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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this dissertation is to answer the question: why do ostensibly similar ethno-national conflicts within a system of settler-colonial domination see such wide variation in their outcomes? How they emerge from conflict through power sharing and social integration versus the endurance of separation and systems of domination and control? The study identifies causal paths that resulted in the decline of domination systems of this type.

Ethno-national conflicts that feature certain similarities develop in different trajectories due to certain conditions that culminate in transforming the structures of these conflicts towards integration (the establishment of a single political entity) or separation (independence in separate entities). The goal of the dissertation is to examine the Palestinian-Israeli conflict through a comparative lens in order to specify the conditions that led to the persistence of the two-state solution and to examine the prevalence or lack of necessary and sufficient conditions for the emergence of a one civic-democratic state.

Building on the comparative approach I argue that ethno-national territorial underpinnings of the conflict and the “regimes of territorial legitimation” of the dominant group are the most crucial explanatory factor in determining the trajectory and outcome of the conflict. “Regimes of territorial legitimation” are the practices, procedures, systems of meaning, and institutional designs that found the relationship between a nation, people,
or ethno-national group and geography/territory. The dissertation features a qualitative structured and focused comparison of the conflicts in South Africa, and Palestine. Method of difference is applied for a case-oriented interpretive inquiry that focuses on the complexity of each of the two cases and aims at capturing the historical diversity of these similar cases.
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Chapter I
Introduction

Patterns of ethno-national conflicts: Divergence and convergence

Ethno-national conflicts show similar characteristics and patterns as protracted, violence, and persistent. Examples of these conflicts can be found in Europe, Asia, and Africa. All of which challenge the established nation-states and their political as well as geographical boundaries. Research on the phenomenon is ample and diverse. Main features and patterns of these conflicts are similar, their trajectories, however, vary. Gurr and Harff identify two main kinds of ethno-national groups on the bases of their political demands; “collectivities that demand representation within the state they live in, and separatists – groups who demand autonomy from the state that rules them (Cited in Ben-Yehuda and Mishali-Ram 2010: 3).

In general the trends these conflicts have shown, especially in the last two decades, towards separation indicates the irreconcilability of some national demands for sovereignty and independence. However; in some other cases a reverse trend prevails and leads to a variety of shared and integrated polities; South Africa is a cases in consideration. The Palestinian-Israeli conflict in its current state of affairs exhibits these opposing trends and patterns. The conflict is in a stalemate or more specifically has been in an interregnum where the Israeli military occupation is still as valid and vibrant as it
has been for decades while a pseudo authority was established apart from accomplishing the Palestinian aim of national self-determination and statehood. What accounts for this divergence of outcomes of similar conflicts? In other words: why do some ethno-national conflicts terminate in unitary political entities (integration) and others in various forms of autonomy or power-sharing while other end in separation; what causes this divergence?

Looking at the Palestinian-Israeli conflict from the perspective of ethno-national conflicts this research examines the developments of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict in a trajectory that has led until today to the persistent of the two-state approach. Although profound changes in the properties of the conflict have accumulated specific conditions ostensibly conducive to a One-State outcome the separation rather than the integration agenda gains supremacy. In other words, the conflict is fixated on ethno-national territorial underpinnings whereby democratization is excluded from political and diplomatic agenda as well as from public debate. In this sense liberation based on ethno-territorial determinants has excluded democratization. What are the conditions that culminated in the persistence of separation and ethno-national territorial aspects of the conflict? Although it stands at odds with international and domestic consensus on the two-state solution as the acceptable outcome of the conflict, the one-state agenda merits systematic examination as to its plausibility and attainability, let alone its normative appeal. The contradictions inherited in the two-state solution, namely the discrepancy between reality on the ground and the political vision of separation is a key issue in the debate over the One versus the Two State solution to the conflict. It reflects the push and pull factors that may lead to the implementation of the right of national self-
determination and independence or, alternatively, to diverse types of self-rule, autonomy or unitary states. This is not unique to the Palestinian-Israeli conflict; similar conflicts show the same contradictions.

