007: 149). When it comes to the strength of actual international cooperation, institutional design plays less of a role and the level of threat to the member states security is of less importance as well. Within the NATO community, actual cooperation in the absence of a common and clearly identifiable security threat, is determined by the identity and ideology of the Euro-Atlantic community (Schimmelfennig 2007: 148).

Therefore, we see that the desire to seek or maintain membership in a given alliance to achieve substantive objectives may make more or less democratic institutions desirable as a means to this end (Horowitz and Tyburski 2016: 187). What should be noted is that dissimilar regime types *per se* are not likely to be a significant barrier to forming alliances where a significant common threat is perceived and dissimilar regime types do not generally harbour expansionist objectives. At the same time, even highly compatible, similar ideological regime types, such as liberal nationalist democracies, are not likely to ally with one another consistently in the absence of significant perceived external threats. It is the combination of greater regime activated external threats and lesser regime deactivated threats among potential allies that seems likely to produce alliances among similar regime types, or among and between certain subsets of regime types (Horowitz and Tyburski 2016: 198).

UNIVERSITY of the
WESTERN CAPE

2.3.3.4.1 UKUSA/Five Eyes

In the previous section a liberal explanation of UKUSA was followed, however, a Constructivist explanation adds to our understanding by emphasising that similar regime types may have more trust in one another than those of a different regime type as they have similar values in place. Deep intelligence liaison requires the development of trust amongst partners that could lead to long-term alliances (Svendsen 2009: 710). This is where constructivism, culture and identity play an important part in deciding who to trust based on having similar values. This is embodied by the long standing formal international intelligence liaison UKUSA, which dates back to the 1940s. UKUSA is an intelligence agreement between the United

Kingdom and the United States of America, with Canada, Australia and New Zealand signing on as second parties to the agreement. It is commonly known as the 'Five Eyes' (an alliance of Anglophone states). This agreement institutionalized and divided the collection and exchange of SIGINT between all five agencies-resulting in the most integrated known intelligence network. These agencies were: the U.S. National Security Agency (NSA), Australian Defence Signals Directorate (DSD), Canadian Communications Security Establishment (CSE), and New Zealand Government Communications Security Bureau (GCSB) (Sepper 2010: 157).

What this demonstrates is that cooperation is closest between states with similar constitutions, outlooks and underlying political values and broadly speaking, culture. This in a nutshell expresses that those sharing a similar regime will have closer intelligence cooperation and not necessarily for instrumental reasons, but for cultural and identity reasons (Svendsen 2009: 718). Cooperation between these nations are deemed to be intimate, however, they are not necessarily mutually beneficial, due to the disproportionate resources at the disposal of the USA and the UK and the rather meagre resources available to Australia, Canada and New Zealand (geographically, Australia and New Zealand are isolated countries thousands of miles from the UK and USA). There are third party countries involved, such as Denmark, Japan, the Netherlands, Norway, Turkey to name a few, but they have limited access to restricted and discretionary SIGINT resources (Rudner 2004: 197).

UNIVERSITY of the
WESTERN CAPE

2.4 Conclusion

The purpose of this chapter was to define the important concepts that will be used and outline the various theoretical lenses that will be applied to understand the role that regime type plays in explaining the intelligence relations between South Africa and Israel in comparative perspective (during apartheid and thereafter). The theory of realism argues that states will share intelligence irrespective of regime type if the partners see the sharing in their national interests of which a shared threat is often the key factor. No matter what regime type a state has, a state's drive to survive in an anarchic system will dictate intelligence and its actions. The theory of liberalism and democratic peace argues in turn that regime type matters in that democracies are likely to form deeper relationships with each other. A constructivist approach agrees that regime type matters, but depicts how culture and identity shape or define policy preferences and how all these combined may lead to a strong alliance whether a regime is democratic or not.

CHAPTER THREE: SOUTH AFRICA AND ISRAEL 1948 TO 1990: BIRDS OF A FEATHER

3.1 Introduction

This chapter introduces one of the two time periods, 1948 to 1990, of the South Africa-Israeli case study. This period from a South African standpoint is the apartheid era. This chapter will argue that Israel's internal policies were regarded in the same light as South Africa's, which provided the catalyst for a strong relationship between the two countries. This chapter provides a general understanding and background of apartheid, and then relates the concept to both states, especially explaining how they acquired their "apartheid status". The attention shifts from the perspective of apartheid as a governing principle that is evident on both sides, to the intelligence sector. It proposes to show how the intelligence sector is impacted by how the two states acquired their proposed apartheid status. From a South African intelligence perspective, the two opposing sides under apartheid will be explored, the apartheid intelligence service and the transformations that occurred within that sector as well as the intelligence sector of the African National Congress (ANC). The ANC narrative is an important theme for the thesis as it lays the foundation of the ANC intelligence thought process, which replaces the National Party (NP) mentality in relation to intelligence post-1994. In terms of Israel, its intelligence services and structures, as well as the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) threat and how the PLO relationship is significant to the apartheid regime and the ANC are explored.

WESTERN CAPE

This chapter outlines key interactions that brought South Africa and Israel closer as countries, but more specifically as intelligence counterparts. The aim of this chapter is to show how the two states are intertwined based on their apartheid policies during this period, not merely on a security level, which includes intelligence and military cooperation, but in many governmental facets. As the chapter concludes, it becomes evident that there is a shift as South Africa makes the transition toward democracy and what it might mean for future cooperation specifically in terms of intelligence. The reasoning behind beginning the timeframe from 1948 to 1990, is based on the fact that even though the was minimal cooperation between the two states in the formative years (it was formative for both states), there is a need to have an understanding as to the context of each as it plays a pivotal role in indicating the road towards each other as the years progress. Therefore, without this understanding of the context of each state, the road towards each other will be of inconsequence and this period will only cover the high-points in the relationship or high-points that led to the relationship. And as 1990 is the start of the

democratic process in South Africa, it was decided to include that period with the democratic section of this thesis, as this is a transition away from apartheid.

3.2 Apartheid as a governing principle in South Africa and Israel.

This section explains the international understanding, codified in various UN resolutions, of apartheid as a principle that informs a state's way of governing its people. It then turns to how apartheid was applied in both South Africa and Israel during the time period under investigation.

3.2.1 *The international understanding of apartheid.*

Member States of the United Nations (UN), commit as per the UN Charter to pursue "universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion" (UN 1976: 1). The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, states that all human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights and that everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms without any distinction of any kind, such as race, colour or national origin. Essentially these documents codify that all people, regardless of race or skin colour should be treated the same and equal to one another.

In 1976, an International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid was established by the United Nations (UN) as South Africa's apartheid policy had gone against the Charter of the UN. The Convention declared that apartheid is a crime against humanity. That inhuman acts resulting from the policies and practices of apartheid and similar policies and practices of racial segregation and discrimination should be punishable (UN 1976: 1).The Convention also defined apartheid as "inhuman acts committed for the purpose of establishing and maintaining domination by one racial group of persons over any other racial group of persons and systematically oppressing them" (UN 1976: 2). In the case of South Africa, the minority white population maintained supremacy over the rest of the citizens of colour in South Africa. The UN would determine whether a state fell under the apartheid banner if the following are present in a state: "the murder of members of a racial group, the infliction on them of serious bodily or mental harm, arbitrary arrest and imprisonment, the imposition of conditions calculated to cause a racial group's complete or partial physical destruction, measures that keep a racial group from participating in the political, social, economic or cultural life or a state, measures that physically segregate a racial group, the expropriation of the land of a racial group, the subjection of a racial group to forced labour, and the persecution of persons who oppose apartheid." (UN 1976: 3). The thesis takes a similar view on what apartheid is and how it manifests in states.

3.2.2 Apartheid in South Africa

As of 1948, the newly elected ruling National Party (NP) government adopted and implemented stringent legislation in order to separate people of colour from white South Africans and treat them as lesser citizens. The political ideology was labelled apartheid. This separation covered most aspects of economic, social and political life (Venter 2011: 6). In order to keep people of colour and white citizens separate, every citizen was to be legally classified into one of four designated racial groups: black, coloured, Indian and white. The racial group you belonged to, determined what school, university and residential area you could be in, with the white racial group entitled to the best of the above.

By law and subsequent police enforcement, the above places were kept segregated in order to keep white citizens from mixing with other racial groups as marriage and sexual relationships across racial lines were prohibited and punishable (Venter 2011: 6). To be white in South Africa was to be privileged and to be black was to be repressed and restricted. A mirror image of being Jewish and Arab Palestinian in Israel at that time. When the South African parliament passed the apartheid legislation, the Jewish population were left unaffected by these new laws. Providing the same privileges to Jewish people as white South Africans'. It was surprising for Jewish immigrants from Nazi Germany, who had suffered oppression and disenfranchisement, to be granted membership of the ruling class; an unexpected reversal of fortune (Polakow-Suransky 2010: 20).

UNIVERSITY of the
WESTERN CAPE

The Republic of South Africa devised a policy that was intended to deprive 75% of its inhabitants (majority Black citizens) of their South African citizenship and by extension democratic citizenship. The Bantu Homeland Citizenship Act (1970) allowed the deprivation of citizenship, which was amended as the Bantu Laws Amendment Act (1974). The 'Homeland Act' essentially gave Black South Africans citizenship to one of ten ethnic homelands (Venter 2011: 6). The intention was to deprive all Black inhabitants of citizenship in the Republic of South Africa, however the apartheid government still recognized them as legal persons (albeit inferior), and thus predicated the legal mechanism of their exclusion on the replacement of their citizenship in the Republic of South Africa with alternative citizenship.

Naturally the black majority was not in favour of these types of legislation, but the white minority had a monopoly on state power, especially condign power through the security apparatus. The primary resistance to this oppression came from the African National Congress (ANC). Since its inception in 1912 it waged a 50 year struggle for freedom which had been

predominantly through peaceful negotiations. Inspired by the next generation of leaders such as Nelson Mandela and Walter Sisulu, the ANC decided to engage in armed struggle against the white political order. It was a combination of ANC allies and the international community generally that pushed South Africa to isolation from the rest of the world. Various instances, such as the numerous labour strikes during the 1970s led by the ANC, were occurred with the objective of making South Africa ungovernable and economically weak. What became evident was that the ANC-in-exile under Oliver Tambo was highly successful in isolating South Africa diplomatically by implementing these factors (explained at the end of this page) (Venter 2011: 9).

In 1976, students in Soweto (the Soweto Uprising) revolted against the enforcement of Afrikaans being the medium of instruction in schools. The rioting spread rapidly around the country and the events that followed, including the assassination of Black Consciousness leader, Steve Biko, hastened the Republic's ostracism (Mills 1994: 19). These events, including the burden of a mandatory UN Arms Embargo in 1977, the increasing hostility of the Carter Administration (USA president from 1977-1981) towards South Africa's racial policies, heightened Pretoria's perception of defencelessness and its siege mentality. The perception of defencelessness set the stage for a fundamental policy review, ultimately, South Africa was faced with a "total onslaught" (Mills 1994: 19). The period from 1980 to 1990 is when the ANC fully undertook its plan to make South Africa completely ungovernable. This tactic, the ANC felt, would bring an end to apartheid. In 1982, at an ANC 70th anniversary celebration in Dar es Salaam, ANC President Oliver Tambo declared that 1982 would be the year of massive action against the apartheid system (SAHO 2018). These actions would include numerous bombing exploits on the side of the ANC and South African apartheid government such as:

- Four bombs exploding at the Koeberg Nuclear Power Station in 1982 for which the ANC claimed responsibility.
- A car bomb exploding outside Pretoria's air force headquarters leaving 19 dead and more than 200 injured in 1983.
- A bomb blast at the Department of Internal Affairs and Police headquarters in Roodeport in 1983.

In July 1984 one of the many states of emergency is called for six months. In January 1985, P. W. Botha offers to release Nelson Mandela, provided the ANC rejects violence as a political

weapon, however, Mandela rejected the offer the following month (SAHO 2018). In June 1986 another state of emergency is called and only officially ends in 1990. The use of violence has led to countless deaths on both sides of the battle, most noticeably the assassinations of Ruth First and Griffiths Mxenga and previously mentioned Steve Biko to name a few. The ANC ensured that South Africa could not function internally and outside pressure in the form of sanctions and embargoes made it near impossible to effectively run the country, feeding their siege mentality. The ANC was instrumental at impacting the state level of apartheid South Africa, however, their real objective was to hurt the apartheid government at a systemic level, which it subsequently did. These factors ultimately led to the destruction of Apartheid through negotiations starting from 1990 and culminated in democratic elections in 1994.

3.2.3 Israel and apartheid

The conflict between Jews and Arabs in Palestine dates back to 1910, when both groups sought to lay claim to the British controlled territory. The Jewish laid a claim to the land based on the biblical promise to Abraham and his descendants, Palestinian Arabs' (Muslim) claim to the land is based on continuous residence in the country for hundreds of years (Beinin and Hajjar 2014: 1). The territory of Palestine was administered by the United Kingdom of Great Britain under a Mandate received in 1922 from the League of Nations (UN 2008: 3). By the beginning of 1928, Muslims and Jews in Jerusalem began to clash, while the British attempted to limit the Jewish immigration as a means of appeasing the Muslims (Beinin and Hajjar 2014: 3). By the end of World War II in 1945 the United States took up the Zionist cause and with Britain unable to find a practical solution, the British referred it to the United Nations (UN). On 29 November, 1947 the UN General Assembly voted to partition Palestine, the General Assembly adopted resolution 181 (II), with the name "the Plan of Partition with Economic Union" (UN 2008: 7).

Within its formation years, Israel was perceived as a humanistic, socialist, neutral, and anti-colonialist state. The Holocaust, the UN Partition Resolution on Palestine and the status of Israeli socialism as a third way between capitalism and communism were all responsible for the state's attractive image (Neuberger 2009: 39). As a result, Israel gained the esteem of socialist leaders such as Nkrumah, Nyerere, Kaunda and to a certain extend Castro. However, from the mid-1960s, Israel's image underwent a dramatic transformation (the result of which will be evident further along in the chapter). Israel has now developed into a Western, European, technologically advanced, militaristic, right-wing and anti-communist country (Neuberger 2009: 39).

The partition 'plan' was put into motion, which terminated the British mandate and created an Independent Arab State, an independent Jewish State and the city of Jerusalem by 1 October 1948. The plan made concessions for Jerusalem, which both newly formed states claimed, and subsequently saw Jerusalem become administered by the United Nations Trusteeship Council (UN 2008: 7). The plan was not accepted by the Palestinian Arabs and the neighbouring Arab States on the grounds that it violated the provisions of the United Nations Charter, which essentially granted people the right to decide their own destiny (UN 2008: 9). Therefore, when Britain relinquished its mandate over Palestine and removed its forces, this immediately led to hostilities between the Palestinian Arabs and the Jewish. The neighbouring Arab nations took the side of the Palestinian Arabs which subsequently led to a continuation of battles between the Palestinian Arabs and Jews. These battles between the Palestinian Arabs and the Jewish population perpetuated tensions, hatred and othering between the two ethnicities.

With the Partition Plan creating an independent Jewish State, David Ben-Gurion, head of the Jewish Agency, established the state of Israel in 1948 with then American President Harry Truman acknowledging the state of Israel on the same day. In relation to the 1947 Partition Plan, the state of Israel was guilty of flagrant violations of the constitutional principle regarding citizenship toward Palestinians (Davis 2003: 68). The Palestinian Arabs are seen as hostile to the concept of a Jewish state in territory that has been deemed wrongfully taken from them. Arab fears was heightened by executions of substantial numbers of Arab civilians perpetrated by right-wing elements among the Israeli forces. This ongoing conflict with, and subsequent treatment of the Palestinian Arabs, is why Israel gets tagged with the apartheid label.

WESTERN CAPE

Furthermore, what classifies Israel as an apartheid state on par with that of South Africa in this period is the withholding of citizenship from a certain ethnic group. The actions taken within and by the Israeli state towards the Palestinians if analysed in accordance with the Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid puts Israel under the apartheid banner. When the 1947 UN Partition Plan was drawn up, it provided that five million non-Jewish, Palestinian Arabs would be entitled to Israeli citizenship. However, due to the Jewish government restricting citizenship, only 20% (one million) became citizens of the state of Israel (Davis 2003: 69). And of the 900 000 Palestinian Arabs who at the start of 1948 lived in the territory that came to be Israel, over 85% were gone by the end of that year, having become refugees in nearby states (Quigley 1991: 225).

The concept of Zionism (the national ideology of Israel) represents a form of nationalism, with the Jewish nation as its centre re-emerging strongly and with Israel as its home. The sentiment of Zionism as apartheid grew stronger, especially due to the fact that categorization and identification was made on the basis of Jew versus Non-Jew. The concept of citizenship is described as a certificate representing a legal relationship between the individual and the state. Democratic citizenship is then the recognition by the state of the right of every citizen to equal access to the political process of the state, to the civil, social and welfare services and to the mineral resources of the state (Davis 2003: 88). Within Israel Jews and non-Jews (specifically Palestinian Arabs) are equal before the law on various issues, for example partaking in the political process, as well as, their legal standing before the courts. However, the non-Jews differentiate from the Jews when it comes to property, to social and welfare services and to the material resources of the state. What this essentially meant was that the Israeli legal system is categorized into two streams based on citizenship. Class 'A' citizenship is reserved for Jews, who are subsequently seen as whole citizens with access to all rights as Israeli citizens. Class 'B', citizens the 'non-Jews', this group is discriminated against through the legal system and treated as second class citizens. A direct comparison between Israel and apartheid South Africa is limited in that Israel never went as far in relation to the complete separation of 'Class A' from 'Class B' as their South African counterparts did. Israel had not been that extensive in their separation of the Jewish and the Palestinian Arabs.

UNIVERSITY of the
WESTERN CAPE

Within this time-frame, Israel had been subject to numerous boycotts but it had bandwagoned onto the USA and been dependent on the superpower in many respects. This allowed the USA to have considerable leverage over Israel when it came to key decisions, including, as will be discussed later, the role it played in the Israel-South Africa political relationship (Walt 1987: 233). But the USA protection could only limit international condemnation of Israel so much. On 10 November 1975, the UN General Assembly adopted a draft resolution describing Zionism as a 'form of racism and racial discrimination'. The draft read as follows: "The General Assembly recalling… that in its Resolution of 14 December 1973, the General Assembly condemned… the unholy alliance between South African racism and Zionism'… taking note also of Resolution 77… -of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) which considered that the racist regimes in occupied Palestine and… -in Zimbabwe and South Africa have a common imperialist origin… -determines that Zionism is a form of racism and racial discrimination." (Adams 1984: 17). This resolution was brought about by Israel's treatment of Arabs within its borders. This race separation could have been foreseen given the manner of

Israel's creation, as there had been no inclination on the part of the Arabs to assimilate into the Jewish population that had taken over Palestine and forced out the majority of their countrymen (Quigley 1991: 249). The passing of this resolution and others similar to it ultimately signalled a growing understanding by the international community that Zionism is a racist ideology and therefore the direct comparison to apartheid South Africa has grounding.

What is evident is that the discriminatory practices are not isolated phenomena, but part of a whole whose purpose is to keep the Palestinian Arabs in a subordinate status, ultimately second class citizens of Israel. There are three pillars that Israel attains its apartheid status from, in comparison to apartheid South Africa. South Africa had the 1950 Population Registration Act to categorize the different racial groups, within the Israeli-Palestine context there is preferential legal status granted to those defined as Jewish nationals under the 1950 Law of Return. This superior status underpins the creation of a dual legal system (Dugard 2013: 911). The second pillar, the territorial and racial segregation, which is evidenced by Israel's land appropriation and settlement policies of Palestinian territory. With visible grid of walls, fences, trenches, roads, tunnels and checkpoints and administrative controls on movements draw comparisons to South Africa's pass laws. The third pillar is the matrix of security laws and practices invoked to validate the suppression of the Palestinian Arabs (Dugard 2013: 911). Therefore, under the Apartheid Convention, Israel's discriminatory practices quality as apartheid policy.

UNIVERSITY of the
WESTERN CAPE

3.3 Consequences of apartheid policies for South Africa and Israel

Given the internal policies of South Africa and Israel, both states faced increasingly hostile neighbourhoods and international sanctions that furthered a sense of being under siege. Their political relationship develops with this predicament as the backdrop.

3.3.1 Hostile neighbourhoods

In 1965, after the Unilateral Declaration of Independence, the then Rhodesian Prime Minister, Ian Smith, had to contend with international sanctions, which ultimately led to Rhodesia becoming somewhat of a client state of South Africa. Rhodesia had little alternate access to outside sources of finance, fuel, armaments and political support (Spaarwater 2012: 58). Under Prime Minister Vorster, the apartheid government's foreign policy was characterized as "outward moving" in an attempt at reconciliation with African states who were the main drivers of sustained attempts to isolate South Africa. Under pressure from the British Labour government, Vorster pressured Smith to find an internationally acceptable solution. He forced the Rhodesian government towards the Lancaster House Settlement negotiations in 1979,

which led to the agreement in the same name that resulted in the recognition of the Republic of Zimbabwe.

Reverend Abel Muzorewa became interim prime minister of Zimbabwe-Rhodesia, pending general elections. The Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU) party with its Zimbabwe African National Liberation Army (ZANLA) under the capable but ultimately disastrous Robert Mugabe, won the election and the latter became prime minister of Zimbabwe in 1980. The new country was recognized internationally and was significantly supported by the People's Republic of China and the Democratic People's republic of (North) Korea (Spaarwater 2012: 59). The significance of this is that, South Africa had lost its last buffer state and would now, according to the apartheid government be surrounded by states under communist and communist-influenced governments, and under direct assault from communist-supported forces both inside and outside the country, driving and inflating their siege mentality. This was a mentality Israel had as well but their fear lied with the Arabs within and around its borders.

During the 1950s and 1960s, Israel highlighted building relations with the newly independent states of sub-Saharan Africa, more specifically South Africa. In 1963, Israel informed the UN Special Committee on Apartheid that it had taken steps to comply with the military boycott of apartheid and had recalled its ambassador to South Africa (Al-Jazeera n.d.: 9). Israel had been openly critical of apartheid throughout the 1950s and 60s, trying to establish itself and subsequently build alliances with post-colonial African governments, who were opposed to apartheid. However, after the 1973 Yom Kippur war (a war that formed part of the larger Arab-Jewish conflict relating to land that Israel has occupied) most African states broke off ties with Israel. The government in Jerusalem subsequently began to take a more benign view of the isolated regime in Pretoria (Al-Jazeera n.d.: 9).

Israel had been involved in numerous wars with its immediate neighbours, such as the Yom Kippur war, the War of Attrition (Israel vs. Egypt, Jordan and Syria) and the Lebanon War (Israel vs. PLO and Syria). From an Israeli perspective, the Yom Kippur war was a campaign waged by the Arab world against Israel's very existence by means of terrorism, an economic boycott and a concerted effort to politically delegitimise the Zionist entity (Neuberger 2009: 13). These conflicts coupled with the internal policies that had been active within Israel, assured that Israel's neighbours would not recognise the state. Iran had been only the second Arab state to recognise the sovereignty of Israel but Iran withdrew its recognition of Israel after

the 1979 revolution in Iran. Post 1979, the Iranian authorities avoided referring to Israel by its name, instead referring to it as a "Zionist regime" (Green, 2018).

3.3.2 Sanctions, embargoes and international isolation

The objective of sanctions may be divided into two interrelated categories: symbolic and instrumental. While regarded principally as expressive, symbolic actions may be undertaken for instrumental purposes as well. A state's international image is inseparable from its ability to protect its power, as a realist would argue the ability to portray power equals power. Sanctions that were adopted against South Africa were adopted to express disapproval of apartheid as well as to reassure domestic groups that the country is fully committed to racial equality (Payne 1990: 21). From the late 1960s Prime Minister John Vorster's NP government (South Africa) embarked on a so-called 'outward moving' foreign policy initiative in an effort to counter international economic and diplomatic sanctions set up by the UN (Spaarwater 2012: 141). The objective was to overcome the cumulative isolation of the country by establishing new commercial and diplomatic relations. This effort was concentrated on the African continent where generous assistance and terms of trade can be put on the table.