A good starting point to answering this question lies in the very definition of ethno-national conflicts and ethno-nationality. Ethnic-nationality is defined as “a common identity of a group based upon perceptions among members of the group and nonmembers”, therefore it has subjective and objective aspects that are ingrained in their identity (Ben-Yehuda and Mishali-Ram 2010: 3). The fact that ethno-nationalism encompasses tangible and intangible elements that establishes the common characteristics that homogenize the group and unify it makes the concept hard to discern. Ethno-national conflict, therefore are elusive to explain and to resolution: the factors and forces the one may consider explaining ethno-national conflicts are enormous. There is no single factor that has the capacity to account for the phenomenon. Some studies emphasize the foundation and formation of the modern nation state (e.g. Amdife and Warhola 1993 on the African context) others focus on the decomposition of the state and civic configurations (e.g. Noutcheva and Tocci 2004 on the European cases). Studies also examine the prospects of ethno-national conflicts in traditional societies (e.g. Kloit 1989 on the Mediterranean ethnic conflicts) While some research (e.g. Mychajlyszyn 2001 and Sanz 1994) is dedicated to discern ethno-nationalism in Post-Soviet republic. Moreover, there are a number of studies that attempt to understand the phenomenon from the perspective of political systems especially the Parliamentary system and it role in accommodating ethnic plurality (e.g. Tse-min Lin 201). More to do with this research,
some studies focus the attention on the role of territory in the conflict (e.g. Yiftachail 2002), while others focus on the protractibility of ethno-national conflicts and its implications (e.g. Yehuda and Mishali Ram 2006), and the demographic effects (Cederman 2009) whereas some research examines the international links and protractibility of these conflicts (e.g. Mishali Ram 2006). There exists a wide agreement in those studies that ethno-national peoples/groups are those who contend the state with political demands; political relevancy of a group or a people is central for its emergence as an ethno-nationality (Gurr, cited in Ben-Yehuda and Mishali-Ram 2010: 3). Drawing on these previous efforts this dissertation presents the premises of our inquiry to demarcate the conceptual terrain of our research that introduces certain factors that have not been fully, or at all, examined by previous research. This research departs from these conceptual propositions:

- In ethno-national conflicts within a settler-colonial setting, territorial and spatial underpinnings play the most crucial role in determining the trajectory of the conflict and its outcome. The political geography of the conflict and its relationship with identity offer a plausible explanation of the divergence of outcome these conflicts exhibit; and

- Territorial-national nexus and the ‘regimes of territorial legitimation’ it relies on determine the conflict’s patterns of domination and exclusion-inclusion. Conditions of either integration or separation emerge from the structures of domination and exclusion-inclusion that shape the main properties of the conflict. Systems of settler-colonial domination premised on ethno-territorial exclusion obtain a high degree of sustainability and durability due to their integral nature; and
• Both ‘regimes of territorial legitimation’ and structures of domination that serve their persistence are subject to internal dynamics of change and transformation as well as external influences. The most important among which are: the characteristics and political strategy of the challenging ethno-national group/people, and international legitimation or delegitimation of a certain definition of the ethno-territorial underpinnings of an accepted outcome.

The conflicts in South Africa and Palestine offer a rich illustration to these interrelated and combined factors. As ethno-national conflicts they are characterized with the persistent pursuit of self-determination for the subordinate groups, the Africans and the Palestinians peoples. Ethno-nationalism represents the ties that bound a group of people that has “a common origin and ‘tribal’ [kinship ties] affiliation of its members, a shared history, culture, language, and, most often, a common dominant religion” (Klein 2010:10). The interrelatedness between these factors makes particular ethnic peoples/groups politically significant and relevant; they pursue political goals and they are politically mobilized and organized to achieve these goals. Different aspects of these conflicts and their multidimensionality and inter-group splits do not make them less ethno-national (Connor 1990: 19). Moreover, inter-group splits may be a result of the conflicts’ politics and internal rivalries and competitions over the most appropriate means to achieve independence or autonomy; they do not necessarily imply different interpretations of the underlying stakes of the conflict. For instance, although religious beliefs have a clear correlation with national identity especially in the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, it is fundamentally a struggle over national identity, territory, and civil rights. In
South Africa the complexity of the conflict and the different affiliations of the adversaries do not undermine the comparability to the other conflicts in terms of its clear ethno-national dimension (Conor 1990: 20-21). To be sure, ethno-nationalism was prevalent and turned the conflicts into protracted and complicated struggles for the realization of national identity and self-determination, which makes forging a single national consciousness rather less likely taking into account their ethno-national rigidity.

The establishment of a unitary state under this condition seems less likely. Indeed, when the conflict implies aggressive and violent struggle between two imagined or real national identities it becomes rather elusive to attain an integrative outcome of the conflict as the protagonists see the existence of one as the negation of the other. The struggle in this case is ostensibly a zero-sum game whereby the achievement of one’s national goals implies vanquishing the other.

Ethno-national conflicts of the type discussed in this research are multi-dimensional, protracted (and at some point intractable), they reflect endemic asymmetrical power relationships and identity struggles; these features result in violence and bitter antagonism between opposing groups” (Nic Craith 2002:12) in which subordinate groups’ demand for self-determination represents group’s persistent sought for political recognition as a collective national. Thus, national movements in both settings waged their struggle against the state for the achievement of self-determination for their peoples. More to the purpose of this research, the divergence in outcome of the two cases is striking and merits systematic examination of the conditions that created it. Whereas Africans’ self-determination in South Africa was uplifted within a democratic liberation
struggle namely, the achievement of civic self-determination, the Palestinian struggle developed in the sought of national self-determination (theoretical treatment of the national versus civic self determination is illustrated in chapter II). A cursory look at the current state of the Israeli –Palestinian conflict set the stage for articulating the parameters of the research, the logic of comparison, and research methodology that follow.

Reshaping ethno-territoriality in Palestine

The two-state solution of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict is in a structural impasse: While the existence of the Palestinian Authority (PA) is circumscribed and crippled by Israel’s military domination, the territorial and spatial domain of the Palestinian state is shrinking by Israeli colonial settlement expansion. During 1990s-2000s the Palestinian-Israeli protracted conflict has entered an era of stalemate under the auspices of Oslo agreements\(^1\). The agreements between Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) developed in a protracted “peace process”\(^2\) in which Israeli occupation has rearranged its domination over the Occupied Palestinian Territories (OPT), and the PLO turned into an authority whereas its declared objectives were not achieved especially

---

\(^1\) Officially the Accords are called ‘The declaration of Principles on Interim Self-Government Arrangements” (DOP).

\(^2\) The term refers to the protracted negotiating rounds between the two parties; PLO and Israel since 1993. The phrase, as William B. Quandt (2005) correctly indicates, is used to describe the USA approach to the Arab and Palestinian-Israeli conflict. This approach is characterized by a gradual step-by-step- strategy to resolve this conflict. USA diplomacy in this regard focuses more on the process than on the substance of the issues at stake; how to resolve these issues rather than what substantively should be done.
national self-determination. As Klein (2010) notices the Oslo process has turned the conflict into a struggle over borders between two, supposedly distinct political and legal entities rather than a struggle over national self-determination.

However, following the second Palestinian Intifada in 2000; Israel conquered and took over the areas under the Palestinian Authority’s jurisdiction, which reversed the conflict dynamics back to their ethno-national territorial properties as a struggle for national self-determination. Taking into account Israel’s continued control over most of the OPT and the enclavization of the Palestinians within major residential areas (main cities) coupled colonial settlement expansion, the realization of a Palestinian independent sovereign state has become more elusive.

Nonetheless, the two-state outcome remains the targeted, and negotiated, outcome of the conflict. It represents Palestinians’ political and national aspiration for self-determination on OPT as declared by the PLO in 1974 and in 1988 as we discuss in Chapter IX. This outcome receives Israeli formal acceptance and international community’s endorsement. Moreover, it seems that the validity of the two-state outcome derives strength as it provides both adversaries with what they are seeking: independence for the Palestinians and disengagement from the Palestinian population for the Israelis. The latter understanding of this outcome complicates a compromise that may lead to the achievement of a sovereign Palestinian state: disengagement from the population while controlling the territory renders this outcome meaningless.