In the aftermath of the October 1973 war, Arab states placed an oil embargo on Israel. As a ripple effect, the Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) states imposed an oil embargo against South Africa and in doing so, registered protest against both South Africa's internal racist policies and at Pretoria's improving relationship with Israel (Joseph 1988: 159). In November 1975, the UN General Assembly adopted Resolution 3379, which equated Zionism with racism. Thereafter, from an Arab and Palestinian perspective, both South Africa and Israel were regarded as apartheid states that had to be internationally isolated (Joseph 1988: 159). South Africa and Israel were slowly being ostracized by international organizations. South Africa left the International Labour Organization (ILO) and then the World Health Organization (WHO) in 1964. Boycotts and embargoes were not only limited to trade and economics, there were numerous sports and culture activism taking place. South Africa had been banned from all international athletic competitions and from the Olympic Games. It had no official place in UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization), the International Civil Aviation Organization, the International Telecommunications Union and the Universal Postal Union (Beit-Hallahmi 1987: 163). Many international artists refused to perform and tour both Israel and South Africa, but on a sports front South Africa was completely isolated. The sporting boycott had more of an impact on South Africans as they were exceptional in various sports codes and not being able to

participate had been felt as detrimental to their success. The above sanctions served two major functions, namely firstly, in the case of South Africa, the growing international pressures and internal strife was slowly moving the country to a boiling point. Secondly, the mounting international pressure and isolation had only pushed South Africa and Israel closer to one another.

3.3.3 Siege Mentalities

Both South Africa and Israel felt directly threatened by guerrilla groups that were found just outside their borders and who they labelled as communists and/or terrorists. Both states were situated in hostile neighbourhoods supportive of their perceived enemies. In the Cold War context they had the backing of the USA, but it did not stop international condemnation and increasing ostracism for their governing principles. These factors propelled in both states siege mentalities, i.e. a feeling of being under siege with most states being against them. The two states provided the world with the impression that both were surrounded by hostile, merciless enemies, which in turn justified their actions. Respectively, they sought to convince the rest of the world that if their governments fell, the odds were good that the African countries and Arab states would gang up against them (Bar-Tal and Antebi 1992: 632).

South Africa's siege mentality was accentuated by the shaping of close links with other pariah states, such as Paraguay, Taiwan, Chile and Israel. It was the relationship with the latter that especially turned into one for mutual security. For this purpose, the two states weaponized this shared siege mentality and used every means at their disposal to arm themselves with modern weapons from the open market and from each other to build up their own independent arms industry (including developing nuclear weapons) (Adams 1984: 3). According to Walt (1987: 34) the siege mentality also justified their stance toward each other, namely by aligning with a similar state they ultimately defended their own governing principles. Israel supplying South Africa with modern technology required in order to improve its security forces is also more understandable in this context (Mills 1994: 17).

3.4 South Africa and Israel: Political relationship

South Africa and Israel had a long historical relationship as evident by a statement made by former Prime Minister of the Union of South Africa, Jan Smuts, addressing the Jewish community of South Africa on 3 November 1919: "The white people of South Africa, and especially the older Dutch population, has been brought up almost entirely on Jewish tradition. The Old Testament, the most wonderful literature ever thought out by the brain of man, the Old

Testament has been the very marrow of Dutch culture here in South Africa. That is the basis of our culture in South Africa, that is the basis of our white culture, and it is the basis of your Jewish culture; and therefore we are standing together on a common platform, the greatest spiritual platform the world has ever seen. On that platform I want us to build the future of South Africa" (Davis 2003: 87). Although the 'common platform' that Jan Smuts referred to was the foundation of Israel and South Africa's relationship, their similar governing principles, resultant pariah status and siege mentality were factors that continued to draw the two states closer to each other.

The year 1948 was significant for both South Africa and Israel. In South Africa the National Party (NP) won the electoral vote and became the ruling party. In Israel, following the 1947 Partition Plan, the Israeli state was established. From the onset trade between the two started to develop and it seemed as if a flourishing relationship was on the cards. A few years later in 1953 the first Prime minister under NP rule, Daniel Malan, visited Israel. However, there had been years of ongoing disputes within the Israeli Foreign Ministry over the relationship with South Africa, due to the risk of losing ties with sub-Saharan African states (Neuberger 2009: 18). At the start of the 1960s ties between the two countries were on the decline. The persistent pressure from the international community applied to the South African government due to the continuing domestic unrest provided Israel with a choice: South Africa or the rest of Africa. Israel was provided with an early warning of its impending ostracism, when it was not tendered an invite to the 1955 Afro-Asian Bundang Conference[14] in Indonesia and a sign that Israel should garner closer ties with the nations of Asia and Africa (Neuberger 2009: 14). The fact that all the countries of Asia and Africa were invited to the conference bar Israel and South Africa, placing the two states alongside one another and the attendees issuing a joint declaration expressing their support for the Arab rights in Palestine and called for the implementation of the UN resolutions (Neuberger 2009: 17).

In the end, Israel chose the rest of Africa as the focus of its diplomacy in the 1960s. The reasoning behind this was that, the rest of Africa could still provide the mineral resources Israel as a country needed and appeared to help with the easing of Israel's political isolation from its Arab neighbouring countries (Joseph 1988: 11). This decision had no perceived negative connotation added to it. Israel could get the resources it required, and in the process distance

[14] The Bundang Conference had representatives from 29 'non-aligned nations in Africa, Asia and the Middle East, most notably: Egypt, India, Iraq, and China (Neuberger 2009: 14).

itself from apartheid South Africa. Israel's stance became clear when in 1961, they voted in favour of the first major UN resolution calling for sanctions against South Africa, a resolution that was subsequently opposed by the West. It seemed as though Israel's choice had paid off. African states were reluctant to support anti-Israel UN resolutions, and Israel paid back in kind by sending thousands of experts to African states and training African students at Israeli universities (Joseph 1988:11). The South African government was not pleased with Israel's stance and after the 1961 vote, Pretoria restricted the transfer of contributions from Jews in South Africa to Israel.

Israel's victory over its Arab neighbours in the 1967 Arab war caught the South African government's (especially the security sector's) attention. The white minority in South Africa had seen this victory as a beacon of what could be done against numerical odds and with the proper motivation. The Vorster government relaxed its stringent currency regulations and allowed South African Jews to transfer $20.5 million in aid to Israel. Even though Israel still needed the rest of Africa's support, cooperation with South Africa increased markedly (Joseph 1988: 12).

In 1971 the relationship declined again. Israel, in an effort to play it safe in their commitment to other African states, provided a financial contribution to the African Liberation Committee of the Organization of African Unity (OAU). This was done with the intention of reassuring the rest of Africa that Israel was indeed against apartheid, regardless of its budding relationship with Pretoria.

From 1957 to 1973, Africa was the preferred continent of Israel's third world policy, during this period, Israel had diplomatic ties with thirty-three countries in Africa, all of which hosted an Israeli embassy. Israel thus had more embassies in Africa than any other country bar the United States. It is important to note that during this period Israel did not have an embassy in Pretoria nor did South Africa have an embassy in Tel-Aviv. Despite its warm ties on the continent, the Yom Kippur War engendered a complete reversal in Israel-Africa relations (Neuberger 2009: 18). Between March 1972 and September 1973, seven African nations broke off their relations with Jerusalem, from October to November 1973, no less than twenty-one countries broke off ties with Israel as a sign of solidarity with Egypt and in protest of the Israeli army's crossing of the Suez Canal (Neuberger 2009: 20). The wholesale severance of ties with the African states triggered a complete turnaround in Israeli-South African relations.

By 1974, the Israeli Consulate in South Africa was upgraded to an embassy, thus making Israel one of 24 states to have diplomatic missions in South Africa. In 1975, South Africa responded by opening an embassy in Israel. The diplomacy between the two nations seemed to have influenced their respective positions towards one another on the international stage. This became evident at the UN when Israel's voting pattern transitioned from condemnation of Apartheid to abstention or an absence from any vote that pertained to South Africa. Examples of these include:

- 1971: Resolution adopted by the General Assembly on the situation in South Africa resulting from the policies of apartheid. Israel abstains (UNDL 2018).
- 1976: Resolution 31/80 on the status of the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid adopted by the General Assembly. Israel abstains (UNDL 2018).
- 1981: Resolution 36/172 on the public information and public actions against apartheid and role of the mass media in the struggle against apartheid: adopted by the General Assembly. Israel non-voting[15] (UNDL 2018).

The Arabs' success in helping to isolate Israel, especially in Africa where Israelis had endeavoured to build close relations, prompted the Jewish state to develop stronger ties with Pretoria, a decision which contributed to further isolating Israel (Payne 1990: 121). For this support, South Africa repaid Israel by being one of the few countries in the world not to call for Israel to withdraw from territories it occupied from 1967 (Joseph 1988: 22).

Following the collapse of relations with Africa in 1973 and the failure to entice the Asian giants (India and China) since 1950s into diplomatic relations, Israel was left seeking a viable alternative to supplement the losses that would be accrued from the African states. Israel set its sights on Latin America, during the 1970s most of the governments in Latin America were military regimes which Israeli hoped to collaborate with on security matters (the relations were predicated on Israeli weapons exports) (Neuberger 2009: 21). And despite the efforts invested into Latin America, Israel was on the end of a couple of political bombshells, such as Mexico and Brazil voting in favour of the UN General Assembly 1975 resolution equating Zionism with racism.

[15] Abstaining pertains to intentionally spoiling a ballot with the vote being tallied, non-voting means the voter did not cast a ballot and therefore not tallied.

At this time, what enticed these two nations to one another from an Israeli point of view is that their ideal ally would be powerful, rich in natural resources, they should also not be too susceptible to American influence, should have shared geopolitical interests with Israel, and above all, should have the resources and technology to help build a sophisticated weapons industry. South Africa seemed to fit the bill (Joseph 1988: 34). For South Africa on the other hand, Israel as an ally meant that it had the opportunity to gain backdoor access to Western markets, e.g. Israel enjoyed duty free access to the European Economic Community (EEC) and had a large number of export-orientated industries and transportation channels to Europe. These warmer diplomatic ties between the two states had the UN's Special Committee against Apartheid suspicious that the two were in major collaboration with one another. The committee began to collect evidence that Israel was aiding South Africa to circumvent European boycotts of its products, such as fruits and textiles. This was accomplished by re-exporting South African goods under Israeli labels (Polakow-Suransky 2010: 74).

By the end of 1974, Shimon Peres, Minister of Defence (later Israeli Prime Minister), came to Pretoria to meet secretly with South African leaders to establish an important link between the two governments. Peres had the idea that these new links between the two countries will develop into a relationship with similar aspirations and interests, which would be of long-standing benefit to both (Polakow-Suransky 2010: 80). The following year Peres met with his South African counter-part, Defence Minister P.W. Botha. The two laid the foundation for a flourishing military relationship. Beginning from 1974, the two defence bureaucracies started engaging in bi-annual meetings between members of both defence ministries and arms industry officials. This extended to military intelligence officials on both ends, who started convening annually, alternating the location of the meeting between Tel Aviv and Pretoria to discuss strategic cooperation (Polakow-Suransky 2010: 81).

On 31 March 1975, both defence ministers met again to discuss the possibility of South Africa acquiring nuclear weapons, which the Israeli delegation formally offered to sell. From a defence standpoint, South Africa and the West were no longer as cooperative as they used to be; only Israel had an efficient government to government arms relationship with Pretoria (Joseph 1988: 77). South Africa had to live with an international arms embargo since 1963. The gaps and loopholes in the embargo were patched in 1977. With the death of Steve Biko in 1977 the UN Security Council Resolution 418 determined the acquisition of arms by South

UNIVERSITY of the
WESTERN CAPE

Africa constituted a threat to international security. Hence all members of the UN were obliged to stop the supply of weapons, ammunition and equipment to Pretoria (Joseph 1988: 44).

Within days after the 1977 embargo, Israeli foreign minister Moshe Dayan said that South Africa was a "good friend" and that Israel would not "leave her to the mercy of fate" (Joseph 1988: 45). Israel was forced to abide by the embargo, but Israel interpreted it as excluding commitments made before the UN resolution. Not much could have been done to alter what had become one of the most significant strategic alliances. Adams (1984: 199) noted that the alliance had grown in an atmosphere of secrecy and for the Israelis became something close to shame.

The so-called 'special relationship' that subsequently emerged has been described as one based on convenience not affection or a relationship prompted by realpolitik, especially from the Israeli side (Joseph 1988: 88). Israel at this point had not been formally cut off from the international community to the lengths that South Africa had been. Arguably, Israel got more out of the trade with South Africa. Realpolitik could be said to explain the relationship by two relatively isolated states with few alternatives. From a practical standpoint the notion that "states with similar domestic systems are one's natural allies, and those with different political systems or beliefs should be viewed with suspicion" as noted by Walt (1987: 37) supports such an interpretation. The choices made in both states had essentially forced their hands in the direction of one another.

UNIVERSITY of the
WESTERN CAPE

However, Israeli-South African relations did not look at all like what we would expect between reluctant bedfellows with nothing in common but interests (Joseph 1988: 89). There are many countries who had continued to do business with South Africa, such as the conservative Arab country, Iran under the leadership of the Shah and with Latin American countries (Beit-Hallahmi 1987: 160). The two states (South Africa and Israel) shared a fondness of one another that transcended the mere business relationship the two have led the international community to believe existed. White South Africans closely identified with Israel and missed few opportunities to show their admiration and empathy with the state. This could be linked to what Jan Smuts had to say about the two states' common cultural foundations. Particularly from an ideological solidarity perspective, where alliances usually result from states sharing political, cultural or other traits (Walt 1987: 33).

It is fair to say that the two states had a successful alliance, based on the confluence of factors. These factors included a similar historical predicament based on their governing principles (regime type), leading to international isolation and a shared siege mentality that acquired momentum of its own as these states increasingly engaged. The relational dimension is important. South Africa and Israel's cooperation during the apartheid period grew out of the two states' isolation, but their isolation was also perpetuated by their relationship with each other. Israel realised that once the international community placed them in the same bracket as South Africa, they might as well break all reserves and go full steam into the relationship. The alliance with Israel broke through the psychological and practical isolation in which South Africa had been trapped.

3.5 South Africa-Israeli intelligence relationship during apartheid period

Having discussed the broader political underpinnings of the South Africa-Israeli relationship during the apartheid period, the chapter now turns to the intelligence relationship. It starts by providing a brief overview of each country's intelligence sector and then explores how they cooperated in this time period.

3.5.1 South African Intelligence Sector

The Apartheid era intelligence field consisted of a range of statutory services, the focal point of which was the National Intelligence Service (NIS), with a domestic and foreign mandate. The security branch of the South African Police (SAP) had a domestic mandate, although it also operated against the ANC outside the country. The military intelligence division of the South African Defence Force (SADF) had both a domestic and foreign mandate and most of its efforts were also focused on the liberation movements (Gilder 2012: 245).

3.5.1.1 Bureau of State Security (BOSS)

In 1969 the South African government set up the Bureau of State Security, which in theory was supposed to work in conjunction with the security police on intelligence to counter the rising threat of black militancy. The mandate conveyed to BOSS was to "investigate all matters affecting the security of the state, to correlate and evaluate the information collected and, where necessary, to inform and advise the government. To perform other functions and responsibilities as may be determined from time to time (RSA 1969)." This seems to be a stock definition provided to intelligence agencies, but the last sentence which could be interpreted rather vaguely is where questions in relation to their activities may be asked. As no specificity

is provided as to who may ask or provide BOSS with these "other functions", this leaves plenty of uncertainty and space for interpretation as the political elite deemed fit.

There is not much published regarding its structures, however, it is reported by O'Brien (2011: 26) that it had six departments including: Subversion, Counter-espionage, Political and Economic Intelligence, Military Intelligence, Administration, and National Evaluation, Research and Special Studies. In its foundation years, BOSS continued to benefit from a rather unofficial and uncomfortable relationship with British and American intelligence. This unofficial relationship had been based around intelligence sharing in relation to Communist activities, which were of interest to both the Americans and British, as well as training methods for conducting counter-insurgency (O'Brien 2011: 26). As the six departments depict, BOSS was merely intended to collect and handle intelligence, they were not to act on the intelligence gathered, but instead to leave that to other organs of the state with the statutory function to do so. In essence BOSS was meant to provide operational intelligence with the ANC being its primary target.

In theory BOSS was to be solely an organisation for the centralised co-ordination, assessment and dissemination of intelligence, however, this was not the case. BOSS would not only become an operational unit but develop into an intelligence and operations organisation for the Prime Minister's prerogative. From an operational standpoint, BOSS's initial success in the early 1970s was achieved by infiltrating the guerrilla movements followed by a wave of arrests on the ANC. However, the failure to predict or counter the Soweto uprising, the disaster of the Muldergate scandal and above all, the change of prime minister (John Vorster to P. W. Botha), resulted in the opportunity for change (Adams 1984: 87). BOSS, however, would not survive the 1970s. With the Soweto Uprising seen as a stain on the watch of BOSS, they had tried to play a productive role in relation to policy development and that is what they did when the apartheid regime had to review their security strategy. The 1977 White Paper on Defence had received contributions from BOSS on how to uphold the right of self-determination of the 'White Nation' (Africa 2009b: 67). This was a small instance of when the intelligence agency impacted on security policy, but during the height of apartheid, security policy and strategy were coordinated at the national level by the State Security Council (SSC). What was significant, was that the heads of the intelligence services also served on the SSC, thus giving them tremendous influence in national decision-making (Africa 2009b: 68). Essentially, the three main agencies- the South African Police Security Branch, the Directorate of Military Intelligence (DMI) and BOSS was governed by the SSC through several pieces of legislations,

particularly the 1972 Security Intelligence and State Security Council Act, making the SSC the true centre of power (Hannah, O'Brien & Rathmell 2005: 21). In 1978 the "Information Scandal" exposed the South African Department of Information using covert funds to purchase media outlets with the hope of influencing overseas perceptions of South Africa. This brought to an end Vorster's premiership. The new Prime Minister P.W. Botha had an intense dislike of the extremist policies carried out by BOSS under John Vorster (who had used BOSS to spy on political opponents within the government), which he viewed as counter-productive. The only solution was to do away with BOSS entirely and build a new agency based on academic principles of analysis. Botha thus formed the Department of National Security (DONS) in August 1978. By 1980 it had become the National Intelligence Service (NIS) (Adams 1984: 88).

3.5.1.2 National Intelligence Service (NIS)

The NIS was to move away from what BOSS had become and rather be what it was envisaged to be, which was to investigate all matters affecting the security of the state as well as correlate and evaluate the information collected. This meant that its power and influence was limited to research and analysis, with its operational capabilities terminated (O'Brien 2011: 66). There was a reconfiguration regarding roles within the South African intelligence sphere, with the main objectives of the NIS being limited to assessment and analysis. Botha entrusted the new NIS dispensation to the relatively young and inexperienced, 33 year old Dr Niel Barnard as the head of NIS. Barnard was a strong admirer of the CIA's interaction with academics and thus following the mandate that Botha had set out. He began to change the NIS's methodology to be more academic (O'Brien 2011: 68).

Relations between this improved intelligence service (NIS) and the Western government agencies were rather intimate. Senior military officials from the South African armed forces were able to visit the USA officially and did so regularly. There was a regular exchange of information on persons of interest to both states, as well as the NIS supplying the West with details of shipping movements. With a good supply of hard intelligence coming from the Soviet Union toward the ANC, the South African government looked toward their anti-communist allies for support, applying Cold War rhetoric (Adams 1984: 88). Such information exchanges may have surprised some members of Western governments that the likes of the USA and Britain could support a racist regime. However, there were strong factions in many intelligence service and armed forces in the West that believed a strongly pro-West, white ruled South

Africa was essential to halt the advance of Communism in Africa and to secure the free flow of oil around the Cape of Good Hope (Adams 1984: 88).

3.5.1.3 The ANC's intelligence background

When the apartheid government banned the ANC in 1960, with many members in prison already, the remaining members went underground and exiled to neighbouring countries (Mozambique and Namibia). The ANC in exile was a huge organization which had offices all over the world. It took care of thousands upon thousands of its cadres in Zambia, Angola, Tanzania, the front-line states bordering South Africa, in western and eastern Europe, in the Americas and Asia (Gilder 2012: 137). Following the student uprising of the mid-1976, there was an increase in young recruits flooding into exile and the ANC opened a secure rear base for the training of new cadres. The overall political and administrative leadership to this vast network was provided by the ANC's National Executive Committee (NEC) which was headed at the time by O.R. Tambo (Gilder 2012: 137). The struggle within South Africa from the ANC perspective was co-ordinated by the Politico-Military Council (PMC). The PMC co-ordinated three operational structures: the political headquarters, the Umkhonto we Sizwe (MK) headquarters and the Department of National Intelligence and Security (NAT).

As a member of the ANC intelligence sector during apartheid, Barry Gilder, had been in exile in Angola. Gilder is of importance as he takes up a rather important role in the democratic South Africa within the intelligence sector after the 1994 and his story provides a sense of ANC intelligence culture. In the 1980s, Gilder, as part of an extensive military cooperation between the ANC and the Soviet Army, went to Moscow to be trained in small-unit guerrilla warfare and large-scale conventional warfare. The training was to be conducted by what was called the 'Northern Training Centre', a department of the Soviet military that had been set up especially to provide military training to liberation movements around the world (Gilder 2012: 100). The course was designed in order to allow for different specializations such as: military tactics, artillery, weaponry and engineering. This training was ultimately to be taken back into the numerous camps the ANC had in African nations in an attempt to disrupt the apartheid government. The training was extensive, covering organizing a revolution through all its stages of development, from the early beginnings up until the regime fell in the fictional country.

During the pinnacle of the apartheid struggle, virtually all of MK's general training took place in Angola. Initially the training was conducted by the Cubans and Soviets, but then the ANC command took charge with the Cubans and Soviets taking over under special circumstances.

This is of special importance as it relates to the culture that has been instilled in these intelligence agencies. On the one spectrum there was the apartheid intelligence sectors which had its origins traced back to the British, Americans and Israelis. The other side has the ANC-DIS (Department of Intelligence and Security) and MK being trained by the Komitet Gosudarstvennoy Bezopasnosti (KGB) (Soviet Union) and later, the Main Directorate of the General Staff of the Armed Forces of the Russian Federation, GRU (Russia), the Cuban Direccion de Inteligencia (DGI), Libyan intelligence and the East German Stasi (O'Brien 2011: 219). There is a stark contrast in protocols and culture between the intelligence agencies of the apartheid state and that of the ANC. Not only is this significant for the next chapter when the two agencies merge into one as the democratic era came into effect, but also impacts on intelligence cooperation with Israel as will be discussed.

Like other ANC exiles and refugees, intelligence operatives were financially dependent on outside support (donations), of which the majority came from the Swedish and Norwegian governments. They covered the costs of feeding and caring, in the form of a small monthly allowance, rent, bi-annual clothing allowance and a once off furniture allowance for refugees living more permanently in Botswana (Gilder 2012: 164). From the mid-1984 to mid-1985 the Swedish government contributed about $150 000 and the Norwegian government contributed about $170 000. That was not the only contribution the Swedish made. Over the period of 1972-1992, they contributed close to $52 million, in what they called 'daily necessities' for ANC refugees throughout southern Africa (Gilder 2012: 164). A factor for this generous contribution from the Scandinavian countries is that they noticed some ANC members develop a social democratic rhetoric, which is what the Scandinavian countries advocated for (Gilder 2012: 164).

Intelligence for the ANC operative was essentially "just a branch of the knowledge industry" (Gilder 2012: 243). The bulk of the information that it draws on is actually information that is available to any ordinary citizen. Similar to most intelligence agencies the ANC-DIS focused on the manner in which the information is analysed to be valuable. Two areas may aid in this process. First, organizing the information in order to provide insights into the world in which modern nations operate, advising the leaders of nations on the threats, risks and opportunities they face as they undertake the work of governance and negotiate their place in an ever-changing world (Gilder 2012: 243). Secondly, it lies in obtaining that small amount of secret information that the nation's adversaries prefer to keep hidden in order to give governments the edge in pursuing their objectives.

3.5.2 Israeli Intelligence Sector

The Israeli intelligence community was built on a combination of various traditions that were learned, adopted, inherited or copied from other countries, mainly Britain, France, the United States and the former Soviet Union (CIA 1979: 9). In 1979, the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA-America intelligence agency) described the Va'adat as the central body in Israel's intelligence and security community. Its primary function had been the co-ordination of all intelligence and security activities at home and abroad. It consists of the Director of Mossad, the Director of Military Intelligence, the Director of Shin Beth, the Inspector General of Police, the Director General of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, the Director of the Research and Political Planning Centre of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs (CIA 1979: 10). Israeli intelligence was based on the views of clear identification of enemies, the comprehensive collection of information about them and the perpetual search for allies. Key goals were to always be aware of the capabilities and intentions of the Arab states toward Israel, to develop relations with intelligence agencies in order to benefit Israel, and collect specifically information regarding anti-Zionist activity and how to neutralize it (CIA 1979: 9). The Israeli intelligence community includes:

- the Aman: the supreme military intelligence branch;
- Mossad: the agency responsible for the collection of foreign intelligence and covert action outside of Israel;
- Shin Bet: the agency responsible for internal security and counterintelligence;
- The intelligence branch of the Israeli Police and
- The Centre for Political Research: the intelligence branch of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs that analyses raw Intel from various sources for officials on the policymaking level (Al-Jazeera n.d.: 14).