International legitimation of the two-state solution reflects international rejection of Israel’s military occupation of the OPT since 1967. The legitimacy Israel gained for its
territorial boundaries is enshrined the United Nation Resolution 181 of 1947 that partitioned Palestine in two states; Jewish and Arab. Therefore, Israel’s occupation of 1967 remains illegal and the resolution 181 is still the legal basis for Israel’s existence. Thus Israel “has not been able to induce widespread acceptance of the de facto extension of its borders achieved through its victory in the 1967 war” (Farer 2008: 181), which maintains the status of the OPT as subject to relevant international covenants on self-determination and belligerent occupation. In reality, though, Israeli authorities practice the power of a sovereign authority in large parts of the OPT. Thus, inasmuch as the establishment of a Palestinian state is a subject of an apparent consensus and many UN resolutions and other International covenants and laws, it seems today far away from reality.

The establishment of a Palestinian state under Israel’ control of most the area of the OPT creates a chasm between territorial integrity essential for the realization of statehood and the right of national self-determination; two inextricably linked aspects of modern

---

For example, when the International Court of Justice conducted its legal proceedings In July 2002 on Israel's apartheid wall on the West Bank, the World Court invited the State of Palestine to participate in the proceedings. In other words, the International Court of Justice recognized the State of Palestine. The ICJ ruled that the Israeli Wall is illegal. The ICJ justified its rule by recognizing that “the construction of the wall and its regime create a fait accompli on the ground...it would be tantamount to de facto annexation” of large areas of the OPT. This legal foundation of a Palestinian state was created long before the ICJ rule. For example the UN security Council, in resolution 465 (1980) stressed that “all measures taken by Israel to change [any aspect or feature] of the Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied since 1967...have no legal validity...and also constitute a serious obstruction to achieving a comprehensive, just, and lasting peace in the Middle east” (Abunimah 2006: 32-36).

Palestine has Observer State Status with the United Nations Organization, and basically all the rights of a U.N. Member State except the right to vote. Effectively, Palestine has de facto U.N. Membership. These manifestations have their roots in the U.N. General Assembly's Partition Resolution 181(II) of 1947 that called for the creation of a Jewish state and an Arab state in the Mandate Palestine. Furthermore, it is a widely accepted position that Palestinian people has a fundamental right to self-determination as recognized by the United Nations Charter and general principles of public international law, and that Israeli military occupation of the OPT is subject to the 4th Geneva Convention of 1949.
statehood. It is a well-established principle in international law that the nation determines the future and the political form of the region/territory not the opposite (Falk 2000: 47). Moreover, behind this principle there exists as well a

“power moral concern, namely the creation of the conditions that enable people to give coherent shape to their sense of collective identity…A gathering of people in place to which they have been randomly or arbitrarily assigned, cannot accomplish that” (Farer 2008:182).

Israeli control over the territory and space of the OPT prevents Palestinians’ ability to form, sustain, and develop this collective right without which a state would be a mere construct void of meaning and at best a client state (See Khan, Giacaman 2004: 4-6, 50-53 and 112-115) whereby Palestinians can enjoy the trappings of sovereignty and some symbolism of statehood while Israel maintains actual control and sovereignty over the territory. The requirements of the establishment of a sovereign nation-state are missing in this blueprint. As Aruri (2003: 174) rightfully stresses, a state

without sovereignty, without geographic continuity, and without control over its borders, airspace, and economic and water resources… In fact it would be a state within Israel, but not alongside Israel.