UNIVERSITY of the
WESTERN CAPE

In 1949, Reuven Shiloah proposed establishing the Central Institute for Co-ordination of the Intelligence and Security Services (Mossad). The goal was to achieve more co-ordination and direction of intelligence activities (Mossad 2018). Ben Gurion (one of the founding members of the State of Israel and its first Prime Minister) approved the proposal. Mossad was established on 13 December 1949. Due to its mandate of predominantly being based outside of Israel, it had established working relationships with foreign intelligence agencies especially the CIA. Shiloah subsequently served as the first director of Mossad. He endured a tough start to the organization, with an embarrassment as early as 1951 (an Israeli spy ring was exposed in

Baghdad), Shiloah subsequently retired in 1952 (Encyclopaedia Britannica 2018). Essentially the external intelligence service operated under the Foreign Ministry as part of the State Department, which had two arms: Collection, which operated mostly in Europe, and Analysis, which operated in the Foreign Ministry headquarters in Tel Aviv (Mossad 2018).

Mossad's mandate includes:

- "Covert intelligence collection beyond Israel's borders";
- "Preventing the development and procurement of non-conventional weapons by hostile countries";
- "Preventing terrorist acts against Israeli targets abroad";
- "Developing and maintaining special diplomatic and other covert relations";
- "Producing strategic political and operational intelligence" and
- "Planning and carrying out special operations beyond Israel's borders" (Al-Jazeera n.d.: 17).

Values of Mossad:

- "To serve in the Mossad is a national mission";
- "To perform this mission by identifying with values of the nation and statehood and with the goals of the Mossad";
- "To adhere to values of justice, integrity, morality and simplicity, reliability and personal responsibility, discipline and secrecy";
- "Cultivate excellence, task orientation and dedication";
- "To encourage initiative, creativity, resourcefulness, and valour, and are open to varied opinions and criticism";
- "Mossad employees are the source of its strength and the organization invests in cultivating them, developing their capabilities, and instilling them with a feeling of team spirit" and
- "The Mossad leadership obliges its members to lead and motivate, undertake full commanding responsibility and realize this in a constructive manner, provide backup, delegate authority, led by example and serve as a source of inspiration."
  (Mossad 2018).

UNIVERSITY of the
WESTERN CAPE

Mossad maintained eight operational divisions: a collections department, a political action and liaison department called Tevel. A special operations division, a manpower, finance, logistics and security department, a research department, a technology department, a training department and a technical operations department (CIA 1979: 16). Initially, Mossad was responsible for aiding and facilitating the large scale illegal immigration of Arab Palestinians to Palestine by the end of 1949 to 1950. However, their task was later extended to include espionage and counter-espionage activities abroad, the obtaining of armaments and related technologies. It had an economic intelligence unit which looked for loopholes in the Arab oil embargo through which Israel may benefit from (Al-Jazeera n.d.: 17). Mossad is in charge of operating agents in countries further afield including the Arab states, their agents penetrate countries through third-party countries (Kahana 2002: 421). Mossad is co-responsible for the provision of an early warning of general war, it is also co-responsible for collecting military, political and strategic intelligence (Kahana 2002: 422). Mossad is responsible for special operations in foreign countries aimed at collecting information about and or preventing terrorism through information gathered via HUMINT and SIGINT (Kahana 2002: 442). The mandate and ideology of Mossad has not changed over the course of the years, maintaining its *status quo* within the intelligence community.

Within the Israeli Defence Force there was an External Relations Department (ERD), which was one of the most powerful and secret organizations within its intelligence community. The ERD had been created in 1974 by then Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin, in the wake of the Yom Kippur war, which had been an intelligence failure of note and was not acceptable for Israeli intelligence standards. The mandate given to the ERD was essentially to be a watchdog to monitor other intelligence services while at the same time conduct its own intelligence gathering (Thomas 2009: 109). Of special interest here is one department within the ERD that dealt with other friendly intelligence networks, the RESH. At the top of its list was the Bureau of State Security (BOSS), the most feared arm of South Africa's security apparatus, but a friend to Israel and specifically to Mossad**.**

As of 1958, Israel's military prowess proved very attractive to African leaders, most of whom presided over unstable governments and armed forces whose loyalty could not be guaranteed. As a result of this, Mossad became involved in the training of military personnel in the Ivory Coast, the Central African Republic, Cameroon, Senegal, Togo, Tanzania, Uganda, Ethiopia, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Somalia and Mauritania (Adams 1984: 13). In the 1960s, Morocco felt threatened by Algeria and Egypt, which was when King Hassan II enlisted the help of Mossad

to establish a secret service. Mossad had assisted the Nigerian security service in 1984, in the botched kidnapping of Umaru Dikko a politician from London. In 1985 the Sudanese intelligence service helped Mossad and the CIA in carrying out Operation Moses, which was the transfer of Ethiopian Falashas to Israel via Sudan (Al-Jazeera n.d.: 42).

In addition to military assistance, Mossad had taken the opportunity to set up a highly efficient intelligence networks which spread throughout the continent. Aside from training the secret services in Ghana, Uganda and Zaire, Mossad gathered recruits in every country that Israel supplied aid to. This was a good investment as it led to Israel gaining invaluable intelligence within the region, and this in turn had proved very useful to the South Africans who had access to Israeli intelligence relating to guerrilla activity on the African continent (Adams 1984: 13).

3.5.3 Working Together

Beit-Hallahmi (1987: 126) suggests that according to a former BOSS operative cooperation between South Africa and Israel on intelligence operations dates back at least to 1964 when communication between the secret service of the two countries was routine. Visits to Israel were a common occurrence for those in the South African security forces, for example Theunis "Rooi Rus" Swanepoel. He was the chief interrogator of the 1964 Rivonia Trail, the man known as the Beast of Soweto for the way he crushed the 1976 riots. He was always a welcomed and honoured visitor to Israel in the 1970s (Beit-Hallahmi 1987: 127). The fact that the Israeli government, more specifically agents within Mossad had been welcoming of an individual, such as Swanepoel, shows that the Israeli and South African sides were on the same page about what is needed to protect their states.

This 'understanding' was based around the fear that both states and their intelligence agencies believed that their respective neighbouring states were tilting toward a revolution that would eventually engulf both their countries (Thomas 2009: 161). Based on this fear, it led to BOSS and Mossad becoming the most feared foreign intelligence services in Africa. The Israeli secret police had a permanent mission in South Africa, thus being able to help their counterparts in the day to day operation of intelligence in the apartheid system. Shin Bet, much like Mossad, prided itself on its success in keeping the Palestinians under control by using a network of informers penetrating Palestinian organizations and harassing and arresting suspects. Shin Bet operatives felt they could teach the South Africans how to control the natives (Beit-Hallahmi 1987: 127).

When it came to their enemies the two agencies had relatively free reign in dealing with their states' main threats, namely the ANC, PAC and SACP in South Africa and the PLO for Israel. While BOSS had its own methods of interrogation, Mossad provided and taught techniques that worked for their agents in the field. Methods such as squeezing genitals and a variety of mental torture ranging from threats to mock executions. The two agencies travelled to neighbouring African countries on sabotage missions, which often involved killings which the Mossad agents demonstrated for their counterparts, without any embarrassing evidence left behind (Thomas 2009: 160). Mossad even offered to locate ANC leaders living in exile in Britain and Europe for BOSS to kill, which the Bureau welcomed but ultimately declined due to the support it had among die-hard Conservative politicians in London (Thomas 2009: 160). The reason the two agencies got along so well is that they matched each other in their internal make up and when it came to issues such as blackmail, sabotage, forgery, kidnapping, prisoner interrogation, psychological warfare and assassinations (Thomas 2009: 160). Both states provided their intelligence structures *carte blanche* in order to neutralise their enemies. This allowed the two agencies to interact and pass on methods that are not within the realm of legality**.**

There seems to be an understanding of *quid pro quo* based on the fact that the two agencies had very similar problems and had some semblance as to the solutions to them. In Israel's case the PLO has proved a particular successful adversary, cleverly changing its image from the terrorist movement of the 1960s and early 1970s to that of a more mature and moderate organization. The first sign of a shift was the PLO enjoying observer status at the UN since 1974 and in 1976 when it was admitted to full membership in the Arab League (Encyclopaedia Britannica 2018). The ANC in a very similar manner, transitioned from a 'terrorist' group (as labelled by the apartheid government) to a moderate political organisation. Thus, adding to the common identity apartheid South Africa and Israel had, they both had similar images of the enemies that they wanted out of the picture.

In 1972 the two states agreed to come to the aid of one other with significant implications for intelligence cooperation. This was ratified when Ezer Weizman, then a senior official in the Israeli defence ministry, met with P.W. Botha who was working at the State Security Council (that had a mandate of advising the government on the countries national policy and strategy in relation to security) at the time. This aid was an *understanding* not openly discussed that if either country were to be attacked and required military assistance, the other would come to its aid (Thomas 2009: 160). From a South African security perspective, agencies such as BOSS,

the NIS, the Security Police and the Department of Military Intelligence (DMI) collaborated closely with their Israeli counterparts. Collaboration included exchanges of information, transfer of technology from Israel to South Africa and training of South Africans by Israeli counterparts (Beit-Hallahmi 1987: 126).

Military intelligence cooperation between Israel and South Africa increased dramatically in the 1970s and 1980s. South Africa became Israel's partner in clandestine projects including nuclear and missile research. There were cabinet level meetings between the defence and intelligence counterparts of the two states held at least annually and intelligence was regularly shared. South African generals visited Israel's front-line in Lebanon and Israeli generals similarly visited South Africa's front-line in Namibia and Angola (Jeenah 2010: 3). By the beginning of 1975, the intelligence relationship had also been formalized and South Africa assisted Israel with various intelligence gathering operations.

Israeli operatives were able to help the South Africans monitor and infiltrate the ANC. According to Israeli intelligence several hundred ANC members had been trained by the PLO either in Lebanon or at training camps in South Yemen (Adams 1984: 91). However, Mossad had managed to infiltrate the camps to an astonishing degree and had consistently passed back relevant intelligence to the South African authorities. Providing the South African government with early warnings of changes in strategy and tactics as well as detailed lists of recruits, their specialties and their performance on the training courses (Adams 1984: 91). This type of information severely hampered any planned action, especially bombings, the ANC's disruption tactic of choice. The South African government's successes in combatting the ANC threat are owed in large part to Israel and Mossad directly. Much of the efficiency of the South African security services must be placed at the door of Israel, as there had been permanent Mossad agents based in South Africa in an advisory capacity since 1976, who were both army experts and specialists in counter-intelligence operations and interrogation (Adams 1984: 91).

An important outcome of intelligence sharing is training. While it is difficult to substantiate training activities, evidence indicates that Israel assisted South Africa with different aspects of training particularly in the intelligence field (Payne 1990: 135). Payne (1990: 136) notes that South Africans have graduated from Israeli military schools and Israeli military advisers served in South Africa as instructors and guides for local ground forces. Payne also states that strategies used by the South African defence forces in their invasion of Angola and attempts to destabilize neighbouring states follow Israeli strategies against the PLO and the Arab states. A

logical outgrowth of intelligence sharing and training is technical cooperation. Technical research and collaboration between Israel and South Africa had significantly enhanced the latter's ability to produce many of its own weapons, to lengthen the production run and lower the unit cost, and protect its borders against guerrilla attacks (Payne 1990: 136).

In 1976, the Israeli Defence Ministry sent Colonel Amos Baram as a special advisor to the chief of the South African Defence Force (SADF). His attitude to the mission was that "we have a common interest, security problems. Not just borders, internal problems too." (Polakow-Suransky 2010: 97). The challenge according to Baram was that it was not simply about fighting communist troops in Angola, but helping South Africa maintain domestic security as well. Mirroring military cooperation in 1976, South Africa and Israel entered into a trading agreement as part of their expanding relationship to pool together intelligence information. For South Africa this meant access to Israel's unrivalled sources in the USA and within Africa. Besides the economic incentives, Israel gained access to South Africa's monitoring operation at Silvermine in Simon's town, Cape Town. The South African navy still enjoyed mutually fruitful cooperation with NATO, in particular regarding the continued availability of the Simon's Town shipyard facilities to Western navies and the shipping tracking station at Silvermine (Spaarwater 2012: 84).

A secret CIA analysis of Israel's foreign intelligence and security services prepared in March 1979 stated the following: "Israeli liaison in Africa has varied considerably from country to country, depending on the exigencies of the situation. Israel intelligence activities in Africa have usually been carried out under the cover of military and police training, arms sales to national military forces and aid and development programs" (Adams 1984: 85). This relationship was a clear benefit to the South African security sector. With Mossad's reach spanning the African political spectrum and wielding considerable covert influence as well as gathering excellent intelligence, the Israelis' were a valuable ally.

By 1979, South Africa had become the largest purchaser of Israeli arms, accounting for 35% of Israel's military exports (Jeenah 2010: 4). In 1984, South Africa had requested, and was given, training by the Israel Defence Force (IDF) on anti-terrorism techniques to combat the ANC. This was followed by a visit from a senior South African Defence Force (SADF) official to the Occupied Palestinian Territory, as a guest of the IDF, to witness Israel's anti-riot equipment and methodologies (Jeenah 2010: 4). The significance of this is that at the time, the two states were combatting a similar enemy according to them, the ANC and PLO. This is

essentially what the military intelligence relationship was about, not economic gain but a common understanding of their pariah status and the enemies they faced which left the two states in a common struggle for survival. As a result of both being pariah states, Israel and South Africa were not in a position to choose who they could trade or cooperate with, and as they had both been labelled as pariah states they had nothing to lose in cooperating with one another. Due to restricted resources, as pariahs, neither Israel nor South Africa could afford to manipulate or betray the other. Post-Apartheid, South Africa became a democracy and was no longer seen as a pariah or isolated from the world along with Israel, thus removing their long standing cooperation based on their isolation.

What the two states made their highest priority was the pooling of information about terrorism placing an emphasis on strategic intelligence. When Mossad conducted a covert operation in Lebanon in June 1982 targeting the PLO, the mission was a success as Mossad discovered documents that showed detailed international cooperation between the PLO and various other 'terrorist' groups including the ANC. Documents explained details of training, funding, equipment, safe houses and their various agents around the world. This information was of paramount importance if the apartheid government was to thwart the threat of the ANC. In the early 1980s, ANC leaders in exile started receiving parcel bombs and letter bombs in the mail. This terror campaign resulted from cooperation with Mossad, which had used similar techniques in its deterrence of PLO leaders. These operations and cooperation between the two had led to a real camaraderie among Israel and South Africans in the intelligence services (Beit-Hallahmi 1987: 127).

UNIVERSITY of the
WESTERN CAPE

3.6 <u>The apartheid era draws to an end</u>

South Africa and Israel were both nervous about relying too heavily on the United States and these fears proved to be well founded. In 1975, the USA Senate voted to discontinue covert aid to Angola. By early 1976, the flow of funds to the anti-Communist forces in Angola had slowed to a trickle (Polakow-Suransky 2010: 87). After the Clark Amendment passed South Africa withdrew its troops from Angola and concentrated its troops in northern Namibia. South Africa felt betrayed and abandoned by the Americans.

Throughout the 1980s, South Africa's intelligence and security relationships with British and American intelligence had become more important, in specific reference to the Cold War context within which South Africa perceived itself to operate (O'Brien 2011: 167). However, due to growing international isolation, even these intelligence relationships became strained.

The Reagan and Thatcher administration (USA and England respectively) tried to retain clandestine links to Pretoria as losing South Africa and its key geo-political location would be counter-productive in the Cold War efforts of the West. Ultimately, these efforts failed as the negative image associated with South Africa was too much to maintain open strategic relations.

But South Africa was not the only country to feel betrayed. Israel saw Washington halt economic aid and significantly reduce military aid. The American move caused Israel's Prime Minister, Yitzak Rabin to reconsider his state's excessive reliance on Washington. He subsequently resented President Ford for signalling to Israel's enemies that the Jewish state was still dependent on the United States and could be forced to make concessions in order to obtain arms (Polakow-Suransky 2010: 87). Israel's push toward South Africa could have been a reaction to the worsening relations with the United States. The Israeli politicians had hardly played down the rifts with America, emphasizing their displeasure over President Ford's slicing of $550 million of USA aid (Kessler 1976: 158). The USA at the time, was South Africa's largest single trading partner, with trade in 1985 amounting to $3.38 billion and according to the United States Department of Commerce in 1985 some $8 billion worth of shares of South African companies were being held in the USA (Joseph 1988: 76).

The Apartheid government had a primary aim of preventing the USSR from establishing a commanding presence in southern Africa, which it shared with the USA. The South African government felt it deserved more assistance from the USA in opposing the spread of communism. This point was made on numerous trips by Lieutenant General Wessie van der Westhuizen to see the then director of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) and chairman of the National Security Council (Spaarwater 2012: 112).

The White House began to show signs of a tougher stance toward both Israel and South Africa by cancelling the sale of 500 pound concussion bombs to Israel and publicly denouncing apartheid soon after Jimmy Carter entered the White House as President. With the Soviet and Cuban threat gone, South Africa could no longer appeal for Western support by invoking anti-Communist arguments, nor could it rationalize repression of the democratic opposition by cloaking apartheid in Cold War rhetoric (Polakow-Suransky 2010: 218). In other words, the American government could no longer hide behind the communist threat as its reason for supporting the apartheid government, which was not ideal for Pretoria.

After the turn in the USA policy toward apartheid South Africa, Israel found itself alone among the developed nations in still maintaining strong, even strategic relations with apartheid South

Africa. It belatedly started to echo USA sentiments. On 18 March 1987, the Inner Cabinet of the Israeli government denounced the apartheid policy of South Africa and limited Israel's security ties with Pretoria (Al-Jazeera n.d.: 10). On 16 September 1987, the Israeli Cabinet approved a series of measures designed to limit trade, sports and cultural ties with South Africa. Put into effect was a clause in the "measures" package, which stated that with immediate effect, only coloured, Indian and black students would be allowed to attend leadership courses held in Israel (Al-Jazeera n.d.: 10). It was more difficult to break the cultural ties and common identity which has been developing for over fifty years and had sustained the two nations' relationship.

With an incumbent ANC government ready to take over South Africa, the secretary-general of Israel's far-left Mapam party, Elazar Granot, addressed delegates of the Socialist International. This was a global gathering of social democratic leaders, attended by many European heads of state. Granot praised Nelson Mandela for what he has accomplished. However, the first words from Mandela were "the people of South Africa will never forget the support the State of Israel gave the apartheid regime" (Polakow-Suransky 2010: 219). Showing the intent and supposed attitude towards those who actively and openly supported the apartheid government, from the incumbent ANC government.

The Israeli government had now also come to the realization that apartheid was dead, the priority of the Israeli government had shifted to making sure that South Africa remained a customer rather than becoming an enemy. By enemy, that does not explicitly mean rival but could also refer to the new South African government playing hard ball on issues, such as keeping Israeli secrets from the apartheid era. The new South Africa no longer saw a need for a wartime arsenal and Israel was forced to replace its most important customer with new clients such as China and India (Polakow-Suransky 2010: 229). Israel had to take action if it was to convince the new South Africa to not completely write them off. After Mandela's release Israel appointed critics of apartheid to key posts in Pretoria, such as Alon Liel, who became ambassador in 1992 (Polakow-Suransky 2010: 218). Liel then started dealing exclusively with black leaders in an attempt to ingratiate Israel to the pending new South Africa which did not sit well with the de Klerk government as they didn't like being passed over while they were still in control of South Africa.

3.7 Conclusion

From 1948 when the National Party took the reins in South Africa and the Israeli state was formed, both states employed apartheid policies that discriminated on a racial basis against groups of their citizens to the point of global outrage. These policies led to resistance from

inside and outside their borders. Along with their hostile neighbourhoods, international isolation of these states led to mentalities of being under siege, which in turn became the justification for security directives that included relying on each other. But, the enthusiastic relationship that ensued politically, militarily and in terms of intelligence went well beyond necessity to reflect a bond informed by empathy of each other's political predicament and national identity. Intelligence cooperation during the period 1948 to 1990 was inspired by this broader relationship and inspired in turn an alignment of organizational culture between the intelligence agencies, including through training and joint operations. The shift in the USA policy towards apartheid South Africa signaled that apartheid would not be sustainable and that political transition was on the cards. By analyzing the intelligence structure of both, there are similarities that are ascertained and changes that are brought about due to the others influence. This trend becomes of importance at a later stage when change is enforced. This transition and its impact on the intelligence relationship between South Africa and Israel is the focus of the next chapter.

UNIVERSITY of the
WESTERN CAPE

CHAPTER FOUR: THE SOUTH AFRICAN-ISRAELI INTELLIGENCE RELATIONSHIP POST-APARTHEID (1990-2015)

4.1 Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to investigate the intelligence relationship between South Africa and Israel post-1994, starting with the transition period in 1990 to 1994 and concluding with the Zuma era in 2015. South Africa's regime transitioned as of 1990 from an apartheid state to a democracy in 1994, with the premise of becoming an all-inclusive 'rainbow nation' based on freedom and equality. Israel's regime based is based on democracy but through the governing principle of apartheid as set out in chapter three remained the same. As a result of its democratization, South Africa's foreign policy and of special importance to this thesis, its intelligence structures and organizational culture needed to change too. Again, Israel's intelligence remained the same. This chapter explores the changes implemented and brought about by the regime change generally in South Africa and how transformation manifested in South African intelligence structures. It shows how the *status quo* was maintained in Israel and finally examines how intelligence cooperation between these states changed in the post-apartheid period up to 2015. The period ends in 2015 due to the fact that the information gathered allows for conclusions to be made up until this point. At this point of the thesis, the emphasis is on *describing* the South African-Israeli intelligence cooperation in the post-apartheid period. The emphasis is not on *explaining* changes or continuity in these states' intelligence relationship during this period- this will be the focus of the next chapter.

4.2 Regime change and intelligence in South Africa 1990-2015

This section seeks to chronologically outline the post-apartheid intelligence dispensation in the context of political change in South Africa. This will be done by mapping changes in the intelligence structures and culture as they occurred under the administrations of President Mandela, Mbeki and Zuma, but starting with the transition period of 1990 to 1994[16]. Uncovering the implications these had on the political process, particularly the implications on the intelligence bureaucracy.

4.2.1 Transition Period: 1990-1994

Transition theory holds that an authoritarian or oppressive society persists until a threshold is reached due to tireless internal and external pressures, which often results in swift regime

[16] President Kgalema Motlanthe's presidency is not discussed separately as he was widely seen as a 'care-taker' president without much impact.

change. The theory notes that authoritarian governments reach a point where they implode or make way for a new regime, which most of the time is democratic (Liebenberg 2013: 14). The transition period in South Africa occurred during 1990 to 1994. There had been plenty of changes on a governmental front. With the unbanning of the ANC and other political parties, many ANC political prisoners had now been released and taken up prominent positions within the ANC. Nelson Mandela was released in 1990 and was subsequently elected president of the ANC after 27 years in prison. After his release the challenge of coming to the negotiating table had become his and the ANC's battle. During the transition period, under the leadership of F.W. de Klerk, the apartheid government had been on the path towards democracy and was trying to implement policies in the spirit of reconciliation. Its imperative was working toward a negotiated-settlement that could bring about an acceptable end to apartheid for internal stability and to appease security concerns externally, including denuclearizing.

Negotiations between Nelson Mandela and F. W. de Klerk revolved around how to end the system of apartheid with both sides ultimately satisfied with the outcome. These talks had another advantage, as they helped prepare Mandela and the ANC for the steadying role they had yet to play when it came to the ANC and the Inkatha Freedom Party (IFP) conflict, as well as calming white South African fears about the prospect of a black president. The first set of formal negotiations was held at the World Trade Centre in Johannesburg, the event was named the Convention for a Democratic South Africa (CODESA) (Liebenberg 2013: 29). The CODESA talks stalled in 1992 due to differences about the role the interim constitution would play and the majority votes needed to actually accept the final constitution.

UNIVERSITY of the
WESTERN CAPE

Away from the negotiation table, on the ground level in South Africa, the transitional period had seemed to be a particularly violent time. This could be due to the fact that various political entities had been vying for political power covertly and overtly. According to Jeffery (1992: 4) cited in Schutte, Liebenberg and Minnaar (1998: 10) the reasons for these politically motivated violence are:

- The economic, social and political imbalances that has been experienced by the people of South Africa, which is the result of centuries of racial discrimination and over 40 years of apartheid policies;
- "The use of the police force and army by successive white governments as 'instruments of oppression', precluding the development of 'community-orientated' security forces";

- The unexpected and sudden legalizing of political organizations, against a background of conflict between the IFP and the ANC and long held perceptions among the IFP, white South Africans and the security forces, that the ANC was the enemy;
- "The climate of political intolerance, especially in the black community, coupled with the fact that economic deterioration had frustrated the expectations aroused by the unbanning of political parties";
- The rising criminal activity, coupled with the inability of the inadequately manned and subsequent apathetic police force to counter this; and
- "The conduct of ANC and IFP members and of supporters who perpetrated many incidents of violence, while each side had been over-hasty in blaming the other and the top leadership of both had been tardy in taking effective steps to discipline their members."

There were significant transformations that needed to occur within the administrative functions of the government, for example incorporating four 'white' provincial governments and nine former 'Bantu homeland governments' into nine provincial governments and one national government. The entire state administration had to be restructured into a non-racial system, thus paving the way for black people who had been historically excluded from high-level civil service positions to be recruited, appointed and trained. There had to be a fine balancing act incorporated as well by maintaining white expertise and new black empowerment in the civil service (Venter 2011: 9).

UNIVERSITY of the
WESTERN CAPE

South Africa's transition to democracy put forward a scope of unknown outcomes; many within South Africa and the global community expected South Africa to enter into civil war. Mansfield and Snyder (2002) state that domestic political climates change when there is a transition to democracy that can alter the probability of conflict. They argue that transitions only heighten the risk of conflict as the new leaders use nationalism and divisionary tactics to improve their prospects and political goals. However once the transition is complete, the threat of conflict is then diminished even between long-standing rivals due to the newly found ways of conflict resolution under democracies.

In 1993, the last sitting of the white-led tricameral parliament adopted the Interim Constitution (Act 200 of 1993). This constitution allowed sufficient consensus to allow for the old and new guard to govern together. With the Interim Constitution in place, it allowed South Africans to

partake in their first one-person-one-vote based on non-racialism in 1994 (Liebenberg 2013: 30). The ANC won that election and came to power in South Africa and between 1994 and 1996 a new Constitution of South Africa (Act 108 of 1996) was written and subsequently approved by a democratic parliament.

4.2.1.1 The effect of the transition on intelligence

This section examines the foundations of South Africa's intelligence sector which was laid during the transition period as various security functions of the state were renegotiated to adapt to democracy as the new governing principle in South Africa.

The apartheid regime had maintained its dominance during apartheid via condign power, especially manifesting in military and security control. The intelligence services fed information to various security stakeholders and were subsequently seen as a key contributor to the upholding of military control within apartheid. For the above reason the intelligence structures needed to be overhauled to align with democracy as the central principle and South Africans were to trust their new government and particularly its security structures.

As a result of CODESA, the Transitional Executive Council (TEC) was formed legislated by the Transitional Executive Authority Act of 1993, which had the objective to "promote the establishment of a council which would promote, in conjunction with all legislative and executive structures at every level of government in South Africa, the preparation for an transition to a democratic order in South Africa" (Africa and Mlombile 2001: 3). The objective of the TEC was to develop a set of basic principles that all intelligence services would adhere to operationally during the transition period, this included the ANC, PAC, SACP and TBVC states as well as the apartheid NIS. These services were to remain intact but the goal was to implement a single intelligence framework. The NP government suggested to merely absorb these intelligence agencies (of the liberation movement) into their intelligence structure (the NIS), but this was subsequently rejected by the ANC (Africa and Mlombile 2001: 4). It is evident that there was a direct role of the intelligence structures in both the negotiation process and in developing the new intelligence dispensation, which saw both sides being involved in designing the future intelligence dispensation (Africa 2009a: 70). As this type of solution would not ensure what the ANC wanted in an intelligence agency for South Africa which would not be used for political control, democratic principles of oversight and public accountability had to be what the new intelligence structures are built on.

The subsequent organisational restructuring was based on the Intelligence Services Act (Act No. 38 of 1994) and the National Strategic Intelligence Act (Act No. 39 of 1994), supplemented by the White Paper on Intelligence, 1995. These are the main policy documents that formulated the South African intelligence sector. Apart from these legislations, one central way in which the post-apartheid intelligence dispensation varied from the apartheid legacy was in its legitimacy. These services were established in terms of the Constitution, which laid the foundation for their legislative framework (Africa 2009b: 76). The Constitution states that neither the security services, nor any of their members, may in the performance of their functions…

- Prejudice a political party interest that is legitimate in terms of the Constitution; or
- Further, in a partisan manner, any interest of a political party (RSA Constitution 1996: Section 198).

The restructuring essentially made provision for a civilian intelligence that included domestic intelligence, counter-intelligence, departmental intelligence and foreign intelligence. Subsequently, two civilian intelligence agencies were established, the National Intelligence Agency (NIA) and the South African Secret Service (SASS), with ministerial power resorting with the Minister of Intelligence and a director-general (DG) who assists the minister by running the specific department. DG appointments are to be made by the minister often with presidential backing (Hough and Du Plessis 2002: 1).

UNIVERSITY of the
WESTERN CAPE

The National Intelligence Service (NIS); the Intelligence Services of the TBVC states (Transkei, Bophuthatswana, Venda, and Ciskei); as well as the DIS of the African National Congress (ANC) and the Security Service of the Pan-Africanist Congress (PASS) had to be integrated into a new intelligence dispensation. This unification process extended beyond mere institutional amalgamation. It culminated in the redefinition of the essential expectations of strategic intelligence and pursued the extensive transformation and modernisation of the intelligence organization (Hough and Du Plessis 2002: 1).

In 1995, the National Intelligence Agency (NIA) (the organization that would be taking over from the apartheid era NIS) was established as the central post-apartheid intelligence structure that was charged with domestic intelligence and counterintelligence missions. The South African Secret Service (SASS) was tasked with dealing with foreign intelligence. The first Director-General (DG) of the NIA was Sizakele Sigxashe, who was a former leader of the ANC DIS, while the DG of the SASS was Mike Louw who was DG of the apartheid NIS. The

National Intelligence Coordinating Committee (NICOC) was to act as an intermediary between intelligence bureaucracies and the political side. The co-ordinator of NICOC (similar role as a DG) receives, evaluates and integrates from all the intelligence gathering components of the state. As well as Military Intelligence within the Intelligence Division of the South African National Defence Force (SANDF); and Crime Intelligence (including counter-intelligence) within the South African Police Service (SAPS) (Hough and Du Plessis 2002: 3).

The new intelligence dispensation and the official perceptions underpinning it, as subsequently illustrated, represented a significant departure from past approaches and structures and provide a more democratic framework for intelligence (Hough and Du Plessis 2002: 4). From a structural and administrative perspective, the intelligence dispensation is shaped to be democratic, in that there are more checks and balances put in place to curb previous atrocities from reoccurring. At the core, democracy relies on accountability and transparency, however intelligence by contrast operates within the covert realm to be effective. The problem that arises is that secrecy may undermine both accountability and transparency. Well-established democracies will over time have developed mechanisms in order to deal with this dilemma, while new democracies are still in the process of creating them (Bruneau and Dombroski 2014: 1), therefore South Africa was in the process of trial and error.

UNIVERSITY of the
WESTERN CAPE

This is the space that NICOC was envisaged to ameliorate, namely to eliminate the doubts cast by the murkiness of the intelligence dispensation, not from an oversight perspective but from a cooperative one[17]. The Joint Standing Committee on Intelligence (JSCI) of Parliament was established to provide oversight of the intelligence sector. This committee is a multi-party parliamentary body that is tasked with keeping the intelligence services in check (Africa 2009a: 84). One scrutiny of the JSCI is that party members do not have a direct say in who represents them, instead members of the JSCI are appointed by the President following nominations by the respective parties (Africa 2009b: 84). When there is not clear consensus on the objectives of the JSCI, or the President misuses his power for personal gain.

As the pinnacle of national intelligence within South Africa, the NIA's mandate and responsibilities and broader democratic provisions contextual to intelligence structures need elaboration. They include:

[17] NICOC was not established in a strict over-sight capacity, which is the JSCI role. NICOC was envisioned to promote cooperation and coordination between the various intelligence agencies.

- To fulfil the national counter-intelligence responsibilities and for this purpose to conduct and coordinate counter-intelligence (Gilder 2012: 299).
- "To gather, correlate, evaluate and analyse domestic intelligence, in order to identify any threat or potential threat to the security of the Republic or its people";
- "The national intelligence agency shall respect the rights of all South Africans to engage in lawful political activity";
- "Intelligence activities shall be regulated by relevant legislation, the Bill of Rights, the constitution and an appropriate Code of Conduct";
- "All intelligence institutions will be accountable to parliament and subject to parliamentary oversight";
- "The public shall have the right to information gathered by any intelligence agency subject to the limitations of classification consistent with an open and democratic South Africa";
- "The national intelligence agency shall be politically non-partisan";
- "The national intelligence agency shall guard the ideals of democracy, non-racialism, non-sexism, national unity and reconciliation and act in a non-discriminatory way" and
- "The composition of the national intelligence agency shall reflect the racial and gender composition of South Africa, and affirmative action programs shall be implemented to this end."

(Hough and Du Plessis 2002: 4/5)

The above reflect contingencies to combat an apartheid era style of intelligence from reappearing. Those tasked with transforming the intelligence service knew this would be a key issue if the intelligence service of South Africa was to become on par internationally. The 'new' NIA would be a much larger organization than its apartheid predecessor, the NIS. It had two director-generals; one overseeing corporate services and one managing operations. The NIA had directorates such as: domestic collection, research, counter-espionage, security, corporate resources, and technology and intelligence academy. This modelling and structure could be attributed to the Mossad, who are structured with similar directorates as evident in the previous chapter. The aim of this mandate is to aid the transformation by outlining the core functions

UNIVERSITY of the
WESTERN CAPE

for members of the NIA. Therefore, a main emotional objective of the newly established NIA was the transformation of the intelligence service into one that was tuned to the new democratic order, essentially changing the culture of intelligence in South Africa.

The NIA had to be responsive to the needs of the government of the time by providing value-adding intelligence on threats and potential threats to enhance their efforts in an attempt to wipe out the legacy of colonialism and apartheid (Gilder 2012: 300). Therefore, one limitation had to be implemented into the mandate of the NIA, to suppress any law enforcement powers. They (NIA) could support SAPS with intelligence when they are requested to do so. Meaning that the agents of the NIA could not go into the public sphere and arrest/detain citizens, this was SAPS jurisdiction and if implemented would be reminiscent of apartheid intelligence tactics.

4.3 Mandela Era 1994-1999

This era of South Africa was characterised by change and uncertainty (as previously mentioned, trial and error), which could be aided by a clean slate, and President Nelson Mandela led that challenge. Mandela along with the ANC had vowed to implement policies and practices that were to benefit the interests of all South Africans regardless of race or gender. Mandela guided policies through his 'saint-like' persona that provided ethical legitimacy for South Africa internationally and a proposed all-encompassing rainbow nation internally (Lansberg 2011: 237). Mandela's aura and personality often overshadowed the foreign policy decision-making process, which did not necessarily translate into an effective foreign policy-making role (Lansberg 2011: 237). It meant that foreign policy followed the public statements that Mandela made, instead of the foreign policy dictating what Mandela would state publicly. This was evident when Mandela announced that South Africa would continue to sell arms to Rwanda – on the very day the Department of Foreign Affairs (DFA) was about to announce the termination of that policy (Lansberg 2011: 238).

A constant stumbling block for the Mandela era intelligence dispensation was the negative stigma that had been associated with the intelligence and military sector that had been carried through from the previous regime. Mandela himself was effective in selling South Africa to the global community, but his senior intelligence advisors were grappling with how to conduct intelligence with the best of intentions in a new democracy that remains factitious and confrontational (Gilder 2012: 319). There were signs of this new South African intelligence culture over the coming years, but it was a slow process.

Within the intelligence and foreign policy sphere, the challenges that needed to be addressed were decision-making styles and cultures of the apartheid-era government officials that had to be integrated and matched with the styles and cultures of the ANC (Lansberg 2011: 236). What Mandela and the newly elected ANC government understood was that there were skilled members within the apartheid regime government who were needed and could benefit South Africa moving forward. Hence, the decision was made to implement a policy labelled the 'Sunset Clause'. This clause protected civil servants' jobs (specifically white South Africans across all government spheres) for a five year period after the 1994 election. From an intelligence perspective, the ANC encouraged and pushed through the integration of former intelligence officials from the liberation movements and the former independent homelands into the NIA. However, from a practical perspective, this led to what could be described as a "mixed marriage from hell" for those who still had resentment from the apartheid era (Sanders 2006: 342).

The aim Mandela was striving for was to have black and white South Africans work side by side with the aim of making race irrelevant, not just in the work place, but amongst the South African public as a whole. That could become a reality in most government departments soon after apartheid. However, in the intelligence sector, where both sides targeted the other, now having to work together, would not easily breed the desired results. As Barry Gilder, the newly appointed coordinator of NICOC post-1994, discovered on a visit to a NIA regional office in Mpumalanga, in the immediate period after regime change. Gilder noticed that within the office there was what he refers to as "a spirit of apartheid intelligence" that continued to exist. Former apartheid intelligence operative formed networks that had the aim of actively destabilizing the province. When Gilder addressed the office about this, a former NIS officer responded by stating that: "There are no such networks in this province. What we do have are networks of 'unrehabilitated terrorists' in the province, in fact we have such 'unrehabilitated terrorists' in the agency itself" (Gilder 2012: 303). These "unrehabilitated terrorists" in the context provided can be deduced to be the former ANC intelligence operatives. In response to this Gilder stated: "With exceptions, it is clear to me that this organization is still riddled with divisions along racial, historical and political lines" (Gilder 2012: 303).

Gilder (2012: 249) notes that below the surface of the new democratic intelligence service, the merger of the ANC and apartheid intelligence apparatus was not the ideal path to take as distrust and suspicion was rife. He notes that even though this was branded as a democratic intelligence service, essentially "we had no choice but to build it on the foundation of the apartheid statutory

service- its infrastructure, its systems, its processes and procedures, its presence abroad and to a large measure- its personnel" (Gilder 2012: 249). Many of the old guard elected to stay on and build the new service, while many chose not to aid in the development of a 'black government'. This resulted in suspicion and distrust on both sides which many suspect could last long into the democratic era (Gilder 2012: 249).

It was evident that there could not simply be a reshaping and transforming of intelligence, there needed to be a determination of the philosophy that needs to be introduced throughout the structures, as well as establishing a new culture of intelligence (Hough and Du Plessis 2002: 21). The transition encouraged a cultural shift in the intelligence sector, which over time had an effect on how South Africa's intelligence sector dealt with its foreign counterparts.

In essence the Mandela era had been the hardest time period in South Africa, as so many scenarios could have played out that would have led South Africa down the path of civil strife. Despite the challenges, the period was characterised by tireless efforts of both black and white South Africans not only to build a stable democracy, but a competent intelligence service that could be built on by those who follow.

Within South Africa, from Gilder's (2012: 319) perspective, major issues at the time were also opposition parties and the media constantly looking and expecting the worst from the new government and expecting the new intelligence agency to be biased towards the governing party, while centuries of racial, political and ideological stereotypes continue to inform public discourse and attitudes to those who are trying to make democracy work. According to the media at that time there were many that thought the NIA was just an instrument for the governing party, the ANC, to further its political objectives. However, that was far from the case as those within the NIA who embraced democracy, aimed at providing the intelligence the duly elected government of the day needed in order to further national interests (Gilder 2012: 319).

4.4 Mbeki Era

Thabo Mbeki was elected as the second President of South Africa in 1999 and for a second term in 2004. During the tenure of Mbeki, there had been a policy wave within the intelligence sector that resulted in an expansion of intelligence structures and the strengthening of institutional culture (Africa 2012: 109). The Mbeki administration shifted from Mandela's personality leadership and policy drive toward a more structured leadership style. This meant that decision making had shifted to a more centralized style, which was dominated by the

president or his key advisors. Those who had been drafted into key positions, were those who shared the same views, especially when it came to foreign affairs, as Mbeki. A key signifier to understand the shift in foreign policy decision-making, specifically within the security sector, is the shift in direction from the DFA dictating foreign affairs and firmly towards the presidency and the cabinet (Lansberg 2011: 242).

Mbeki tried to use South Africa's status on the African continent to spark an African Renaissance, which would not impact Africa alone but shape government policy within South Africa as well (Africa 2012: 110). In 2002 the African Union (AU) was formed and as one of its better resourced states, South Africa found itself in a leadership position when it came to facilitating negotiations between conflicted parties and peacekeeping missions. In order for South Africa to be effective at this, there would be a necessity for a good flow of intelligence internally and across borders (Africa 2012: 110). Both Mbeki's intelligence ministers aligned their policy initiatives with the main policy views that the Mandela government had introduced, which focused on improving systems to build relations with other services, with peace and stability at the centre of their plans.

Mbeki's two terms as South African president saw two Ministers of Intelligence Services, namely Lindiwe Sisulu and Ronnie Kasrils. During Sisulu's tenure as minister, she argued that the resources available and capabilities of the intelligence services were inadequate and that new policy initiatives were needed to tackle the threats of the early 21st century. A major concern regarding leaked documents resulted in the spotlight shone on the careless handling of documents by government officials due to a poor level of information security. While the casual handling of documents required attention, the intelligence services had to deal with the Promotion of Access to Information Act (PAIA) (Act 2 of 2000). This act was intended to make it constitutionally mandated that citizens of South Africa be allowed access to documents with few exceptions. In theory, anyone could submit a written request for access to information, with the right to have such a request processed (Africa 2012: 113). The need to shore up security in relation to documents being leaked due to poor security and the need to adhere with the constitutionally mandated requirement for access to information became a major dilemma. In the end, here was an acknowledgement that information should be available to the public, but a greater emphasis was placed on shoring up the security of information within the intelligence sector.

UNIVERSITY of the
WESTERN CAPE

The first phase of the Mbeki era also saw a 'moving with the times' approach, which was essential in an effort to curb emerging threats in a Post-Cold War information era. Under Sisulu there was a push to improve the intelligence community's technical infrastructure and capacity. One such technical infrastructure implemented was the Office for Interception Centre (OIC), which sought to centralize the conduct of lawful interception of communications (Africa 2012: 115). Another measure implemented under Sisulu was to establish a common standard of protection for electronic communications within government (Africa 2012: 115). Sisulu's policy agenda led to the establishment of the South Africa National Academy of Intelligence (SANAI). The role of SANAI was to provide career training for prospective intelligence operatives within the civilian intelligence services. Sisulu also sought to implement a specialized body that would ensure information was not compromised and that this body would play a role of auditing the security of existing technologies especially on computer systems. Hence, Electronic Communications Security (COMSEC) was established, which had the mandate to protect and secure critical electronic communications against unauthorized access or any other related threat (Africa 2012: 116).

In 2005, the NIA embarked on an operation under the orders of then Director-General, Billy Masetlha, to engage in a political intelligence gathering exercise named Project Avani. The mandate of the project was to gather, correlate, evaluate and analyse intelligence in order to identity any threat or potential threat posed by the presidential succession debate, foreign services interest therein, the impending Jacob Zuma trial and poor service delivery impacts (Hendricks and Musavengana 2010: 139). Essentially the project was to analyse 'the Jacob Zuma' factor on the country as a whole. The problem this poses is that the intelligence field was getting involved in political matters, which is clearly going against its mandate, as it takes the structure back into apartheid era tactics. Masethla was subsequently fired for this operation. Project Avani revealed that there were serious gaps in the oversight and governance of the intelligence sector, such as:

- Lack of sufficient preventative and proactive controls on politically sensitive operations;
- Lack of sufficient control on the use of intrusive methods of investigation;
- Insufficient control of operational protocols; and

WESTERN CAPE

- Continued politicization of domestic intelligence operations and the potential or misuse of authority in conducting political intelligence operations (Hendricks and Musavengana 2010: 140).

In Mbeki's second term as president, he appointed Ronnie Kasrils as his new Minister of Intelligence Services. Within this administration, priorities shifted towards recruitment, training and strategic placement of members, further development of the Intelligence Academy, improvement of operational capacity, as well as improving intelligence sharing and co-ordination between all sections of the intelligence sector, developing intelligence cooperation in Africa and with South Africa's international partners (Africa 2012: 119). Kasrils had stayed the course with the initiatives that Sisulu had begun with no fundamental differences in policy, including to further the legislation on the system of classification and declassification of information. This subsequently led to the drafting of the Protection of Information Bill (PIB), which had generated much public interest for negative reasons. It was informally named the "Secrecy Bill", as it aims to regulate the protection and dissemination of state information.

4.5 Zuma Era

In 2009, Jacob Zuma became South Africa's president, following a short period during which Kgalema Motlanthe stood in as interim president after President Mbeki was recalled by the ANC. Zuma vowed to pursue a more open and consultative form of government in an attempt to distinguish his government from the Mbeki administration (Lansberg 2011: 246). He promised that his government would be "more caring, responsive and interactive" (Zuma 2009). Many political commentators had noted that Zuma had a more consultative personality that would allow a switch in managerial style from centralised under Mbeki to a more consultative style (Lansberg 2011: 246). However, within Zuma's first term this consultative approach was hard to find. Instead, Zuma had done as Mbeki did namely to surround himself with advisors and this is where the true decision-making power resorted.

In broader terms of foreign policy Zuma was less of a foreign policy president than Mbeki, however under his administration South Africa became a member of the BRIC countries. BRICS promotes a world order that promotes a world less dominated by the West. This anti-Western narrative also gained more currency as ANC policy under Zuma. This anti-Western rhetoric is evident within BRICS as two members are (particularly in recent times) at loggerheads with Western hegemon, the US. Thus the question remains, why was South Africa so eager to join/gain association to BRIC when it should be acknowledged that BRICs is not a

formal political club or economic bloc that has clearly defined and coherent objectives and programmes (Qobo 2011). South Africa fully committing in essence to the developing tag and an identity that is shifting away from Western influence. This is particularly important in the economic sector where the global financial crisis underscored the importance of diversifying South Africa's export markets away from Europe (absorbed 40% of South African exports) and directed toward fast-growing developing economies (Qobo 2011). This move to join BRIC, from a foreign policy perspective, is a step toward establishing itself as a regional leader and a potential well-established representative of the African continent. However, this does pose a concern as South Africa's foreign policy can be criticized as being too focused on aligning with its future BRICS members and in certain aspects behaving submissively, i.e. when South Africa denied the Dalai Lama a visa when he wanted to visit South Africa. Indicating how on an international level, national policies and directives can be influenced.

In 2009, the ANC-led government decided to merge the NIA and SASS into one State Security Agency (SSA). The concepts and mandate associated with the NIA and the SASS would still be in effect (domestic and foreign intelligence), but resorted under their new 'head' and reported to an SSA Director-General. The SSA would amalgamate the South African National Academy of Intelligence (SANAI), the National Communications Centre (NCC), the Office for Interception Centres (OIC), and the Intelligence Services Council on Conditions of Employment (ISC) under one large intelligence umbrella the SSA (O'Brien 2011: 230). This was an attempt to bring the various branches of intelligence closer to one another to promote greater cooperation and sharing amongst one another.

WESTERN CAPE

Political commentators state that the creation of the SSA reflected a growing securitisation of the South African state. They argue that the security of the state displaced that of the individual, which undermines the core principles that the intelligence services are meant to be based on (Africa 2012: 124). The Zuma administration and his appointed Minister for State Security, Siyabonga Cwele, had maintained similar priorities to that of his predecessors on information security. Shortly after his appointment, he intended to resubmit the draft PIB to Parliament. The draft followed up on the ground work done by Sisulu and on the earlier version submitted by Kasrils. The Bill was envisioned to guide the procedure of classification and declassification of state information and criminalize the activities of those engaged in espionage (Africa 2012: 125). The main objective was to cut out/down the number of leaks being achieved by criminalizing a person who is found to have leaked sensitive documents, even if what was leaked exposes criminal activity.

This was not helped by the personnel choices that President Zuma had been making, such as ANC stalwarts and loyalists Jeff Maqetuka (appointed as Director-General of SSA), Moe Shaikh (appointed as head of the foreign intelligence service; the SASS department) and Gibson Njenje (appointed as head of NIA). These appointments were described as providing 'new blood', but merely casted more doubt over political influence in the intelligence sector. What played against President Zuma is the legacy of the highly controversial 'Arms Deal' of the 1990s. In the 1990s, the South African government entered into a series of weapons contracts with European arms suppliers. The South African government engaged in a R60 billion arms acquisition program to supply primarily the South African Air Force and Navy. Questions began to arise in relation to the procurement process, especially about who was involved and how the deal had been structured. Zuma's financier at the time, Schabir Shaikh, was the brother of Moe Shaikh, one of the negotiators of the arms deal. Schabir had received kick-backs intended to benefit Zuma, he was convicted and sent to prison. It had been uncovered that arms manufacturer, Thales, won a R2.6 billion stake in the arms deal in 1997. Claims were made that Thales made payments to the amount of R500 000 a year as well as numerous other benefits to then deputy president of the ANC, Jacob Zuma, for that deal and future deals (Myburgh 2018).