A Palestinian state under these circumstances would be a bi-furcated state that enjoys no more real autonomy than has South African Bantustans” (Fare 2008: 188). However, while the Bantustan policy in South Africa was defeated in favor of none-racial and ethnically neutral democracy, it prevails in the Palestinian-Israeli conflict as a proxy for separation and Palestinian statehood. This research aims at answering this question using the comparative approach.
Parameters of the Study

Ethno-national conflicts are classified, in a broader sense in ways that assist interpreting their properties. Heraclides, for example, presented a detailed classification of ethno-national armed conflicts that range from irredentist to secessionist and separatist autonomous movements (Cited in Ben-Yehuda and Mishali-Ram 2010: 4). These cases represent a larger universe of similar cases of ethno-national conflicts with diverse outcomes that range from realizing the principle and right of national self-determination and independence to the creation of a unitary democratic state and in between these two extremes. This classification of ethno-national conflicts serves as a leading analytical tool to explaining their paths. Hartzell and Hoddie’s (2007: 6,42, 43)detailed study on power-sharing and power-dividing institutions after the termination of civil wars includes a useful resource to learn about the dynamics that may lead to this type or another of outcomes of a conflict. Among thirty-eight conflicts they have examined between 1945-1999 they identify but few cases resulted in extensively or highly institutionalized integrative political entities; South Africa stands as a leading example. The model, inasmuch as it provides us with important insight to the similarities and differences between conflicts included in this research, it is limited to power-sharing/power-dividing negotiated outcomes whereas the comparison in this study seeks explanations of ethno-national conflicts, which travels beyond civil wars and power-sharing treatments. It examines a broader phenomenon and more varied results. From the establishment of a Federal Constitutional Republic in Nigeria in 1960 to the emergence of a Democratic republic in India 1974-1950, and from Kashmiri autonomy crafted in 1947 to Timor
Leste’s independence of 1999-2000 and the stalemate status of West Saharan conflict, the striking divergence of outcomes merits extensive systematic examination and represents the wider context of my research and the universe of cases from which the cases evaluated here are selected (See also Nic Craith 2002:136-138 and Erin Jenne 2006: 7-9).

The two cases of South Africa and Palestine differ in many aspects: they are characterized by diverse social, economic, geopolitical and other important features, which make comparison challenging. However; they share at least one key similarity: they are to different degrees coming out of their respective conflicts following different approaches to peace and political settlement and different levels of integration-separation. Therefore, they are selected on the variation they show in their outcome (the dependent variable). Thus they present a laboratory to in-depth interpretation the patterns of ethno-national conflicts and the conditions that generate their convergent outcomes.

This research sees the diverse outcomes as different points on a continuum that depicts the dynamics of ethno-national conflicts and their demise. The cases selected represent a plausible representation of this diversity of outcomes. Had we drawn all cases on a continuum with conflict climax is in the center, South Africa would have occupied the left extreme and embodies full integration in a unitary state, and Palestine-Israeli case lags at the right side of the center with the outcome is still in the making but preoccupied with separation. In this the Palestinian case resembles other cases such as Timor Leste whereas one finds different degrees of institutional arrangements for power sharing and autonomy in between these two extremes such as the Northern Ireland power-sharing.
Thus, the main consideration has been taken into account in case selection of this research is to find incidents of variance of the outcomes of the conflict across cases. However, the embedding the cases of this dissertation in the broader phenomenon of ethno-national conflicts does not suffice in order to fully justify some important aspects of the comparison, which requires further illustrations.

The question of comparability

This research implements the comparative case study based on structured and focused approach of similar cases, South Africa and Palestine in order to explain their divergent outcomes. The study treats the two cases as principally types of ethno-national conflicts that resulted from the dynamics and excesses of settler-colonial domination systems; each of which has developed and concluded in a different outcome.

In principle, the comparative approach is an important research tool in discussing the conditions that prevail in Palestine/Israel as a whole and their relationship to the question of the emergence of a democratic outcome of the conflict. As discussed below, comparisons are meant to capture similarities and differences between Israeli system of domination and the South African regime of segregation and apartheid. In this sense peculiarities of each case are as crucial as commonalities. Thus, this study is not aimed at labeling. Nor it seeks to introduce normative perspectives or ideological claims. Rather, it examines systematically the parallels between two similar cases of unique types of domination systems to explain their different outcomes. Nonetheless, comparing South
African apartheid with Israeli regime in Palestine stirs contentious debates as to its merits and foundations. This research challenges the claim that the two cases are incomparable.