The level of corruptness surrounding this deal, together with other scandals during Zuma's presidency led to a level of distrust in the intelligence community not seen since the immediate post-apartheid era. Intelligence practitioners and those who held high ranking political intelligence posts were using their positions to benefit President Zuma. Jacques Pauw (2017) in his book "The President's Keepers: Those keeping Zuma in power and out of prison" elaborates on how key political intelligence figures such as Arthur Fraser and David Mahlobo (see below) manoeuvred, often at the detriment of state security to keep Zuma safe.

This was especially as a result of intelligence appointments by President Zuma. Questions had been posed as to whether they had been in the best interest of the state or Zuma himself. The appointment of Moe Shaikh to such a top post had been a reward to a man who is credited with saving Zuma's political career when Mbeki had made serious political allegations against him. It was Moe Shaikh who convinced the South African public that these were all false (Pauw 2017: 39). Another person credited with saving Zuma's political career is Arther Fraser, who at the time was head of operations at the NIA and had subsequently risen to Director-General of the SSA under Zuma. There seemed to be a trend under Zuma of rewarding those individuals who would cover-up for the president. His last appointment as State Security Minister, David

Mahlobo, certainly fit that mould as he had no intelligence experience, but was a Zuma loyalist (Pauw 2017: 48).

Under Mandela, the intelligence dispensation in South Africa had come out of apartheid with a few scars, but those in charge were adamant to lead the post-apartheid intelligence dispensation democratically. We arguably see this trend continue under Mbeki despite the PIB controversy. However, as the presidency changes to President Zuma, there becomes a regression in intelligence related outcomes, intelligence shifts from a focus on state interests to individual interests.

4.6 Regime in Israel 1990-2015

This section will seek to outline the situation in Israel, particularly how its regime and intelligence compared to South Africa's that was at the beginning of the period under analysis undergoing a transition. The same could be said for Israel, who in 1993 entered the "Oslo negotiations" with the Palestinians, represented by the PLO (BBC News 2013). The negotiations differed from previous efforts as this time there was finally mutual recognition between Israel and the PLO. The negotiations led to the "Oslo Agreement", which was a landmark treaty to put an end to the decades of conflict, as well as give the recognition that the Palestinians wanted. Even though the Oslo Agreement did not succeed, it was an important step that needed to be taken between the two 'states', showing that Israel is willing to come to the negotiation table in an attempt to solve the conflict. In 1995 Yitzhak Rabin and Yasser Arafat signed an Interim Agreement to transfer further power and territory to the Palestinian Authority. This agreement laid the foundations for the 1997 Hebron Protocol, the 1998 Wye River Memorandum and the internationally sponsored Road Map for Peace of 2003 (BBC News 2018).

In relation to South Africa at the time transitioning to a new government that was favourable toward the PLO, making peace with the PLO would have gone a long way to save relations with South Africa and Israel. The ANC leadership wanted what the Oslo Agreement was meant to deliver, an independent Palestinian state. These peace initiatives had made the job of Israeli ambassador, Alon Liel, that much easier in ANC circles (Polakow-Suransky 2010: 218).

The Israeli government has been dominated by two political parties in recent decades, namely the Labor Party and Likud. The Labor Party enjoyed relative success in the 1990s electing two Prime Ministers. However, since 2001 Likud has held a steadfast political grip within Israel. All subsequent Prime Ministers had been Likud members including the current Prime Minister

Benjamin Netanyahu, who took office for the second time in 2009. His first term was 1996 to 1999. Likud is a right wing political party, which since its inception adopted the principles of social equality, a free market economy and the preservation of Jewish tradition and culture, essentially largely shaped by Zionism (Jewish Virtual Library 2018).

Netanyahu had won his first term by campaigning that he would deliver peace without sacrificing Israel's security and that he would be hard-headed when entering dealings with Israel's Arab neighbours (Peters 1996: 9). There was a focus on the dangers of terrorism in the Middle East and how vital security is in relation to its Arab neighbours to Netanyahu. At this time terrorism had been a major concern especially to the USA, a major ally in the late 1990's. During the first few months of his first term as Prime Minister, Netanyahu had continued to profess his commitment to the peace process, but his words were not put into policy action. This was exacerbated by the refusal to commit to a meeting with Yasser Arafat (PLO leader at the time), and the failure to develop proper channels of communication between his administration and the Palestinian Authority. When a meeting eventually took place between the two, it had been largely symbolic as no substantive progress was made (Peters 1996: 10). Although Netanyahu is controversial, his supporters view him as the country's best defender in a hostile geopolitical location and a world that threatens Israel's, and by extension Jewish existence (Scheindlin 2017).

UNIVERSITY of the
WESTERN CAPE

The 2000s within Israel was marred by violent conflicts with the Palestinians, initiated by both entities at various times. The violence prompted Israel to build a barrier in and around the West Bank in 2002, it was aimed at stopping the Palestinian attacks (BBC News 2018). The violence and the barrier drew international attention with potential resolutions to the conflict being the main objective. However, in 2004 the International Court of Justice issued an advisory opinion that the West Bank barrier was illegal. The subsequent years see the violence shift to the Gaza, where invasions were made by Israel to stop rocket attacks on Israel (BBC News 2018).

Politically within Israel there were changes occurring at all spectrums, Ariel Sharon resigns from the Likud Party to form Kadima, with Netanyahu elected as the new Likud leader (in 2005). In 2006, Sharon suffers a major stroke and Ehud Olmert becomes caretaker Prime Minister, Olmert's Kadima Party would win the most seats in the elections a few months later (Al-Jazeera 2013). In Palestine, President Mahmoud Abbas swears in a Hamas-led government, this led to Israel formally severing all direct contact with the Hamas-led Palestinian government, which brought about an international isolation of Hamas, particularly

in the Gaza Strip. In 2008, facing a corruption probe, Olmert announces that he plans to step down, a few months later at the next elections, Netanyahu is elected Prime Minister (Al-Jazeera 2013).

Netanyahu (second term as president), has addressed the Israeli/Palestine conflict from a perceived tactical conflict management perspective, instead of attempts to actually resolve the conflict. Any attempts at a two state solution is contradicted by Israeli actions in the West Bank and Gaza. In recent times, the Israeli government made concessions to the Palestinian Authority's President Mahmoud Abbas, which included prisoner releases, removal of a few checkpoints and the removal of small Jewish settlement outposts in the West Bank. These are the forms of action that is to be expected from the Israeli government as they aim to achieve economic peace rather than the step-by-step process toward a two-state solution which international mediators are pushing for (Al-Jazeera n.d.: 7).

The Palestinian conflict played a central role within the formulation and development of the Israeli relationship with South Africa. The lack of a solution to this conflict is of consequence to the image that the global community bestows on Israel. The issue Israel faces is that its actions towards the Palestinians now are still inextricably linked to that of the apartheid era. Measures have not been taken to improve the Palestinians plight. Post-2010 there are still more than 65 Israeli laws that discriminate against Palestinians in Israel and the occupied territories (Al-Jazeera 2018). Five major policies that infringe on basic rights toward the Palestinians:

- The right to acquire or lease land. The majority of the land within Israel is controlled by the state, which blocks the leasing of land to Palestinian citizens and therefore can only be transferred to Jews;
- The right to return. According to the Absentees Property Law (1950), Palestinian refugees that were expelled after November 1947 are denied rights and their property were confiscated by the state, while Jews from around the world could become Israeli citizens;
- The right to residency. This centres around residency within Jerusalem and how the Israeli government has implemented policies that could allow residents (of Palestinian ethnicity) to lose residency in Jerusalem.
- The right to family life. This focuses on family unification, specifically it relates to Palestinian families residing in Israel and in Occupied territories are forced to split apart or live in fear of constant deportation; and

- The right to commemorate Nakba. The Israeli government denies the Palestinians of the mourning and commemorating the day when Israel gained independence at the expense of 700 000 Palestinians in 1948 (Al-Jazeera 2018).

These five policies depict merely a handful of infringes on Palestinian rights that are being implemented by the Israeli government and that are reminiscent of apartheid South Africa. Israeli apartheid tendencies have not become obsolete; it seems to be the opposite by becoming more stringent towards the Palestinians. With the current backing of America on geo-political issues and the rise of violent clashes with Palestinians in Gaza, it seems evident that these policies will not be rescinded soon.

Following from the above, South Africa and Israel have shifted drastically, in relation to the apartheid era. Israel has continued on the apartheid path despite initial peace overtures in the early 1990s, while South Africa at least under the Mandela and Mbeki administration sought to continue its democratic growth. Under Zuma South Africa was said to have "lost its way", but democratic institutions fought back. During this period an anti-Western foreign policy narrative prevailed. However, a state such as Israel cannot afford to switch back to the apartheid era status when it had the USA and South Africa as major collaborators and had numerous boycotts (which are evident in contemporary Israel). This trend does have a familiar feel to it as Israel begins to lose credibility in the global community, Israel runs the risk of reclaiming its pariah tag, however this time South Africa will not be its bedfellow.

The intelligence realm within Israel was led by Mossad, who had from its outset occupied a shadow realm, adjacent from the country's democratic institutions, and still does. Using the term/concept of 'state security' as a justification to condone a large number of actions and operations that in the visible world would have been subject to criminal prosecution and prison terms (Bergman 2018). The most notable example of this was the targeted killings done by Mossad, many of whom have been enemies of the Israeli state, members of the PLO or Hamas. Long term top Hamas operative Mahmoud al-Mabhouh, who had been tracked and under surveillance for years before his assassination in Dubai 2010 by Mossad agents. Mossad had been operational outside of Israel, infiltrating Hezbollah and discovering that North Korea had been building a secret nuclear reactor in Syria, as well as assassinating the Hezbollah military chief (Bergman 2018). However, after an investigation into the death of al-Mabhouh by Dubai police chief, Lieutenant General Dhahi Khalfan unravelled that 27 members were part of the

operation, under the orders of Meir Dagan, Mossad director (Bergman 2018). Subsequently, Interpol issued arrest warrants for all 27 members, but under their assumed false identities used within the mission. The backlash to this on the Mossad and Israel was far reaching, the countries whose passports Israel had used were furious about the implication in assassination attempts. This led to some governments ordering Mossad representatives to leave their country immediately, all of them cut back on their collaboration with the Israeli agency (Bergman 2018). Inside the agency, the negative exposure had resulted in sections of Mossad's operations being shut down as operatives had their covers blown, it also resulted in Dagan not having his post renewed (Bergman 2018).

This was not the first time Israel-Mossad had landed in hot water over the use of passports. In 2010, Ben Zygier, a dual Israeli and Australian national, had died in an Israeli prison (under mysterious circumstances), Zygier had been working for Mossad at the time of his apparent suicide (Rourke 2013). Australia's foreign minister, Bob Carr indicated that if Australian passports were used for security or intelligence gathering by Israel, "it is something against which we take the strongest opposition, no country can allow the integrity of its passport system to be compromised (Rourke 2013)." The organizational culture of Mossad has not changed over the years, placing its state security first and doing this by any means even in foreign countries. Even as new Mossad chief, Joseph Cohen breathed new life into the operational apparatus of Mossad by attempting to diversify its modes of operation, the same organizational culture could be found (any means necessary culture) (Levinson 2018). Exemplified by the assassination of Fadi al-Batsh (attributed to the Mossad), who was killed in the Malaysian capital of Kuala Lampur by a burst of gunfire at close range. These examples indicating the reach of Mossad in its efforts to combat its enemies, with a few blemishes along the way but an incident like the al-Batsh assassination was judged to have no Israeli involvement (Levinson 2018).

4.7 South Africa-Israeli intelligence relationship in the post-apartheid period

If the words of former President, Nelson Mandela was to be followed, then one would have expected the relationship (intelligence included) between South Africa and Israel to be ended at the dawn of democracy. As Mandela stated that the ANC will not forget the support Israel showed to the apartheid South African government, however, the foreign policy and intelligence relationship continued with regular meetings being held. This may have been due to Israel complying with sanctions against South Africa in the late 1980s, Israeli diplomacy to appease the ANC, the continuing influence of apartheid era officials who remained in the NIA

post-apartheid, Mandela's support for the Israeli-PLO peace process underway in the early 1990s and South Africa's own issues in the 1990s with terrorist attacks from certain Muslim quarters[18].

The South African intelligence sector understood that it needed to follow the lead of the political leadership in not completely ostracising apartheid allies if a successful transition was to be made. The benefit of this is that to those specific states that publicly backed the apartheid regime, like Israel, dealing with an individual such as Louw would have provided a sense that South Africa is still 'open for business'. Notwithstanding the fact that internally the culture and identity of the South African intelligence dispensation was being remodelled into a democratic mould.

In the immediate aftermath of the end of apartheid in South Africa the intelligence relationship between South Africa and Israel continued with exchanges between Mossad and the NIA being standard and regular, revolving around individuals and organisations in relation to terrorism (Al-Jazeera n.d.: 50). However, cracks in the relationship began to show already in 1996 when Barry Gilder (NICOC co-ordinator) led a delegation of the 'new' NIA to the Middle East, and one of their first stops was to Gaza where they met with the intelligence services of the Palestinian Authority (PA). This was to discuss the possible assistance of the South African services for the establishment of a training academy for their intelligence services (Gilder 2012: 280).

UNIVERSITY of the
WESTERN CAPE

From Gaza, the delegation moved on to Tel Aviv, where they had a meeting at Mossad headquarters. Once the pleasantries were completed, the head of the Mossad delegation questioned Gilder, as to the reasoning why Israel was second on their trip after they visited Palestine. The head of the Mossad delegation stated that "according to the Oslo Accords cooperation by any foreign intelligence service with the Palestinian Authority must be channelled through us" (Gilder 2012: 280). Gilder's reply to this statement was: "South Africa is a sovereign country. We have friendly relations with all countries in the world. My government has granted recognition to the state of Palestine. Our relations with the Palestinian intelligence services are a state-to-state matter. It would not be correct for us to conduct them through a third party" (Gilder 2012: 280). This statement indicated that the new South Africa would be relating to Israel on different terms than during apartheid.

[18] These reasons will be explored in more detail in the next section when the relationship is put in the theoretical framework outlined in chapter 2.

ANC principles are impacting on the international relations of South Africa, where a friend of the ANC during apartheid had come first, over a previous apartheid ally. Within the Mandela era, foreign policy principles had been derived from Mandela's push for human rights. Human rights became a guide for relations between nations and foreign relations were to mirror the deep commitment to the consolidation of a democratic South Africa (ANC n.d.). With principles such as these, it is easy to understand why there was a reluctance to engage with Israel in the immediate post-apartheid era. Israeli diplomacy had deployed all resources in an effort to appease relations moving forward with South Africa post 1994, particularly when there was tight military cooperation between Israel and the apartheid regime. However, it was surprising that South Africa did not completely cut ties with Israel following the ascension of the black majority in 1994. Two main reasons for this is that the Israeli government had complied with the framework of international sanctions against South Africa in 1987 and they had forged ties with the leaders of the black majority before the transfer of power (Neuberger 2009: 25). Particularly through its ambassador (Alon Liel) who had been tasked with garnering relations with the ANC and other prominent black political players.

There were many who opposed apartheid within South Africa, with those who can, being vocal about their pro-Palestinian stance against Israel, who claim they are imposing "apartheid policies" on the Palestinians in occupied territories. There has been several protest actions aimed at expressing growing opposition against Israel, these have been mostly driven by organisations sympathetic to the Palestinian cause (State Security Agency 2012: 3). The main pro-Palestinian objective within South Africa, is to have the South African government sever ties with Israel. Although diplomatic relations between South Africa and Israel are not at the level they once were, they are likely to deteriorate more if the South African government intensifies its anti-Israel stance and implements a measure of cultural and economic sanctions (State Security Agency 2012: 7). Another issue the Israeli intelligence sector and by extension Mossad seems to be battling on a global stage but in South Africa specifically, is the Boycott Divestment Sanctions (BDS) movement. Israel is weary of the BDS movement due to the fact that a similar movement gained momentum internationally in 1980s with respect to South Africa and played a major part in the downfall of apartheid. Therefore, Israel is correct in not underestimating pro-Palestine activism, especially when it could lead to South Africa severing diplomatic relations with Israel (Silverstein 2015).

However, from an intelligence perspective, relations between the SSA and Mossad are strained due to their government's relationship (the political impacting the bureaucratic). However the

two are expected to soldier through based on both states national interests being placed first, namely possible terrorist attacks. Therefore, cooperation between the two continued. As Joe Nhlanhla ended his term as the first Minister of Intelligence in South Africa (1999-2000) meaningful exchanges became less frequent (Al-Jazeera n.d.: 50). It seems as though the Mbeki presidency continued ostracizing Israel. This was evident[19] in Mbeki's second term appointment of Ronald Kasrils as Minister of Intelligence. Kasrils had been in exile with the ANC and took up the position of Minister of Intelligence (2004-2008).

Being Jewish himself, his relationship with the South African Jewish community has been tense because of his outspoken opposition against the Israeli government policies towards the Palestinians. His stance as a Jewish individual was viewed as virtual heresy by South Africa's overwhelmingly Zionist Jewish community (Sanders 2006: 345). Mbeki did not counter Kasril's stance, which came as no surprise. Early on in his presidency he took the stance that Israel is firmly to blame for the ongoing violence in the Middle East (Brand and Fabricius 2000).

However, within South Africa, at bureaucratic levels the state of affairs were different evident when Polakow-Suransky[20] visited the defence archive in Pretoria for documents to be declassified, the defence ministry had approved in 2006. However, when he got to the archive, Polakow-Suransky indicated that there was a sense of camaraderie still evident between those employed at the archive and Israeli defence forces. This would be due to the fact that those working at the archive were the same demographic that was cooperative with Israel during apartheid. It seemed as though the reluctance in wanting to get the 'truth' out on their relationship is what slowed down the process for Polakow-Suransky. This provides an insight into the deep organizational culture that was evident between the apartheid South Africa and Israel agencies, as those working at the archive knew that Israel did not want the documents being released to Polakow-Suransky and they tried their best to slow down the release. Even after a ten year period where the two states had different regime types, the apartheid bond still has to be kept secret.

UNIVERSITY of the
WESTERN CAPE

[19] There does not seem to be a correlation between Mbeki's intention to ostracise Israel and the appointment of Kasrils, merely that Kasrils qualifications and beliefs aligned with Mbeki's intentions.

[20] Sasha Polakow-Surasnsky's significance in this thesis is that he published a book titled "The Unspoken Alliance: Israel's Secret Relationship with Apartheid South Africa". While trying to obtain the documents he was doing research for his doctorate.

It had become clear that on a political level, the 'comfort' experienced under apartheid in relation to having an understanding of each other's actions had now disappeared. Another element in decline, is the changing of the perceived common identity, and by extension culture. At a national identity standpoint, South Africa can no longer identify with Israel, this filters through to the bureaucratic/organizational identity as well, where there had been an overhaul of the common identity and culture. The intelligence community in South Africa has now shifted to incorporate 'enemies of my enemies', which the Israeli intelligence community would not be favourable about. From a South African intelligence perspective, there couldn't be an impact on the Israel-Palestine conflict from South Africa, as from an ANC perspective their allegiances would be with the Palestinians and apartheid intelligence officials with Israel, therefore in keeping with the new democratic ideals of South Africa, the decision was to not become involved with that dispute from an intelligence perspective.

Mbeki pledged his and the South African governments support for the Palestinian peoples "legitimate freedom struggle" (Brand and Fabricius 2000). This link, however, goes back to the days when Mbeki, a freedom fighter in South Africa engaged with the Palestinians, therefore understanding their situation. Even well after his term as president, Mbeki was still advocating for the Palestinians by calling for a boycott of Israeli goods as an advocate for the BDS movement. From a political standpoint, it is clear that South Africa and Israel are no longer compatible, but does this impact intelligence cooperation?

WESTERN CAPE

This perceived misalignment of a common identity leads into the next and focal element in the changing intelligence relationship, the misalignment of interests, essentially the redefining of interests, particularly from a South African perspective. The redefining is evident within an early post-apartheid period, by the end of President Mandela and his Minister of Intelligence, Joe Nhlanla's term, relations with Israel had started to slow down, with meaningful exchanges becoming less frequent. The intelligence relationship between the two agencies had shifted from one of necessity and convenience to one of meagreness.

In 2007, Mossad had provided information to the NIA on a suspected terror cell operating in South Africa with ties to al-Qaeda. Mossad hoped this information would be of benefit to the NIA. Those in charge at Mossad also thought that sharing this level of information might be seen as good faith and be reciprocated by sharing the findings on the terror cell but the local Mossad agent was told he would not be allowed access to the information/findings by NIA management in a meeting. According to leaked documents the Mossad agent subsequently

stormed out of (Al-Jazeera n.d.: 51). From a South African political intelligence perspective, Minister Kasrils used this platform (his ministerial position) to advance the Palestine agenda at every possible opportunity. He had been actively involved in the campaign for the Palestinian people's quest for self-determination and the recognition of their right to become a sovereign state in accordance with the proposed 1967 borders (Africa 2012: 122). This had been reflective of the South African government's stance at the time. The political stance portrayed by Kasrils often contributed to the perception that the NIA was not willing to cooperate with Mossad.

When Jacob Zuma took over the presidency, leaked documents[21] purported that South Africa was actively engaging with Israeli intelligence. These documents indicated that under the Zuma presidency there was a clear intelligence relationship evident between South Africa's SSA and Israel's Mossad. In 2009, then Mossad chief, Meir Dagan had broken protocol and called his counterpart in the SSA in relation to the UN General Assembly considering a resolution to endorse the Goldstone Report. This report was in relation to a possible investigation into Israeli war crimes during Operation Cast Lead (Gaza War in 2008/9), Dagan had sought to gain South African support against the resolution (Silverstein 2015). The Mossad chief made the argument that if Israel was found guilty of war crimes it would reduce Israel's interest in pursuing a peace agreement with the Palestinians. South Africa did not see it in this light and ultimately voted in favor of referring the report to the UN General Assembly. In the same light, Zuma appointed Mac Maharaj as advisor with the main brief being to advance South Africa's stated position which is in favour of a two-state solution to the Palestine-Israel conflict (Lansberg 2011: 248). The ANC position has not changed over the years, even recently stating that Israel needs to exhibit genuine initiatives to secure lasting peace and a viable two-state solution that includes full freedom and democracy for the Palestinian people (Chernick 2018).

It was Gibson Njenje (Director-General of the National Intelligence Agency/SSA from 2009-2011), who assured Mossad that the NIA/SSA was indeed still a willing partner in the fight to combat international terrorism and proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. After an Israeli delegation meeting to South Africa, there was an improvement in information exchanges, showing clear bureaucratic validation where the political was lacking (Al-Jazeera n.d.: 62).

[21] The various leaked documents released by Al-Jazeera, compiled by the NIA-SSA, particularly the geopolitical country and intelligence assessment on Israel; SSA meets Israel Mossad arrogant claim September; SSA meets Israel Mossad August 2012; SSA meets Israel Mossad October 2012 and SSA meets Israel Mossad January 2013.

In 2015 information[22] compiled by the NIA-SSA was leaked to and published on the Al-Jazeera news network. The fact that these documents were illegally leaked to Al-Jazeera was a contentious issue, not only in South Africa but in all countries implicated. The Minister of State Security in South Africa, David Mahlobo condemned the 'illegal' leaks, stating that they posed a threat to national security, but the South African government, did not deny the authenticity of the documents (Gqirana 2015). According to Richard Silverstein (2015), "The cables, which relay current information about events in which SSA was directly involved, are without a doubt highly credible." The leaked documents provide insight into the intelligence relationship between the two states that researchers are not usually privy to, because of the secretive nature of this dimension of statecraft. The leaks suggest that the relationship is characterised by tension and highlights a number of incidents that reflect this section reviews.

In a document (meant for internal dissemination within the intelligence bureaucracy) labelled "SSA liaison parameters with Israel" the terms or parameters for SSA and Mossad liaisons are outlined. These parameters were to be discussed in a meeting scheduled for the 29 October 2012, at an SSA facility with members of both intelligence agencies present (Al-Jazeera n.d.: 1). Subsequent to the meeting, the SSA provided their counterparts with what it deemed necessary in order to have a successful relationship, namely the 3C's: communication, co-ordination and cooperation. The impression one gets is that the parameters set out in "SSA liaison parameters with Israel" was envisaged to stop what is depicted in the second document released titled "SSA meets Israel Mossad arrogant claim September".

Within the second document it is depicted that a Mossad agent had contacted the Acting DG of SSA, Dennis Dlomo directly on his cell phone to discuss an ongoing matter. The Acting DG felt that this was inappropriate behaviour by the agent of Mossad lacking respect and protocol (Al-Jazeera n.d.: 1). The fact that the agent was in the country was news to the SSA, but was not surprising to the SSA as that particular Mossad agent was perceived as arrogant when he met with the DG on a previous occasion (Al-Jazeera n.d.: 1). Due to this agent's behaviour and the apparent distrust the SSA has towards Mossad, the SSA assigned counter-espionage agents to watch this agent and a few others in South Africa (Jordan 2015). Of particular interest was that the 'arrogant' agent maintained numerous sources within the South African government and police and has various contacts with Jewish community members (including the Jewish

[22] This information pertained to the intelligence relationship between South Africa and Israel. The information chronologically depicts the historical events of Israel and the historical interaction between the two states during apartheid and post-apartheid.

Board of Deputies). These contacts are assumed to be assisting with intelligence activities (Jordan 2015). The contact and presumed cooperation between the Mossad agent and the South African Police Service seems to revolve around Islamic militancy issues in South Africa, the agent also has contacts within other governmental ministries, including the Agriculture, Trade and Industry, Health and other institutions that deal with research (Jordan 2015).

Another leaked document tells of a representative of the liaison office of SSA meeting with the head of African relations for Mossad at the Burgespark Hotel in Pretoria on 5 September 2012. This interaction shows us that there are clear lines of communication between the two spy agencies. The representative explained to the Mossad official that the SSA has its own set of protocol rules where liaison relationships were concerned. And that if the Mossad was really interested in making the liaison relationship work, it should be on South African terms and conditions when in our country. There were three non-negotiable principles by which SSA stands namely respect for one another; total equality in a liaison relationship; and the *quid pro quo* principle (Al-Jazeera n.d.: 2). The agent was accused of breaking all of these codes of conducts, which was not acceptable to the SSA.

However, the relationship in this period also reflects cooperation despite the sense that the SSA feels it needs to set boundaries for Mossad. Another leaked document released elaborated on South Africa-Israeli liaison regarding terrorism within Africa. In May 2012 it was determined that an imminent attack was planned in Africa, spearheaded by Hezbollah. The information was corroborated by Ivory Coast, Kenya, Uganda, Lebanon, Ethiopia, Ghana and Botswana. The attack was planned against either the USA, the UK or Saudi Arabia. Intelligence determined that the suspected terrorist travelled through Zambia and Mozambique and was supposed to enter South Africa from there (Al-Jazeera n.d.: 2). The SSA was informed by Mossad of the imminent attack in an effort to apprehend the individual. From a multinational cooperation standpoint, this type of cooperation in an operation is exceptional and has its rewards.

Another document relating to international intelligence cooperation between the two agencies, refers to a meeting held in January 2013 where the Mossad agents put forward their interests in the Middle East. They asked if the SSA could share the information that they had on Israel's neighbouring countries (Al-Jazeera n.d.: 3). The agent specifically mentioned Syria, Egypt and Iran. With regards to Egypt, information was requested that might shed light on the direction the Egyptian government might take with regards to Iran and Hezbollah (Al-Jazeera n.d.: 3).

This sudden drive for information resulted from the uncertainty that was being experienced due to the Arab Spring and how the overthrow of the Egyptian government would affect Israel. Egypt under Hosni Mubarak was not a threat to Israel, however, the Israeli's were uncertain as to what to expect from Mohammed Morsi and the Muslim Brotherhood. Therefore, Mossad wanted to know what Morsi and his Brotherhood allies weak points were, the power levels at play and who controlled what (Silverstein 2015). Mossad was extremely delighted when the Egyptian military overthrew Morsi, which subsequently ended the hunt for information (Silverstein 2015). The relationship between the SSA and Mossad must have been in good standing for Israel to request help in relation to their neighbours.

One of the last documents published depicts cooperation between the SSA and Mossad on a case named the Macopa Missile Affair in which an Israeli citizen by the name of Yitzhak Talia was in possession of stolen South African missile plans. The SSA was well aware that it could not do any investigation on Israeli soil. However, Mossad made a deal with the SSA it will get the plans back to SSA, but in return Mr Talia should not be prosecuted in South Africa. Mossad had promised the SSA that in the light of the "strong cooperation between our services, we have examined a way to return the plans to you" (Al-Jazeera n.d.: 2).

The above documents suggest that at least in more recent times exchanges and cooperation have occurred between the states. However, as evident in the leaked documents, cooperation is not as enthusiastic and smooth as during the apartheid period. The purpose of the next chapter is to explore the role that regime change in South Africa played to bring this shift in the nature of the intelligence relationship about.

UNIVERSITY of the
WESTERN CAPE

4.8 Conclusion

This chapter investigated the post-apartheid era (1990 to 2015) with respect to the changes and continuities in South Africa and Israeli politics generally, South Africa and Israeli intelligence structures and operations more specifically and the South African-Israeli intelligence relationship. It did so in juxtaposition to the previous chapter that outlined similar themes during the apartheid period (1948 to 1990). What becomes evident is that the post-apartheid period is characterised by the theme of transformation from apartheid to democracy on the side of South Africa. In Israeli politics initial peace processes eventually gave way to continuity and even intensification of apartheid as a governing principle. This results in a slow breakaway from the Israeli influence that came with South Africa's close alliance with this fellow pariah state prior to 1990, especially in the intelligence sector. Since re-admission into the global fold,

the ANC leadership at first shifted South Africa away from apartheid's old allies and towards nations that supported the ANC during its struggle against apartheid. Recognised and welcomed by the West, countries of the South and later as a BRICS member South Africa no longer needed Israel. Moreover, new intelligence structures were developed and implemented in South Africa post-1994 with each subsequent president in South Africa implementing his own stance when it came to intelligence. Each president's policy objectives had an impact at a bureaucratic level on the intelligence sector and the president's appointment of Ministers of Intelligence also impacted on South Africa-Israeli intelligence cooperation. The post-apartheid intelligence relationship between South Africa and Israel remains cordial, especially in terms of sharing information on terrorism, but the relationship is no longer what it was during the apartheid era. The next chapter applies the theoretical framework developed in chapter two to analyse what the role of regime type is in explaining intelligence cooperation during and after apartheid.

UNIVERSITY of the
WESTERN CAPE

CHAPTER FIVE: EXPLAINING THE SOUTH AFRICAN-ISRAELI INTELLIGENCE RELATIONSHIP

5.1 Introduction

Chapter three and four provided a descriptive overview of South Africa-Israeli intelligence cooperation in the context of these states' regime types by juxtaposing two time periods, namely apartheid and post-apartheid. The aim within this chapter is to move beyond description to analysis by applying the theoretical framework that chapter two developed. Specifically the chapter uses the views expressed by proponents of Realism, Liberalism and Constructivism about the role that regime type plays in intelligence cooperation to explain the evolution of the South African-Israeli relationship from enthusiastic and camaraderie to one that is still deemed necessary, but circumscribed and often tense. This chapter proceeds as follows. It provides a brief comparative summary of the intelligence relationship between South Africa and Israel as discussed in Chapters three and four. It then applies Realism, Liberalism and Constructivism to analyse the role that regime type played in shaping the intelligence relationship, focusing especially on how much value these theories put on the change in South Africa's regime type to explain the continuities and changes in the intelligence relationship between the two periods under investigation.

UNIVERSITY of the
WESTERN CAPE

5.2 The South African-Israeli intelligence relationship from apartheid to post-apartheid

This section provides a comparative summary of the intelligence relationship between South Africa and Israel during and after apartheid in the context of their political ideologies (governing principles), identity and interests.

5.2.1 *Apartheid era alliance and alignment*

What became apparent in chapter three was that the relationship within the intelligence sector went beyond one of necessity to one of enthusiasm, which could be described as an apartheid bond or brotherhood. The core of this relationship revolves around three factors, namely; a perceived alignment of governing principles or political ideology in terms of apartheid and Zionism. Secondly, there was a similar siege mentality rooted in an alignment of national identities, which resulted from the identification of a similar and even common threat perception, international pariah status based on being branded apartheid states and finding themselves in hostile neighbourhood supportive of their respective enemies. Lastly an alignment of interests and ways to achieve these interests, e.g. to secure their states from

internal enemies (also regarded as terrorists), destabilise neighbours seen to be in support of their enemies, and thwart isolation policies by the international communities through e.g. trading in arms with each other. These core elements also informed the close intelligence relationship.

The security threat resulting from these states' internal politics and the global community identifying and labelling a particular state, pushes them towards a pariah and increases that state's siege mentality. Apart from the global community isolating the two states, they felt increasing pressure from those neighboring them such as the Arab nations surrounding Israel and the change in Zimbabwe that had South Africa feeling exposed. The constant fear of being surrounded by your enemies and isolation that comes with being branded as rogue, brought about a siege mentality within both states. The fact that Israel had been engaged in numerous wars and battles with Arab states that surround them had enhanced this siege mentality, while South Africa was engaging with the ANC in numerous countries surrounding South Africa.

In chapter three it became clear that during the apartheid era, South Africa and Israel at a political level became each other's default partner in a time of growing uncertainty in and isolation of these states. Both were regarded as apartheid states by the global community and subsequently gained pariah status albeit to differing extents. Once branded as the same, a relationship that began as convenience turned into an alliance that thrived in especially security matters. The intelligence relationship between the two states' intelligence agencies (BOSS/NIS and Mossad), transcended that of an average intelligence relationship. The two intelligence agencies were enthusiastic about cooperating with one another, and at one point even started to mirror each other structurally and operationally. Mossad primarily versed in foreign intelligence, aided BOSS/NIS in both domestic and foreign intelligence.

WESTERN CAPE

At this point certain elements became the cornerstone of what made this alliance thrive and at the heart of it was a common identity as apartheid states. This common identity encompassed an alignment of the governing principle in both states, which excluded and oppressed groups in the two countries and vehemently defended these practices in the name of state security. The security pretexts were respectively embodied by the armed struggle against apartheid by the ANC, PAC and SACP, while for Israel it was the PLO and Hamas. These actors as discovered, had similar objectives, cooperated with one another and formed their own alliance to reach their liberation goals. They also found supportive neighbourhoods and got framed by South Africa and Israel in the context of the Cold War.

As a result the two states found in each other a partner that not only had similar problems, but could assist with the solutions to these problems. Their similar construction of the security threat they faced allowed deep relations between security structures (specifically the intelligence sector) of both. This meant that high-ranking officials from both defense structures were engaged in annual meetings regarding strategic cooperation, which had a trickle-down effect of increasing exchanges in intelligence and a thriving arms trade relationship. Thus placing a major emphasis on strategic intelligence.

Apart from their similar opponents, the South African and Israeli intelligence community, shared a similar mandate, structure and ideology. The NIS and Mossad both had espionage and counter-espionage activities abroad, as well as obtaining technologies (particularly from each other) that would benefit national defense and national interests. The NIS had divisions that were structured based on what was evident in the Mossad agency, which is not a coincidence as at the time of restructuring of the South African intelligence dispensation (BOSS to NIS), the relationship between Israel and South Africa was blossoming. The fact that Mossad was one of the top intelligence agencies in the world did not detract from shaping the South African intelligence structure after a successful ally state. This level of closeness in order to not only share intelligence, but also help frame the new intelligence dispensation speaks to the relationship and relation-building between the two states. Indicating how the systemic level providing-implementing and imposing a state of exclusion on Israel and South Africa which would at a national level draw the two states close to one another as the above depicts.

WESTERN CAPE

5.2.2 *Post-apartheid era tension and divergence*

The post-apartheid period began with the transition period, and a key figure from a South African perspective was President F.W. de Klerk. He understood that his political party was no longer able to sustain the policies and ideologies of apartheid, thus pushing his administration to pave the way for democratisation of South Africa. Key to this was not only the restructuring of security structures, but the restructuring of the culture within and associated with the security structures of South Africa. As alluded to in chapter three and earlier in this chapter, the security structures, particularly the intelligence departments mimicked and were modelled after the Israeli intelligence department. This required changing not on the basis of production purposes (not that the department was inadequate) but on the basis that it has systemic cultures engrained that relates back to apartheid era intelligence which could not be sustained in a democratic South Africa. Indicating that one of the core elements that upheld the apartheid relationship had now melted away, that of the common internal politics. Indicating that what was happening

at the individual level was having a profound effect on the national level structure. South Africa's governing principle was now a democracy and as explained above, refashioned its institutions, including intelligence to reflect this.

Despite a short-lived peace agreement with the Palestinians, Israel's governing principles remained the same, namely policies that can be equated with apartheid towards Palestinians. Its relations with its neighbours remain in the same mode and Mossad continues to play the same role, using the same methods to achieve its goals. The notion of 'South Africa and Israel versus the world' has disappeared and now the intelligence relationship has taken a mantle of only cooperating when national interests are at risk, such as the case of terrorism. Contemporary South Africa, as a democracy is also a different democracy, it is a post-colonial democracy which has seen it align itself with BRICS, finding a new identity for South Africa as an emerging country. South Africa was welcomed back by the international community and its post-apartheid image is one of a middle and emerging power, rather than a pariah.

Within the Mbeki era, the intelligence sharing between the NIA and Mossad had been revolving around terrorism, as Mossad assisted the NIA with intelligence on a suspected terror cell operating within South Africa. At a time when the two agencies interests were aligned, this form of cooperation would have been followed up with the two agencies tackling the threat together. Instead, the NIA took the information and deemed it not necessary to keep Mossad up to date with their findings, resulting in a Mossad agent storming out of the subsequent meeting where this decision was decided. This interaction depicts how considerable the deterioration of interests have become, the interaction also suggests that the brother-hood so prominent under apartheid, was clearly absent within this intelligence relationship. The leaked document labelled "SSA liaison parameters with Israel" established protocols whereby agents of SSA are to abide by when interacting with Mossad agents. The need for a brief on how to interact with their counter-parts reflects that the two agencies are not cooperating at previous seen levels.

The meagreness (in relation to common interests) of the intelligence relationship had become more evident with the Zuma administration (the South African intelligence structure now remodelled and henceforth known as the State Security Agency of South Africa [SSA]). The director-general of the SSA, Gibson Njenje had stated that the SSA was indeed still a willing partner when it came to issues of terrorism and weapons of mass destruction (Al-Jazeera n.d.: 51). This directive continued throughout the Zuma administration with the relevant ministers

and intelligence heads, showing a clear path that the intelligence between the two agencies were following, and that was terrorism. The siege mentality has all but gone, although during the Zuma era the ANC and other actors shifted its narrative to be more anti-Western, which also frames its membership of BRICS. Israel is still feeling international pressure to change its policies and justifies much of its violent responses to Palestinians in terms that reflect a siege mentality.

Despite the divergence of ideology (governing principles) and mentality (orientation towards the external world), the two states continued to have a relationship, but as was clear from chapter 4, this relationship is no longer of the scope and depth as during apartheid. It is wholly comprehensible that the intelligence relationship now no longer transcends enthusiasm to work with each other, it is one focussed on narrow interests- a limited scope (terrorism and nuclear non-proliferation i.e. national security) has been embedded into the relationship that now sticks purely to the basics and clearly defined terms. Tension seems to be a common occurrence as the two states' expectations of each other clash.

5.3 The role of regime type in the South African-Israeli intelligence relationship

Applying the theoretical framework developed in chapter two this section aims to analyse the role of regime type in intelligence cooperation between South Africa and Israel. It will do so by asking the same question for each theory, Realism, Liberalism and Constructivism, in the framework: How does the theory's predictions about the role of regime type in intelligence relationship contribute to our understanding of the strong intelligence relationship between South Africa and Israel during apartheid and the continuing, but circumscribed and often tense relationship in the post-apartheid era?

5.3.1 A Realist understanding of the intelligence relationship between South Africa and Israel

Realism does not attribute much explanatory value to regime type in intelligence relationships. Rather, it focuses on national interests, especially the security imperatives of states that arise (especially for structural realists) from the anarchic nature of the international system. Intelligence cooperation is not indifferent to regime type, though realists emphasise that it may be more difficult to engage with some regime types' intelligence agencies due to the way the state is set up, but cooperation will still occur to the extent that it is in the national interest to do so. These are in fact due to the structures put in place that led South Africa and Israel to become intelligence partners.

Realism explains relationships in the intelligence field in as much as it assumed states will place themselves and their national interests/security (often related to threats against their survival) first in relation to cooperation. It is for this reason that realism is often employed to describe relationships that include non-democratic actors, such as authoritarian regimes, quasi-states or non-state actors, like terrorists. In the case of South Africa and Israel during apartheid, understanding the cooperation through a realist lens will depict the relationship as two states that had a similar threat to their national security. Both labelled their threat, respectively the ANC and the PLO as terrorist organizations. In addition, the enemies of these states cooperated with each other and as a result it made (Realist) sense for South Africa and Israel to cooperate in the interest of security. However, Realism does not explain the closeness – near "brotherhood"- exhibited between South Africa and Israel's intelligence agencies that suggest their cooperation went beyond a security imperative. In comparison to when South Africa and the USA cooperated in their backing of the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola (UNITA), against Cuban and the Soviet Union backed Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola (MPLA). Angola had been the site of a proxy war between the USA and the Soviet Union vying for Cold War supremacy (News24 2016). The USA and South Africa saw the Cuban involvement in Africa as a mutual threat, however, and cooperated with each other. But, the cooperation between the two was basic, seen as a means to an end and nothing more. The cooperation between the two had to be justified within a Cold War context with the aim of stopping the spread of Communism.

UNIVERSITY of the
ERN CAPE

Realism also contributes to our understanding of the post-apartheid period. For a realist, the continuation of the relationship after the ANC came into power is not strange despite Nelson Mandela's admonition that the ANC will not forget Israel's support for the apartheid government. Realist theory dictates that the intelligence relationship will continue in the post-apartheid dispensation as long as it is in the national interests and beneficial for security to do so. A realist will point to South Africa's terrorist threat in the 1990s and that Mossad was still seen as an important partner to counter this threat. Despite the clear difference in values that informed the two agencies in the post-apartheid era they still cooperated, because interests trump morality. The quote by Phythian (as mentioned in chapter two): "If we were to ask why states regard intelligence as being necessary, we could answer that intelligence is the agency through which states seek to protect or extend their relative advantage" is apt. Its significance in a post-apartheid dispensation is that the South African foreign policy under the ANC will continue to berate Israel's discrimination against the Palestinians. However, at bureaucratic

levels where intelligence cooperation is concerned, national interests needs to be put first. This explains why states often cooperate with 'enemies'. Indicating what happens at a systemic level has a profound effect on the national level policy directive within South Africa.

Realism ascribes the tension in the post-apartheid relationship to functional issues of working with a non-democratic partner, rather than to normative factors. That is, it is harder for a democratic state's agency that operate under different governing principles, but not because of normative reasons, to work with the intelligence agency of a state that is not democratic. Differences in values, such as human rights, will not deter cooperation. But, differences in bureaucratic culture may simply be compensated for by outlining clearer guidelines for cooperation. This may be so, but Realism's explanation of the limited scope of cooperation is unsatisfactory. During the 1980s the Israeli foreign office was loudly opposed and making all sorts of noises about apartheid, but the security establishment was working out of the same office as the South Africans (Polakow-Suransky 2018). Following Realist logic, South Africa may remove its ambassador from Israel, but this will not deter intelligence cooperation or relations behind the scenes. The fact that South Africa has limited its understanding of what is 'in the national interest' to justify cooperation to such high political issues such as terrorism and nuclear proliferation, means that there is more to the role that regime type plays in this case study.

UNIVERSITY of the
WESTERN CAPE

5.3.2 A Liberal understanding of the intelligence relationship between South Africa and Israel post-apartheid.

Liberalism as an IR theory holds that state cooperation based on mutual interests is the norm in international relations (Jackson and Sorensen 2016: 98). This explains why South Africa and Israel had an intelligence relationship during apartheid. An explanation that is rather similar to the reasoning provided by realists: a common threat amidst international isolation and hostile neighbourhoods provided the incentive for the two state agencies to cooperate to an extent of mutual interdependence.

However, Liberalism also holds that democracies, for normative reasons related to the democratic structures and culture they have in common, will not go to war with one another and following Kant, will establish a federation of peace. For the same reasons it is expected that democracies will have deeper relationships than those of other regime types. Moreover, Liberalism emphasises values such as human rights. It would therefore predict that a democratic state will not form an alliance with a state that does not share similar democratic

values. Here Liberalism explains the tension in the post-apartheid intelligence relationship by referring to the divergence in values that frame SSA and Mossad's work. When South Africa became a full democratic country it could no longer place itself in the same context as Israel. Due to many in South Africa seeing Israel as an apartheid state, particularly from a national level and the structures in place.

The change in regime from one governed, according to the principle of apartheid to that of democracy in South Africa is the main contributing factor towards the decline in intelligence cooperation. Whereas for realists, regime type has no bearing on whether there can/should be intelligence cooperation, for liberalists' regime type matters.

Although liberalism can explain why there is a strain evident in the relationship between the NIA/SSA and Mossad on the basis that South Africa pursues foreign policy principles such as human rights, nuclear disarmament, multilateralism and peace, it cannot explain why the intelligence relationship persisted albeit in a curtailed form post-apartheid.

This is linked to the fact that morality plays an important part within the liberal discourse morality should be placed above national interests. The two states clearly still benefit from cooperation, but this benefit comes at the expense of South Africa's democratic values and foreign policy principles. There is evidence to suggest that political distaste for Israel's treatment of Palestinians inside and outside its borders on the one hand and Israeli disdain for South Africa's political position on the other hand, filters through to the bureaucratic level of intelligence. However, these tensions emanating from regime type does not trump the perception that cooperation is needed for state security. In other words, Liberalism explains some aspects of the South Africa-Israeli intelligence relationship, but just not all.

5.3.3 A Constructivist understanding of the intelligence relationship between South Africa and Israel post-apartheid

Constructivism emphasizes the role that culture and identity play in a state's formulation of its national interests. Unlike Realism and Liberalism, Constructivism does not perceive reality as objectively given, but rather as intersubjectively arrived at through social processes. Similarly, the role that regime type plays in intelligence relationships is "what states make of it" and not a given. If two states' governing principles, identities and interests are perceived to align, states are likely to cooperate in the intelligence sphere. Their cooperation is both the result of this perception and can serve as an affirmation of the perception that cooperation serves either self-interest or mutual interest.

Constructivism contributes to our understanding of the South African-Israeli intelligence relationship in that it explains the strong intelligence bond during apartheid, which has been described as going over and beyond what Realism and Liberalism can explain. A confluence of factors as outlined above contributed to the perception that South Africa and Israel faced not only a similar enemy, but a common enemy. The importance of regime type for Constructivism is that it informed this perception, because both states were governed by the principle of apartheid, which resulted in the international community labelling them apartheid states, their pariah status and a siege mentality. The sense that the international community misunderstood their politics and their security predicaments, only served to enforce the sense that they understood each other's positions. At the heart of this 'understanding' thus lies corresponding political cultures that agents of the state were socialised in.

There is a tendency for bureaucracies/organisations to be a reflection of the wider society and political culture, incorporating the culture, language and behaviour. Within the intelligence bureaucracy, the organisational culture provides a certain setting that employees get socialised in and have to conform to. When applied to NIS and Mossad during apartheid, it provides an understanding as to why they were enthusiastic to cooperate with one another. A corresponding organisational culture had been built up over years to a point that the two accompanied each other on intelligence operations and had a common frame of reference to dealing with their enemies. Building and developing structures that had become embedded within the two states relationship revolving around strategic intelligence.

WESTERN CAPE

Constructivism also provides us with a framework within which to situate the trust that developed between the two agencies. Realism argues that distrust in any intelligence relationship, even with an ally, is healthy. Liberalism argues that common democratic values further trust in an intelligence relationship. In juxtaposition, Constructivism's emphasis on the social relationship underscored by a corresponding political culture and identity (democratic or not), explains why trust thrived between South Africa and Israel, especially where it was deemed most needed- at security level.

However, with the end of apartheid and implementation of democracy in South Africa, a new political culture of inclusiveness and human rights have taken root that is also reflective in governance structures. This culture is not 'objectively democratic' as Liberalism would hold, but has been informed by the ANC's perceptions formed from its inception through the liberation struggle and during the different presidencies since 1994 of what democracy in post-

apartheid South Africa must look like. This political culture in turn informs SSA/NIA's perceived role, its organisational culture and by extension, its relationship with Mossad. In a sense the Constructivist explanation of the strain in the relationship between the agencies is similar to that offered by Liberalism (especially if Democratic Peace Theory is employed), namely that is relates to South Africa's democratisation. However, Constructivism goes beyond a Liberalist explanation. It explains why the relationship persists post-apartheid in the circumscribed form that it does.