The contentious nature of the comparison

Some prominent Israeli politicians and statesmen use the analogy with apartheid at least as a looming threat to the state of Israel: Former Israel Prime Minister Ehud Olmert stresses that the failure of the two-state solution will lead to a situation similar to South African apartheid (quoted in Bakan and Abu-Laban 201:1 336). Current Israeli Defense Minister Ehud Barak roars warning his fellow Israelis that the failure to achieve peace with the Palestinians would end up in a state where Israel has no Jewish majority or an apartheid regime (Bakan and Abu-Laban 2011: 338). These statements indicate that a system of certain type of apartheid is developing in the OPT. However, drawing comparisons between South African apartheid and Israeli domination over the Palestinian people, within the state of Israel and in the OPT, is a source of discontent and refusal by the Zionist movement and Israeli politicians, and many adherents of Israel in the USA, Canada and to a lesser degree in Europe.

For those who reject the comparison, comparing Israel to apartheid is a deliberate attempt to undermine the legitimacy of the Jewish state itself. The efforts made by Israel and its allies in the western countries to prevent all attempts to comparing Israel and apartheid resulted in boycotting some international conferences and forums by the USA, Canada, Israel and other states. Two UN sponsored ‘World Conferences Against Racism’ in 2011 and 2009, which are global in their focus, were interrupted by calls to boycott because they were planned to discuss Israel in relation to international law, racism, and a
new kind of apartheid. Perhaps no single book on Israel’s domination as apartheid has generated heated debates more than former US President Jimmy Carter’s *Palestine: Peace not Apartheid* (2007). The book is a New York Times Best Seller and has generated a lot of criticism and debates as to the degree it represents or depicts reality in Palestine.

*Palestine: Peace not Apartheid* aims at presenting facts about the Middle East that are largely unknown in the USA. Carter argues that the main two obstacles to peace in the M.E are that some Israelis insist on confiscating Palestinian lands and colonizing the Palestinian people and the insistent of some Palestinians to respond with violence. In the face of growing roars against the book, Carter’s defense is that the book was not about Israel; rather it is about “Palestine; the occupied territories; forced segregation in the West Bank and terrible oppression of the Palestinians create a situation accurately described by the word” apartheid (quoted in Bakan and Abu-Laban 2010: 334). He goes on to clarify that he sees Israel as a

…wonderful democracy where everyone has guaranteed equal rights, and where, under the law, Arabs and Jews who are Israelis have the same privileges about Israel. That's been most of the controversy because people assume it's about Israel. It's not.”

The core issue in this respect is that comparison with apartheid implies the existence of state sponsored racist practices and policies, which utterly rebuffed by Zionism and the state of Israel. Zionist’s arguments presented to defy the charge have a common thread of reasoning: the Zionist movement is actually a national liberation movement that emerged and established its own national-state while being fundamentally inclusive and democratic. Accordingly, the Jewish never claimed superior to any other peoples or races; thus Israel was founded as, and is still pluralistic. Jews themselves come from a wide
array of racial identifications that Israel absorbed without exception, so the argument proceeds (Tilley2005: 137). To these arguments this research presents two responses; the first has to do with the broader permissibility of the comparison, and the second with the substantive justifications for comparison.

The comparative approach of this study is meant to contribute to the discussion on the hindrances that impede, until today, reaching a political settlement to the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. Comparison in this sense is a useful and necessary venue to understanding the stakes of the conflict. It seeks to capture the properties of domination structures embedded in Israeli occupation of the Palestinian territories and its relationship with the very nature of Israel as a state. In comparing Israeli domination system to Afrikaner nationalist rule and apartheid in South Africa this research is interested in deconstructing the asymmetrical relationships and modalities of power and exclusion that distinguish settler-colonial societies and their underlying ethno-territorial configurations.