Constructivism would point to the slowness in SSA/NIA's organisational culture to change in the immediate post-apartheid era. Not only did intelligence operators of NIS, who remained in the agency post-apartheid, continue the organisational culture, but the very principle of reconciliation that required former enemies to cooperate in the name of the "new South Africa" may also have perpetuated a framework within which the ANC could imagine continuing a relationship with Israel and by extension Mossad. South Africa under the ANC supported the Middle East peace process, but as the process faltered and South Africa supported the Palestinian cause, we see how the relationship declines to the point where it needed specific terms and a limited scope to continue. The two states, through their interaction with each other came to a new understanding, namely that they do not share similar values and that their relationship will only be based on what is essential.

UNIVERSITY of the
WESTERN CAPE

Constructivists would explain the continuing relationship between South Africa and Israel by referring to a perception that despite political differences, the two can still benefit by cooperating on selected issues. Cooperation no longer flows from the perception of wanting to share intelligence, but a perception of needing to cooperate on a special case basis; a significant shift from the apartheid era relationship. Within the apartheid relationship, incidents such as agents storming out of meetings would not occur; that is the actions of a forced relationship. Although this explanation looks similar to Realism's explanation of why the relationship continues despite regime divergence, it goes beyond Realism to explain the disrespect and even disdain among individuals in the two agencies that is reported on in the leaked intelligence documents. Constructivism provides a narrative to make sense of the intelligence relationship that goes beyond the system level (the anarchic nature that requires states to sacrifice values at the altar of national security). It tells a story of individuals negotiating new terms and rationalisations for (i.e. 'constructing') an intelligence relationship amidst a divergence in regime type, understood to include diverging political culture, identity and interests. Initially this rationalisation was one based on the possibility that Israel may democratise as the peace

process takes root, but this changed to a rationalisation based on the perception that the relationship is still beneficial (even in its forced form) for state security. The perceived success in counter-terrorism and non-proliferation confirmed this perception and explains why the cooperation continues in these areas.

5.4 Conclusion

This chapter applied a theoretical approach with the aim to understand the intelligence relationship between South Africa during apartheid and post-apartheid. Realism was especially applied to frame the cooperation during apartheid in terms of the identification of a common enemy and the continuation of the relationship post-apartheid based on security imperatives trumping morality. Neither of these explanations attribute any value to regime type except that it may be operationally more difficult for a state to cooperate for functional (and not normative) reasons with a state that is a non-democracy. Liberalism explains cooperation during apartheid by pointing to mutual interests, and the tension in the post-apartheid relationship by referring to South Africa's democratisation that would make cooperation with apartheid Israel normative and structurally problematic. Regime type thus matters for Liberals, but a Liberal explanation cannot explain why cooperation continues after apartheid ended in South Africa. Constructivism with its emphasis on how culture and identity inform perceptions that subsequently inform how interests come to be framed, usefully fills the explanatory gaps left by Realism and Liberalism. Pointing to corresponding and diverging political cultures and identity, Constructivism allows a multi-level analysis that broadens our understanding of how organisational culture and perceptions at the individual level formed through experience and other social processes can construct a relationship. It is in this sense that constructivism would explain why the apartheid relationship was so close and why it continues after apartheid. Both relate to regime type, but regime type defined in terms of identity and culture that gives rise to and is informed by a governing principle, like that of apartheid or democracy.

UNIVERSITY of the
WESTERN CAPE

CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUSION

6.1 Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to answer the following research question: Theoretically, does regime type matter when it comes to intelligence cooperation between countries, with specific reference to South Africa and Israel? To answer this question, the following sub-questions were developed to assist in answering the research question:

- What is the correlation between intelligence cooperation and regime type in historical perspective?
- How has the relationship between regime type and intelligence cooperation been theorised by Realist, Liberal and Constructivist scholars?
- How has intelligence cooperation changed between South Africa and Israel in the post-apartheid era?
- Can the transformation in relationship be attributed to the change in regime type that occurred in South Africa in the 1990s?

Chapter two provided the conceptual and theoretical framework to be utilised to answer the research question. The starting point was the understanding of intelligence and intelligence cooperation, as well as the framing of regime type that would be implemented within the thesis. The chapter aimed to go beyond a mono-theoretical approach to show the three mainstream International Relations theories- Realism, Liberalism and Constructivism- can be applied to explain different historical and current intelligence relationships. Realism indicates that states will share intelligence irrespective of regime type if it improves national interests. Liberalism and Democratic Peace Theory argues in turn that regime type matters, in that democracies are likely to form deeper relationships with each other. A constructivist approach agrees that regime type matters, but depicts how culture and identities can shape or define policy preferences and how these combinations may lead to a competent alliance.

Chapter three set out to explain and justify (in the case of Israel) the categorisation of South Africa and Israel as apartheid states during the period 1948 to 1990. It provided some historical context of the two countries as well as the subsequent reaction by the international community to the internal policies practised within the two states and the effects the reaction had on both states during this period. It also outlined the intelligence set-ups and operations in both these

countries during this period. Lastly, it outlined what intelligence cooperation took place and what the nature of the relationship was during this period. The objective was to establish what brought these two states' intelligence actors closer to one another, which were established as: (i) perceived alignment of ideological domestic politics, (ii) perceived common identity and (iii) perceived alignment of interests. The question then becomes are these elements the result of a common regime and can this continue once the common apartheid tag is no longer applicable.

Chapter four explored the post-apartheid intelligence relationship between South Africa and Israel in the context of South Africa's political transition. The chapter outlined the transformation experienced in South African politics and within the intelligence sector chronologically from 1990 to 2015. It then turned to Israeli politics and explained the continuities experienced in its governing principle and intelligence sector. It then showed how the three fundamental elements that made the apartheid relationship strong have slowly deteriorated. It depicted a relationship that has become a shadow of what it was under apartheid. However, it showed that cooperation between the two agencies have nevertheless continued, but it is not on the same enthusiastic level as during apartheid, it is circumscribed in modus and scope.

Chapter five applied the theoretical framework developed in chapter two in order to analyse what the role of regime type is in intelligence cooperation during and after apartheid. Realism does not ascribe a special role to regime type, but favour security reasons for cooperation. Realism therefore explains why South Africa and Israel cooperated during apartheid, based on a common enemy, but not why the relationship ended up being so close. Realism also explains why the relationship continued after apartheid ended i.e. there are still security threats that justify cooperation.

In relation to the other two mainstream IR theories discussed, liberalists' understand the strain within the relationship as it foresees the two states to not cooperate at all due to moral reasons. From a liberal standpoint, the actions directed at the Palestinian people, places strain on both the political and bureaucratic spheres, that has resulted in the steady decline and should have subsequently brought an end to the intelligence relationship. South Africa's democratisation would make cooperation with apartheid Israel normatively and structurally problematic, indicating that regime type thus matters to Liberals.

Constructivism filled the gaps in understanding and explaining the relationship during apartheid, however post-apartheid this relationship has evolved and changed. It no longer shares the same identity based relationship as evident in apartheid but now has been transitioned into a new identity based relationship. From a constructivist perspective, in 1994 when South Africa changed its regime from an apartheid state to that of a democracy, and given that before the elections took place in South Africa, Israel was classified as a democracy but also an apartheid state (as depicted in chapter three). After the elections, up until 2015 there had not been a significant change in their policies toward Palestine and therefore it can be predicated (unless drastic changes are implemented) that this trend will continue. Indicating that the ANC-led South African government will not reach the levels of cooperation as seen under the constructivist relationship during apartheid but now build towards a new relationship.

Based on what made the relationship between South Africa and Israel strong during apartheid (constructivist rationale), and given the fact that after 1994 majority of these commonalities had begun to diverge, Constructivism still plays a role in explaining the intelligence relationship post-apartheid. The constructivist argument has slight nuances that differentiates itself from the realist argument. As Alexander Wendt (1992) stated "anarchy is what states make of it", and that is how the relationship between the two states evolved, this relationship had become 'what states make of it'. South Africa and Israel have made the relationship into one that now focusses on their newly interpreted enemies (global terrorism) but far from the enthusiastic and comfortable relationship under apartheid leading to a perceptional change in the relationship. The relationship however does seem to be forced, there is no real 'want to cooperate' outside the fact that they need to which goes to the realist argument. The relationship therefore went from a 'want to cooperate' to a 'need to cooperate', which explains how the relationship between the two has evolved and changed to the one evident in chapter four.

The intelligence relationship between South Africa and Israel has been evolving into its own democratic personality, this personality clearly is comprised and influenced by both the political and bureaucratic sphere, with history playing a major part in shaping both. During apartheid, at both the political and bureaucratic spheres, South Africa and Israel enjoyed an intelligence relationship built upon their identities. However, in the democratic era, a Liberal view has influenced how the relationship takes shape in relation to dealings that could be evident in the public sphere. From an intelligence bureaucratic perspective, the relationship has shifted from one built and strengthened by their constructivist bonds, to one that can be embodied by a realist view on intelligence cooperation. In essence due to the trend of the Israeli

treatment of Palestinians, there will not be a shift in policy reform (from South Africa) in relation to Israel in the foreseeable future, if Israel does not change its actions towards Palestine. However, security issues will take precedent and this will lead the SSA to engage with Mossad on a case to case basis even though it is against the political sphere viewpoint of South Africa.

A finding could be that since the apartheid governments of both had labelled the ANC and PLO terrorist groups which had been the focal point in developing the apartheid closeness. It can be purported that there had been a realist understanding within the apartheid era that merely infused with the constructivist tendencies present within the political system that allowed the two agencies to perform at maximum ability/capacity. This intelligence relationship (realist) continued, but because the constructivist tendencies are now not as prominent due to the change in regime type and the terrorist threat no longer common but a 'blanket' terrorist threat in place (global terrorism). Relations now no longer depict an enthusiastic necessity relationship but is constricted by political clout.

Pertaining to what has been expressed within this thesis, a fair conclusion in relation to intelligence cooperation between South Africa (SSA) and Israel (Mossad) in a post-apartheid dispensation, is that regime type does not dictate whether or not there is intelligence cooperation but the regime type does dictate the form of intelligence alliance a state can partake in. The common regime identified under apartheid between South Africa and Israel allowed for an intelligence alliance that encompassed everything (military and defence dealings) enthusiastically based on the common constructivist notion between the two. However, now that their regimes are no longer identical, the intelligence alliance has to deal with liberal factors such as the morality (particularly from a South African perspective) when it comes to being able to cooperate and therefore, the intelligence alliance is one squarely found within a 'need for intelligence' not a 'want', emphasizing a realist notion. The need to cooperate when national security is at risk only indicates a remarkable shift from a relationship that thrived and was enthusiastic to cooperate with one another under apartheid.

6.2 Future Research

This study has laid the foundation for future research to expand on this topic, particularly expanding on the Israeli perspective on the divergence of a once intimate intelligence relationship. The focus would lie within the post-apartheid era and seek to provide a detailed understanding from an Israeli perspective as to why the relationship has not reached the heights

as within apartheid. Expanding on the concept of this thesis, a future research question could implement the multi-theoretical framework to various case studies i.e. South African intelligence relationship with other states, to determine who South Africa shares the best intelligence relationship with and what are the factors that cause it. By looking at the case of South Africa and Israel, the study aimed to interpret how perception around South Africa's post-apartheid identity brought about by the state's transition to democracy impacted on these states' intelligence relationship, this could be explored further by implementing different case studies. Particularly by contributing further on the literature on regime type and how that impacts on intelligence sharing. From a policy perspective that then contributes to the understanding as to why states have good relationships and not so good relationships.

UNIVERSITY of the
WESTERN CAPE

Bibliography

Acton, J.M. (2014). International Verification and Intelligence, *Intelligence and National Security*, 29(3): 341-356.

Adams, J. (1984) Israel and South Africa, The Unnatural Alliance. Quartet Books Limited: London.

Africa, S. (2009a). Well-Kept Secrets: The right of access to information and the South African intelligence services. Institute for Global Dialogue: Midrand.

Africa, S. (2009b). The South African Intelligence Services: A Historical Perspective. In S. Africa and J. Kwadjo (Eds.), *Changing Intelligence Dynamics in Africa.* Retrieved from http://epapers.bham.ac.uk/1526/1/AfricaKwadjo_-2009-_IntelligenceAfrica.pdf

Africa, S. (2012). The policy evolution of the South African civilian intelligence services: 1994 to 2009 and beyond. Retrieved from:

https://repository.up.ac.za/bitstream/handle/2263/20766/Africa_Policy(2012).pdf?sequence=1

Africa, S. & Mlombile, S. (2001). Transforming the intelligence Services: Some reflections on the South African experience. Available at www.law.harvard.edu/programs/criminal-justice/south-africa.pdf [accessed 19 May 2017]

Aldrich, R. J. (2010). International Intelligence Cooperation in Practice. In Hans, B. & Ian, L. & Aiden, W. (ed.), *International Intelligence Cooperation and Accountability (18-41).* Studies in Intelligence. Routledge: New York.

Aldrich, R. J. (2009). Global Intelligence Cooperation versus Accountability: New Facets to an Old Problem, *Intelligence and National Security*, 24(1): 26-56.

Aldrich, R. J. (2018). Intelligence. In P. D. Williams & M. McDonald (Ed.), *Security Studies: An Introduction 3rd Edition* (pp. 437-451). New York: Routledge.

Al-Jazeera. (2013). Timeline: Politics in the state of Israel. Retrieved 29 Jan. 19 https://www.aljazeera.com/news/middleeast/2013/01/201311215184234934.html

Al-Jazeera. (n.d.). Geopolitical Country and Intelligence Assessment on Israel. Published by, National Intelligence Agency.

UNIVERSITY of the
WESTERN CAPE

Retrieved 18/03/17 http://www.aljazeera.com/investigations/documents.html

Al-Jazeera. (n.d.). Al-Jazeera Investigates: Spy Cables. Retrieved 18/03/17 http://www.aljazeera.com/investigations/documents.html

Al-Jazeera. (n.d.). SSA liaison parameters with Israel. Retrieved 18/03/17

https://assets.documentcloud.org/documents/1672731/ssa-liaison-parameters-with-israel.pdf

Al-Jazeera. (n.d.). SSA meets Israel Mossad arrogant claim September. Retrieved 18/03/17

https://assets.documentcloud.org/documents/1672738/ssa-meets-israel-mossad-arrogant-claim-september.pdf

Al-Jazeera. (n.d.). SSA meets Israel Mossad august 2012. Retrieved 18/03/17

https://assets.documentcloud.org/documents/1672739/ssa-meets-israel-mossad-august-2012.pdf

Al-Jazeera. (n.d.). SSA meets Israel Mossad October 2012. Retrieved 18/03/17

https://assets.documentcloud.org/documents/1672741/ssa-meets-israel-mossad-october-2012.pdf

Al-Jazeera. (n.d.). SSA meets Israel Mossad January 2013. Retrieved 18/03/17

https://assets.documentcloud.org/documents/1672740/ssa-meets-israel-mossad-january-2013.pdf

Al-Jazeera. (n.d.). Mossad to SSA on Mokopa Missile Affair. Retrieved 18/03/17

https://assets.documentcloud.org/documents/1672696/mossad-to-ssa-on-mokopa-missile-affair.pdf

Al-Jazeera (2018). Five ways Israeli law discriminates against Palestinians. Retrieved 12 Oct. 18 from https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2018/07/ways-israeli-law-discriminates-palestinians-180719120357886.html

ANC (n.d.). Foreign Policy Perspective in a Democratic South Africa. Retrieved 24 Mar. 18, from http://www.anc.org.za/content/foreign-policy-perspective-democratic-south-africa

UNIVERSITY of the WESTERN CAPE

Bakan, A.B. & Abu-Laban, Y. (2010) Israel/Palestine, South Africa and the 'One-State Solution': The Case for an Apartheid Analysis, *Politikon*, 37:2-3, 331-351

Barnes, C. (2008). International isolation and pressure for change in South Africa. Griffiths, A. & Barnes, C. (ed.), *Powers of Persuasion Incentives, Sanctions and Conditionality in Peace-making*. Accord Issue 19: 36-40.

Bar-Tal, D. & Antebi, D. (1992). Beliefs about negative intentions of the world: A study of the Israeli siege mentality. *Political Psychology*. 13(4): 633-644.

BBC News (2010). Israel's Peres denies South Africa nuclear weapons deal. Retrieved 12 Mar. 18 http://www.bbc.com/news/10146075

BBC News (2013). History of Mid-East peace talks. Retrieved 11 Dec. 18 https://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-11103745

BBC News (2018) Israel Profile- Timeline. Retrieved 29 Jan. 19 https://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-29123668

Beinin, J. & Hajjar, L. (2014). Palestine, Israel and the Arab-Israeli Conflict (A Primer). *The Middle East Research and Information Project.*

Beit-Hallahmi, B. (1987). The Israeli Connection: Whom Israel Arms and Why. London: I.B. Tauris & Co.

Bergman, R. (2018). The secret history of Mossad, Israel's feared and respected intelligence agency. Retrieved 29 Jan. 19 https://www.newstatesman.com/world/middle-east/2018/08/secret-history-mossad-israel-s-feared-and-respected-intelligence-agency

Bloch, J., Todd, P. (2003). Global Intelligence: The Worlds Secret Services Today. David Philip: Cape Town.

Bloom, W. (1990). Personal Identity, National Identity, and International Relations. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bock R.E. (2015). Anglo-Soviet Intelligence Cooperation, 1941–45: Normative Insights from the Dyadic Democratic Peace Literature, *Intelligence and National Security*, 30(6): 890-912.

WESTERN CAPE

Brand, R. & Fabricius, P. (2000). Mbeki attacks Israel for Middle East conflict. *IOL news*. Retrieved 26 Mar. 18 from https://www.iol.co.za/news/politics/mbeki-attacks-israel-for-middle-east-conflict-54438

BRICS. (2018). What is BRICS. Retrieved 27 Oct. 18 from http://www.brics2018.org.za/what-brics

Brown J.N. & Farrington. A. (2016): Democracy and the depth of intelligence sharing: why regime type hardly matters, *Intelligence and National Security*, 1-17.

Bruni, J. (2016). Australia faces struggle with strategic alliance, *Jane's Intelligence Review*, 28(12): 1-8.

Bruneau, T. C. & Dombroski, K. R. (2014). Reforming intelligence: The challenge of control in new democracies. California: Naval Postgraduate School. https://calhoun.nps.edu/bitstream/handle/10945/41971/CCMR_Bruneau_Reforming_Intelligence_2005-05-08.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

Burnham, P., Gilland Lutz, K., Grant, W. & Layton-Henry, Z. (2008). Research and Methods in Politics (2nd Ed). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Byman .D. (2017): US counterterrorism intelligence cooperation with the developing world and its limits, *Intelligence and National Security*, 1-16.

Caffarella, R.S. & Merriam, S. B. (1999). Perspectives on adult learning: framing our research. In *40th Annual Adult Education Research Conference Proceedings.* Northern Illinois University.

Carlsnaes, W., Nel, P. (2006). In Full Flight: South African Foreign Policy after Apartheid. *Institute for Global Dialogue*: Midrand.

Chernick, I. (2018). Confusion reigns within S. Africa ruling party's policy towards Israel. Retrieved 24 Jul. 18 from https://www.jpost.com/Israel-News/Confusion-reigns-within-S-Africa-ruling-partys-policy-towards-Israel-543278

Chilton, S. (1988). Defining Political Culture. *The Western Political Quarterly*, 41 (3): 419-445.

CIA. (1979). Israel: Foreign Intelligence and Security Services. Virginia: Government Printer. Retrieved 18 July 2017 https://www.hsdl.org/?abstract&did=728060

Cline L.E. (2016). African Regional Intelligence Cooperation: Problems and Prospects, *International Journal of Intelligence and Counter Intelligence*, 29(3): 447-469.

Clough, C. (2004). Quid Pro Quo: The Challenges of International Strategic Intelligence Cooperation, *International Journal of Intelligence and Counterintelligence*, 17(4): 601-613.

Coetzee, E. (2011). *Beyond Mono-Theoretical Approaches: Realism, Liberalism and the Explanatory Crises in the Democratic Peace Theory*. (Master's Thesis, University of Free State, Bloemfontein).

D'Anieri, P. (2012). International Politics: Power and Purpose in Global Affairs (2nd Ed). Wadsworth: Canada.

Daily Maverick (2017). Declassified: Apartheid Profits- Ties to Tel Aviv. Retrieved 09 Mar. 18 https://www.dailymaverick.co.za/article/2017-12-06-declassified-apartheid-profits-ties-to-tel-aviv/#.WqKPYuhubIW

Davis, U. (2003). Apartheid Israel: Possibilities for the Struggle Within. Pretoria: Media Review Network.

De Jager, N. & Steenekamp, C. L. (2016). The changing political culture of the African National Congress, *Democratization.* 23(5): 919-939.

de Mesquita, B. B. & Smith, A. (2012). Domestic Explanations of International Relations, *Annual Review of Political Science.* 15: 161-181.

Deng, F. M. (1995). War of Visions: Conflict of Identities in the Sudan. Washington DC: Brookings.

Dittmer, J. (2015). Everyday Diplomacy: UKUSA Intelligence Cooperation and Geopolitical Assemblages, *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 105(3):604-619.

Doherty, T.L. Horne, T. & Wootton, S. (2014). Managing Public Services- Implementing Changes: A thoughtful approach to the practice of management. New York: Routledge.

Doyle, M.W. (1986). Liberalism and World Politics. *The American Political Science Review*, 80(4), 1151-1169.

UNIVERSITY of the
WESTERN CAPE

Duffield, J. S (2018) Alliances. In P. D. Williams & M. McDonald (Ed.), *Security Studies: An Introduction 3rd Edition* (pp. 267-281). New York: Routledge.

Dugard, J. & Reynolds, J. (2013). Apartheid, International Law, and the Occupied Palestinian Territory, *The European Journal of International Law.* 24(3): 867-913.

Durrheim, K. (1999) Research Design, pg. 29-53. in Terre Blanche, M & Durrheim, K. (1999) Research in Practice. Cape Town: University of Cape Town Press (Pty) Ltd.

Encyclopaedia Britannica. (A) (2018). Mossad. Retrieved from https://www.britannica.com/topic/Mossad#ref1252649 , on 11/06/18.

Encyclopaedia Britannica. (B) (2018). Palestinian Liberation Organization. Retrieved from: https://www.britannica.com/topic/Palestine-Liberation-Organization ,on 12/06/18.

Evans, G. & Newham, J. The Penguin Dictionary of International Relations. Penguin Books.

Fägersten. B. (2010) Bureaucratic Resistance to International Intelligence Cooperation – The Case of Europol, *Intelligence and National Security*, 25(4): 500-520.

Feldman, N. (2017). Israelis will pay for Trump's Jerusalem Gambit. *Bloomberg.* Retrieved 25 Mar. 18 from https://www.bloomberg.com/view/articles/2017-12-06/israelis-will-pay-for-trump-s-jerusalem-gambit

Feldman, N. (2018). Jared Kushner's Dreams of Mideast Peace are Alive. *Bloomberg*. Retrieved 25 Mar. 18 from https://www.bloomberg.com/view/articles/2018-03-21/israeli-palestinian-peace-deal-is-alive-thanks-to-jared-kushner

Fierke, K. M. (2007). Constructivism. In T. Dunne, M. Kurki & S. Smith (Eds.), *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity* (pp. 166-184). New York: Oxford University Press.

Flockhart, T. (2012). Constructivism and Foreign Policy. In S. Smith, A. Hadfield. & T. Dunne (Eds), *Foreign Policy: Theories-Actors-Cases 2nd Edition (*pp. 78-93). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Garcia-Riverso, C., Kotze, H. & Du Toit, P. (2002). Political Culture and democracy: the South African case. *Politikon*, 29(2): 193-181.

UNIVERSITY of the
WESTERN CAPE

Geldenhuys, D. (1997). Pariah States in the Post- Cold War World: A Conceptual Exploration. In G. Mills, T.J. Callahan, D. Geldenhuys and P. Fabricius, *US-South Africa Relations and the "Pariah" States* (pp. 15-24). Johannesburg: South African Institute of International Relations.

Gill, P., Marrin, S., and Phythian, M., (eds.) (2009). 'Intelligence Theory, Key Questions and Debates,' Studies in Intelligence Series, Routledge, Abingdon

Giddens, A. (1984). The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration. Polity Press.

Gilder, B. (2009). Are our intelligence services really that bad? In L. Hutton (Ed.), *To spy or not to spy? Intelligence and democracy in South Africa (45-54).* ISS: Monograph 157.

Gilder, B. (2012). Songs & Secrets: South Africa from Liberation to Governance. Sunnyside: Jacana Media (Pty) Ltd.

Gordon, J. S. (2015). Intelligence sharing in NATO Intelligence Fusion Centre (NIFC) (overview), in G. Moore (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of U.S. Intelligence, Vol.2* (645-660). New York: Taylor and Francis. *Overview written by Gordon, J. S. based on this article.