Thus the comparative perspective is important to providing better understanding to ethno-national conflicts and their divergent outcomes. Moreover, this comparison is a useful tool for understanding state formation and dynamics of change. Thus it aims at exploring systematically the conditions that are conducive to a democratic solution of such conflicts. To reject the comparison on ideological or political grounds deprives the research on the phenomenon from a rich source of empirical revelations on the nature and development of settler-colonial societies.
Terminology and substantive comparison

Apartheid represents a case of racial contract that underpins racist domination as a relationship between unequal groups: racism here defined as any system of differentiation and inequality. UN Resolution 2016 of 1965 clearly defines racism in terms that render Israeli policies against non-Jews a racist action. Apartheid is a generic policy associated with all colonial-settler states and it is a policy framework that is based on racial and/or ethnic exclusivity as the resolution eloquently states. As this study contends, Israel’s domination over the Palestinians in the entire Palestine is characterized essentially and primarily by its ethno-national differentiation system. From this perspective, the comparison with the South African apartheid regime consists with international law. The United Nations Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid (or the Apartheid Convention) although was established to deal with the South African regime of apartheid it is applied generically regardless of the country or specific context. The fact that neither the pre-state Zionist movement nor the state of Israel has ever spelled out an official policy of discrimination against the Palestinians, and Israel did not institute discriminatory practices in one fell swoop doesn’t conceal the structural discriminatory properties that defines the state of Israel as a self-defined Jewish state. Discrimination, inequality, and differentiation on ethno-religious bases worked in a piecemeal fashion to constrain Palestinian rights and access to resources especially land.

In other words, separation in the OPT has been a process whose legal contours are harder to discern and whose name has yet to circulate abroad while discrimination in Israeli proper against Palestinians cannot be denied. Thus apartheid as a generic concept
applies to Israeli domination over the Palestinians as much as it pertains to the white Afrikaner subordination of the Black Africans although it doesn’t replicate it. Nor the absence of a name for Israel’s settler-colonial domination over the Palestinians implies that the concept of apartheid does not apply. Israeli/Zionist Jewish domination over non-Jews in Palestine is primarily a “racial contract between the state of Israel and powerful allies [that] has worked to absent Palestinians through extreme repression and statelessness” (Bakan and Abu-Laban 2010: 332). Obviously this contract granted the Jewish immigrant society a super-ordinate status in political, social, economic, and cultural realms. Approaching Israel’s domination system from the point view of apartheid categorizes its system in order to explain its properties and the conditions it created that pertain to our main task: identifying the conditions that made the Palestinian-Israeli conflict unique in spite of the fundamental similarities it has with South Africa.

Israel’s system of domination is based on a fundamentally discriminatory jurisprudence; its basic laws differentiate between Jews and non-Jews where nationality and a wide set of rights attached to it are granted exclusively to Jews. Whether in the Israeli proper or in the OPT rights and obligations are predicated upon individuals’ ethnic affiliation, their geographical location, and their ethno-nationality defined in terms of Jewishness. Thus, this research approaches the whole Palestine as a single unit of analysis: Israel has established its domination by creating dual structures within Israel and within the OPT both relate to the same origins and utilize different degrees of discrimination and exclusion, which makes the analogy with South Africa more relevant.
Similarities and dissimilarities

The cases of South Africa and Israel/Palestine are not identical. Nor the Israeli settler-colonial domination replicates that of apartheid in South Africa. This dissertation recognizes that the prevalence of historical contexts and structures of colonial and ethno-national domination that establish the initial conditions for comparison, doesn’t obfuscate the importance of peculiarities and specificities of the two cases. Thus, although this research recognizes Israel’s system as apartheid, it contends that Israel’s represents a type of its own.