Gqirana, T. (2015). Radebe: Spy cables leak may put SA's security at risk. Retrieved 28 Mar. 18 from https://mg.co.za/article/2015-03-05-radebe-spy-cables-leak-may-put-sas-security-at-risk

Green, D.B. (2018). From friends to Foes: How Israel and Iran turned into arch-enemies. Retrieved: https://www.haaretz.com/middle-east-news/iran/MAGAZINE-how-israel-and-iran-went-from-allies-to-enemies-1.6049884 ,on 13/06/18.

Grimm, S., Kim, Y. & Anthony, R. (2014). South African relations with China and Taiwan: economic realism and the 'One-China' doctrine. Stellenbosch University: Centre for Chinese Studies. Retrieved 17 Oct. 18 http://www0.sun.ac.za/ccs/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/Research-Report_FEB-2014_Formatting.pdf

Hannah, G., O'Brien, K.A. & Rathmell, A. (2005). Intelligence and Security Legislation for Security Sector Reform. Berlin: Rand Europe.

Harkavy, R.E. (1981). Pariah States & Nuclear Proliferation. *International Organization*. 35 (1): 135-163.

UNIVERSITY of the
WESTERN CAPE

Hatch, M. J. & Schultz, M. (1997). Relations between organizational culture, identity and image. *European Journal of Marketing.* 31(5/6): 356-365.

Hendricks, C., Musavengana, T. (2010). The Security Sector in Southern Africa. Institute for Security Studies: Pretoria.

Hill, C. (2003). The Changing Politics of Foreign Policy. Palgrave Macmillan: New York.

Hillebrand, C. (2017). With or without you? The UK and Information and Intelligence Sharing in the EU, *Journal of Intelligence History.*

History.com Staff. (2009). U.N. votes for partition of Palestine. *History.com.* Retrieved from: https://www.history.com/this-day-in-history/u-n-votes-for-partition-of-palestine , on 05/06/18

Hoffmann, M. J. (2010). Norms and Social Constructivism in International Relations. Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of International Studies.

Horowitz, S. & Tyburski, M. (2016). When are Similar Regimes more likely to form Alliances? Institutions and Ideologies in the Post-Communist World, *Post-Soviet Affairs*, 32(2): 176-200.

Hough, M. & Du Plessis, A. (Eds) (2002). Strategic Intelligence: Selected Official South African Perceptions: 1992-2002. Institute for Strategic Studies: Pretoria.

Humphrey, T. (2003). To Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch. Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc.

Hutton, L. (2007). Looking beneath the cloak: An analysis of intelligence governance in South Africa. *Institute for Security Studies*, Paper 154.

Jackson, B. A. (Ed.). (2009). The Challenge of Domestic Intelligence in a Free Society: A Multidisciplinary Look at the Creation of a U.S. Domestic Counterterrorism Intelligence Agency. Santa Monica: Rand Corporation.

Jackson, R. & Sorensen, G. (2003). Introduction to International Relations, Theories and Approaches (2nd Ed). Oxford: Oxford University press.

Jackson, R. & Sorensen, G. (2007). Introduction to International Relations: Theories and Approaches (3rd Ed). Oxford University Press: New York.

UNIVERSITY of the
WESTERN CAPE

Jackson, R. & Sorensen, G. (2016). Introduction to International Relations: Theories and Approaches (6th Ed). Oxford University Press: New York

Jeenah, N. (2010). Israeli Infiltration in South Africa. Al Jazeera Centre for Studies.

Jenkins, R. (1996). Social Identity. London: Routledge.

Jewish Virtual Library. (2018). Likud Party: History and Overview. Retrieved 05 Jul. 18, From https://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/history-and-overview-of-the-likud-party

Jordan W. (2015). Spy Cables reveal Israel's Mossad tactics. Retrieved 26 Apr. 18, From https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2015/02/spy-cables-reveal-israel-mossad-tactics-south-africa-guardian-150224124719957.html

Joseph, B.M. (1988). Besieged Bedfellows: Israel and the Land of Apartheid. Connecticut: Greenwood Press Inc.

Kahana, E. (2002). Reorganizing Israel's Intelligence Community, *International Journal of Intelligence and Counterintelligence*, 15(3): 415-428).

Kailitz, S. (2013). Classifying Political Regimes Revisited: Legitimation and Durability. *Democratization*, 20(1): 39-60.

Kant, I. (1970). Kant's Political Writings. Hans Reiss, ed. Transcribed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kerlinger, F.N. (1986), Foundations of Behavioural Research: Educational Psychological Enquiery. London: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Kessler, F. (1976). Israel Takes on an Odd New Ally. In R.P. Stevens & A.M. Elmessiri (ed.), *Israel and South Africa: The Progression of a Relationship* (158-162). New York: New World Press.

Lansberg, C. (2006). Foreign Policy-Making and Implementation in Post-Settlement South Africa. In Venter, A. & Lansberg, C. (Eds.), *Government and Politics in the New South Africa (3rd Ed).* Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Lansberg, C. (2011). South African foreign policy formulation, 1989-2010. In A. Venter & C. Lansberg (Ed.), *Government and Politics in South Africa [4th Ed]* (231-256). Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.

Lawal, O. (2012). Pariah State System and Enforcement Mechanism of International Law. *Journal of Alternative Perspectives in the Social Sciences*, 4(1): 226-241

Lefebvre .S. (2003) The Difficulties and Dilemmas of International Intelligence Cooperation, *International Journal of Intelligence and Counter Intelligence*, 16(4):527-542.

Levinson, C. (2018). A golden age for the Mossad: more targets, more ops, more money. Retrieved 29 Jan. 19 https://www.haaretz.com/israel-news/.premium.MAGAZINE-more-ops-more-secrets-more-money-mossad-s-supercharged-makeover-1.6410934

Liebenberg, I. (2013). Transition from Authoritarian Rule to Democracy. In C. Manganyi, I. Liebenberg & T. Potgieter (Ed.), *South Africa and Romania, Transition to democracy and Changing security paradigms* (13-36). Durban: Just Done Publishing.

Lillbacka. R. G. V. (2013) Realism, Constructivism, and Intelligence Analysis, *International Journal of Intelligence and Counter Intelligence*, 26(2): 304-331.

Lubell, M. & Ringler, E. (2018). Cash or custody: Israel kicks off deportation of African migrants. *Reuters*. Retrieved 24 Mar. 18 from https://www.reuters.com/article/us-israel-africa-migrants/cash-or-custody-israel-kicks-off-deportation-of-african-migrants-idUSKBN1FP214

Mann, M. (1993). The Sources of Social Power, Vol. II: The Rise of Classes and Nation States, 1760-1914. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Mansbach, R.W. & Rafferty, K.L. (2008). Introduction to Global Politics. Routledge: New York.

Mansfield, E. & Snyder, J. (2002). Democratic Transitions, Institutional Strength and War. *International Organization.* 56(2): 293-336.

Manjikian. M. (2015) But My Hands Are Clean: The Ethics of Intelligence Sharing and the Problem of Complicity, *International Journal of Intelligence and Counter Intelligence*, 28(4): 692-709.

Marais, N. & Davies, J. (2014). Interrogating the Impact of Intelligence- Pursuing, Protecting, and Promoting an Inclusive Political Transition Process in South Africa. *Inclusive Political Settlements Paper 7.* Berlin: Berghof Foundation.

UNIVERSITY of the
CAPE

Matei .F. C. (2009) The Challenges of Intelligence Sharing in Romania, *Intelligence and National Security*, 24(4): 574-585.

McDowell, D. (2009). Strategic Intelligence: A Handbook for Practitioners, Managers, & Users. Maryland: The Scarecrow Press, Inc.

McGlinchey, S., Walters, R. & Gold, D. (2017). Getting started with International Relations Theory. In S. McGlinchey, R. Walters & C. Scheinpflug (Eds.) *International Relations Theory* (pp. 1-15). E-book: E-International Relations Publishing.

McGreal, C. (2010). Revealed: how Israel offered to sell South Africa nuclear weapons. *BBC News.* Retrieved 13 Mar. 18 https://www.theguardian.com/world/2010/may/23/israel-south-africa-nuclear-weapons

McGruddy, J. (2013). Multilateral Intelligence Collaboration and International Oversight. *Journal of Strategic Security*, 5(6):214-220

Michael, G. J. (2015). Who's Afraid of WikiLeaks? Missed Opportunities in Political Science Research. *Review of Policy Research*. Available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=2546446

Mills, G. (1994). From pariah to participant: South Africa's evolving foreign relations, 1990-1994. Johannesburg: South African Institute of International Affairs.

Moodley-Moore .S. (1998). Ethnic Hegemony, Negotiations and Transitions to Democracy: Comparative Perspectives on South Africa and Israel, *African Security Review*, 7(5): 36-53.

Moran, C. (2017). A JIH Special Forum on Brexit: Implications for UK and European Intelligence Agencies, *Journal of Intelligence History.*

Mossad (2018). Director's Word. Retrieved 26 Apr. 18, From: https://www.mossad.gov.il/eng/about/Pages/DirectorsWord.aspx

Motumi, T. (1995). The Spear of the Nation-The Recent History of Umkhonto We Sizwe (MK). In Cilliers, J. & Reichardt, M. (ed.), *About Turn: The Transformation of the South African Military and Intelligence (84-104).* Institute for Defence Policy: Pretoria.

Mullen, J. & Joseph, E. (2015). Australia, a US ally, to share intelligence with Iran on ISIS. Retrieved from https://edition.cnn.com/2015/04/20/asia/australia-iran-intelligence-sharing/index.html

UNIVERSITY of the
WESTERN CAPE

Munton D. (2009) Intelligence Cooperation Meets International Studies Theory: Explaining Canadian Operations in Castro's Cuba, *Intelligence and National Security*, 24(1):119-138

Munton D. & Fredj. K. (2013) Sharing Secrets: A Game Theoretic Analysis of International Intelligence Cooperation, *International Journal of Intelligence and Counter Intelligence*, 26(4): 666-692.

Myburgh P.L. (2018). Arms deal tribunal: 'Witness X' drops corruption bombshells. *News24.* Retrieved from https://www.news24.com/SouthAfrica/News/arms-deal-tribunal-witness-x-drops-corruption-bombshells-20180205

Nathan, L. (2009). Lighting up the intelligence community: An agenda for intelligence reform in South Africa. *African Security Review* 18(1): 91-104.

National Intelligence Agency. 'Geopolitical Country & Intelligence Assessment of Israel. Al-Jazeera.

Nel, P. (2006). Chapter two: Theories of International Relations. In P.J. McGowan, S. Cornelissen & P. Nel (Eds.), *Power, Wealth and Global Equity: An International Relations Textbook for Africa (3rd Ed) (pp. 21-45).* Cape Town: University of Cape Town Press.

Nel, P. (2006). Chapter three: Morality and ethics in International Relations. In P.J. McGowan, S. Cornelissen & P. Nel (Eds.), *Power, Wealth and Global Equity: An International Relations Textbook for Africa (3rd Ed) (pp. 46-66).* Cape Town: University of Cape Town Press.

News24. (2014). Military bosses blamed for SA soldier's deaths in CAR, Retrieved 27/06/16 http://www.news24.com/SouthAfrica/News/Military-bosses-blamed-for-SA-soldiers-deaths-in-CAR-20141109

News24. (2016). Angola: Fidel Castro's big African adventure. Retrieved 08 Jan. 19, from https://www.news24.com/Africa/News/angola-fidel-castros-big-african-adventure-20161127

News24. (2018). Israel cancels controversial plan to deport African migrants. Retrieved 01 May 2018, from: https://www.news24.com/Africa/News/israel-cancels-controversial-plan-to-deport-african-migrants-20180403-2

Neuberger, B. (2009). Israel's Relations with the Third World (1948-2008). Research Paper No. 5, Tel Aviv University.

UNIVERSITY of the
WESTERN CAPE

O'Brien, K. (2011). The South African Intelligence Services: From apartheid to democracy, 1948-2005. New York: Routledge.

Onuf, N.G. (1989). World of our Making: Rules and Rule in Social Theory and International Relations. New York: Routledge.

Panke, D. & Risse, T. (2007). Liberalism. In T. Dunne, M. Kurki & S. Smith (Eds.), *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity* (pp. 89-108). New York: Oxford University Press.

Pauw, J. (2017). The President's Keepers: Those keeping Zuma in and out of prison. Cape Town: Tafelberg.

Payne, R.J. (1990). The Non-superpowers and South Africa: Implications for U.S. Policy. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Peou, S. (2002). Realism and Constructivism in Southeast Asian Security Studies Today: A Review Essay. *The Pacific Review*, 15(1): 119-138.

Peters, J. (1996). Israel under Netanyahu. *Royal Institute of International Affairs.* Briefing Paper no. 33

Phythian, M. (2009). Intelligence Theory and Theories of International relations: Shared World or Separate Worlds, In *Intelligence Theory: Key Questions and Debates*, Gill, P., Marrin, S. & Phythian, M. Routledge: New York.

Pilster, U. (2011). Are Democracies the Better Allies? The Impact of Regime Type of Military Coalition Operations. *International Interactions*, 37(1): 55-85.

Pitamber, P. (2015) How the Family of African States helped end Apartheid. [Retrieved 12/08/16] from www.mediaclubsouthafrica.com/culture/4182-south-africas-neighbours-helped-to-end-apartheid

Placek, K. (2012). The Democratic Peace Theory. Available (online) http://www.e-ir.info/2012/02/18/the-democratic-peace-theory/

Pollak, J.B. (2009). The Kasrils Affair: Jews and Minority Politics in Post-Apartheid South Africa. Juta & Company Ltd: Cape Town.

UNIVERSITY of the
WESTERN CAPE

Pollak, J. (2012). Ni'Lin like Soweto. In A. Lim (Eds.), *The Case for Sanctions Against Israel* (12-15). New York: Verso.

Polakow-Suransky, S. (2010). The Unspoken Alliance: Israel's Secret Relationship with Apartheid South Africa. Cape Town: CTP Book Printers.

Qobo, M. (2011). South Africa and the BRICs: A Crisis of Identity in Foreign Policy. Retrieved 23 Jun. 19 from: https://saiia.org.za/research/south-africa-and-the-brics-a-crisis-of-identity-in-foreign-policy/

Quigley, J. (1991). Apartheid Outside Africa: The Case of Israel. *Indiana International and Comparative Law Review, 1*: 221-251.

Ray, J. L. (1998). Does Democracy Cause Peace. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 1:37-38.

Republic of South Africa (1996). Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996 (Act 108 of 1996), Pretoria: Government Printer.

Republic of South Africa (1995) State Security Department. White Paper on Intelligence. Pretoria: Government Printer.

Republic of South Africa (1969). Establishment of a New Department of State- Bureau for State Security. Government Notice No. 808.

Reus-Smit, C. (2005). Constructivism. In S. Burchill et al, *Theories of International Relations (3rd Ed)* (pp. 188-212). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Reuters (2018). Saudi King reiterates support for Palestinians after Israel comments. Retrieved 03 Apr. 18 from https://www.reuters.com/article/us-israel-palestinians-saudi/saudi-king-reiterates-support-for-palestinians-after-israel-comments-idUSKCN1HA19H

Richelson, J., (1990) 'The Calculus of Intelligence Cooperation.' *International Journal of Intelligence and Counterintelligence*, 4 (3):307-323.

Rissen-Kappen, T. (1995). Democratic Peace-Warlike Democracies. *European Journal of International Relations*, 1(4): 491-517.

Rourke, A. (2013). Prisoner X was working for Israeli government, Australia confirms. Retrieved 29 Jan. 19 https://www.theguardian.com/world/2013/mar/06/prisoner-x-working-israeli-government

UNIVERSITY of the
WESTERN CAPE

Rudner, M. (2004). Hunters and Gatherers: The Intelligence Coalition Against Islamic Terrorism, *International Journal of Counterintelligence*, 17(2): 193-230.

Sanders, J. (2006). Apartheid's Friends: The rise and fall of South Africa's secret service. John Murray: London.

Scheindlin, D. (2017). Ten Years with Netanyahu, maintaining Israel, the Conflict and himself. Retrieved 05 Jul. 18, from http://library.fes.de/pdf-files/iez/13126.pdf

Schimmelfennig, F. (2007), Functional Form, Identity Driven Cooperation: Institutional Designs and Effects in Post-Cold War NATO. In A. Acharya & A, I. Johnston (Eds.), *Crafting Cooperation: Regional International Institutions in Comparative Perspective* (145-179). Cambridge University Press: New York.

Schimmelfennig, F. (1998), NATO Enlargement: A Constructivist Explanation, *Security Studies*, 8 (2-3): 198-234.

Schimmelfennig, F. (1999). 'NATO Enlargement: A Constructivist explanation', *Security Studies*, 8/2-3:198-234.

Schutte, C. (1998). How many 'Third Forces', South Africa? In C. Schutte, I. Liebenberg, A. Minnaar (Eds.), *The Hidden Hand, Covert operations in South Africa* (pp. 33-56). Pretoria, Human Sciences Research Council.

Segell, G. (2017). Intelligence Cooperation between the UK and the EU: Will Brexit make a Difference? , *Journal of Intelligence History*.

Sepper, E. (2010). Democracy, Human Rights, and Intelligence Sharing, *Texas International Law Journal*, 46(151): 151-207.

Shiloach, G. (2016) Arabs call to Expel Iran from Islamic Bloc. [Retrieved 12/08/16] from www.vocativ.com/308967/arabs-call-to-expel-iran-from-islamic-bloc/

Simon, L. (2017). Neorealism, Security Cooperation, and Europe's Relative Gains Dilemma, *Security Studies*, 26(2): 185-212.

Silverstein, R. (2015). South African Intelligence Cables Expose Mossad Africa Operations. Retrieved 01 Nov. 18 from https://www.richardsilverstein.com/2015/03/19/south-african-intelligence-cables-expose-mossad-africa-operations/

UNIVERSITY of the
WESTERN CAPE

Silverstein, R. (2015). Spy cables expose Mossad South Africa operations. Retrieved 28 Mar. 18 from http://www.middleeasteye.net/columns/spy-cables-expose-mossad-south-africa-operations-1605761964

Silverstein, R. (2015). South African Intelligence Cables Expose Mossad Africa Operations. Retrieved 24 Jul. 18 from https://www.richardsilverstein.com/2015/03/19/south-african-intelligence-cables-expose-mossad-africa-operations/

Smith, A. D. (1991). National Identity. Las Vegas: University of Nevada Press.

South African History Online [SAHO]. (2018). Liberation history Timeline 1980-1989. Retrieved from http://www.sahistory.org.za/topic/liberation-history-timeline-1980-1989 on, 07/06/18.

Spaarwater, M. (2012). A Spooks Progress: From Making War to Making Peace. Cape Town: Zebra Press.

State Security Agency (SSA). (2012). Intelligence Brief: Growing Anti-Israel Lobbying: Security Implications for South Africa. Pretoria: Government Printer.

Svendsen, A.D.M. (2009) 'Connecting Intelligence and Theory: Intelligence Liaison and International Relations,' *Intelligence and National Security*, 24 (5): 700 – 729.

Svendsen, A.D.M. (2016) Developing International Intelligence Liaison Against Islamic State: Approaching "One for All and All for One"? *International Journal of Intelligence and Counter Intelligence*, 29(2): 260-277.

Tabatabai, A. & Esfandiary, D. (2017). Cooperating with Iran to Combat ISIS in Iraq, *The Washington Quarterly*, 40(3): 129-146.

Tapper, J. (2015). Obama administration spied on German media as well as its government. Retrieved 08 Jan. 19 from: https://edition.cnn.com/2015/07/03/politics/germany-media-spying-obama-administration/index.html

Terreblance, M. & Durrheim, K. (1999). Research in Practice. University of Cape Town Press: Cape Town.

Thomas, G. (2009). Gideon's Spies: The Secret History of the Mossad. New York: Thomas Dunne Books.

UNIVERSITY of the
WESTERN CAPE

Turner, M, A. (2004). A Distinctive U.S. Intelligence Identity, *International Journal of Intelligence and Counter-Intelligence*, 17(1): 42-61.

United Nations. (1976). International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid. Retrieved from: http://www.un.org/en/genocideprevention/documents/atrocity-crimes/Doc.10_International%20Convention%20on%20the%20Suppression%20and%20Punishment%20of%20the%20Crime%20of%20Apartheid.pdf , on 06/06/18.

United Nations. (2008). The Question of Palestine and the United Nations. New York. Retrieved from: https://unispal.un.org/pdfs/DPI2499.pdf , on 05/06/18.

United Nations Digital Library [UNDL]. (2018). Situation in South Africa resulting from the policies of apartheid: resolution/adopted by the General Assembly. Retrieved from: https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/652938?ln=en ,on 08/06/18.

United Nations Digital Library. (2018). Status of the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid: resolution/adopted by the General Assembly. Retrieved from: https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/649695?ln=en ,on 08/06/18.

United Nations Digital Library. (2018). Public information and public actions against apartheid and role of the mass media in the struggle against apartheid: resolution/ adopted by the General Assembly. Retrieved from: https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/627013?ln=en ,on 08/06/18.

United Nations Economic & Social Commission for Western Asia. (2017). Israeli practices toward the Palestinian people and the question of apartheid. *Palestine and the Israeli Occupation*, Issue No. 1. Beirut.

Venter, A. (2011). The Context of South African Government and Politics. In A. Venter & C. Lansberg (Ed.), *Government and Politics in South Africa [4th ed]* (3-19). Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.

Verba, S. (1965). Comparative Political Culture. In L.W. Pye & S. Verba (Eds.), *Political Culture and Political Development* (512-560). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Walker, T. C. & Rousseau, D. L. (2016). Liberalism: a Theoretical and Empirical Assessment. In M. D. Cavelty & T. Balzacq (Eds.), *Routledge Handbook of Security Studies.* (pp. 22-31). New York: Routledge.

WESTERN CAPE

Walsh, J. I. (2006). Intelligence-Sharing in the European Union: Institutions are not enough. *JCMS*, 44(3): 625-643.

Walsh, J.I. (2007). Defection and Hierarchy in International Intelligence Sharing. *Journal of Public Policy*. 27(2): 151-181.

Walsh, J.I. (2009). The International Politics of Intelligence Sharing. Columbia University Press: Columbia.

Walt, S. (1987). The Origins of Alliances. Cornell University Press: New York.

Waltz, K. N. (1959). Man, the State, and War. New York: Columbia University Press.

Waltz, K. N. (1979). Theory of International Politics. Philippines: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc.

Weart, S. (1998). Never at War: Why Democracies Will Not Fight One Another. Yale University Press: London.

Weber, R. P. (1990). Basic Content Analysis. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Weiss, M. A. (2015). Arab League Boycott of Israel. *Congressional Research Service*.

Wendt, A. (1992). Anarchy is what States Make of it: The Social Construction of Power Politics. *International Organization*. 46(2): 391-425.

Wendt, A. (1996). Identity and Structural Change in International Politics. In Y. Lapid & F. Kratochwil (Eds), *The Return of Culture and Identity in IR Theory* (47-64). Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc: Colorado.

Wendt, A. (1999). Theory of International Politics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wiese, T. (2015). Secret Revolution: Memoirs of a Spy Boss. Tafelberg: Cape Town

Wigell, M. (2008). Mapping 'Hybrid Regimes': Regime Types and Concepts in Comparative Politics, *Democratization*, 15(2): 230-250.

Wohlforth, W. C. (2008). Realism. In C. Reus-Smit & D. Snidal (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations* (131-147). Oxford University Press: New York.

UNIVERSITY of the
WESTERN CAPE

Wohlforth, W. C. (2012). Realism and Foreign Policy. In S. Smith, A. Hadfield. & T. Dunne (Eds.), *Foreign Policy: Theories-Actors-Cases 2nd Edition* (pp. 78-93). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zehfuss, M. (2001). Constructivism and Identity: a Dangerous Liaison. *European Journal of International Relations,* 7(3): 315-348.

Zehfuss, M. (2002). Constructivism in International Relations: The Politics of Reality. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Zuma, J. (2009). President of the African National Congress, ANC January 8 Statement, 8 January.

UNIVERSITY of the
WESTERN CAPE

Appendix A: Interview Questions to Sasha Polakow-Suransky 24 May 2018.

- The ANC essentially had no problem declassifying documents for you, how would you describe this action in relation towards Israel?
    - Do you think you would have received the documents under the apartheid era?
- Was there any political fallout on either side due to your book that you published?
    - Was there any fallout that you are aware of that occurred behind the scenes, at a more bureaucratic level.
- Was there a concern or feedback regarding a potential bias towards South Africa, in that the ending of the relationship is sort of on South Africa's shoulders? Could it not be that Israel also wanted to end this relationship when South Africa changed its identity and culture?
- What takes precedent when it comes to South African cooperation with others, is it political or is it bureaucratic measures that actually drives what happens within our intelligence or government departments?

UNIVERSITY of the
WESTERN CAPE