The first similarity that makes the comparison warranted is that the two cases sprung from colonial-settler settings; in both settings settler societies were transformed into ethno-territorial peoples. They represent the product of ethno-nationalist specific claims to territory and hegemony over indigenous populations. Afrikaners and Zionist Israeli Jews are settler societies in domination. However; none of those societies’ spokespersons use any of the terminology of colonization and do their best to distant their practices from the heritage of colonialism (Oberschall 2007: 158). Each society, on its own account, justified its colonization by constructing collective myths and ideologies that justify aggressive colonization of their respective terrains. Zionism and Afrikaner nationalism were defensive and self-contained and applied different levels of exclusion and subordination of Black Africans and Palestinians (Akenson 1992: 120). As settler colonial systems, the two regimes were challenged by national liberation movements that sought self-determination and developed through various stages over the greater part of the 20th century (Pearlman 2011:187).
The main feature of these struggles can be assessed in terms of conflicting ethno-nationalist claims of political control over a specific territory, which endowed these conflicts with common particular properties, as presented in the conceptual framework (Chapter II) of this study. Both the South African and Palestinian national movements fought the state and another ethno-national group that the state preserves. Preserving the survival and supremacy of the dominant ethnic group by the state generated the dynamics of exclusion/inclusion that shaped the asymmetrical relationships of the adversaries and defined the types of power deployed to maintain domination. In this respect, different levels and degrees of exclusion and inclusion that characterize the two systems are considered one of the most crucial differences that shaped the ethno-political geography of the two conflicts.

Finally, and perhaps the most important, both regimes applied regimes of territorial segregation and separation to undermine the ability of their adversary to gain political viability. In South Africa territorial separation was instrumental in confining the Black African while exploiting their work force. Thus, as Farsakh (2005) puts it, Afrikaner nationalists, especially the National Party since 1948 sought to control the land and the people together especially in the wake of 1948 by implementing the Bantustan policy. Zionist movement in the pre-state phase sought to control the land without the people, and in 1947-8 it opted to expulsion and ethnic cleansing of the Palestinians. Following the 1967 war, the complexity of Israeli territorial separation was deepened with the establishment of Jewish-only settlements in the OPT. In both cases the Israeli/Zionist underpinnings of territorial control and separation, as we discuss in our empirical analysis
differs from that of South African apartheid. This point brings us to the dissimilarities between the two cases.

The dissimilarities between the two cases are important and they hold the key to understanding the conditions that prevailed and made the democratic outcome possible in South Africa while impeded the same conclusion in the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. Initially, the most striking difference between the two cases is the extent to which the Zionist movement stretched the logic of ethnic-territorial separation much further than the South African regime did. The Zionist movement and the state of Israel ethnically cleansed the indigenous Palestinians and attached fundamental meanings to territorial acquisition and spatial expansion as an imperative; territorial control and total exclusion are the main two properties of Israel’s domination system. Although the white ethno-nationalism in South Africa included land confiscations, segregation and territorial separation, these features were sought functionally and exclusion practiced was partial.

The climax of South African racial-colonial system was reached in the implementation of apartheid and the Bantustan policy that “reflected some effort at genuine separation and, to few Afrikaner dreamers, the possibility of securing an overwhelmingly white state” (Tilley 2005: 136). Therefore total ethnic (racial) cleansing of the indigenous in South Africa was never entertained by the white society. Indeed, a certain degree of inclusion prevailed in all stages of the development of the regime; economic inclusion and a minimum political incorporation (See Younis 2000) of African population created a kind of de facto integration of the Blacks although as a subordinate cast. Exploitation, political
exclusion, and social and ethnic-racial differentiation were the fundamental organizing elements of the white domination system in South Africa.

The case with the Zionist domination in Palestine differs in terms of the total exclusion of the indigenous Palestinians it practiced from the outset. “Hebrew Labor” policy that the movement applied in the Yishuvs (Jewish communities in Hebrew) by which jobs were exclusively preserved for the Jews reflected a doctrine of Jewish ethno-nationalism not a mere economic mechanism. As a movement that aimed at spiritual, political, and cultural fulfillment of Jewish ethno-religious identity, it focused on redemption and spatial insulation as the core tenet of Jewish-nationalism. This peculiar property explains the expulsion of the vast majority of the indigenous Palestinian population in 1947-8 in order to create a Jewish majority.

Finally, the responses to domination and apartheid by the Palestinian and South African national movements show a significant difference. The African National Congress (ANC) and most elements of the anti-apartheid movement never accepted regimes classifications of the South Africans on the bases of their racial-ethnic affiliation. These forces consistently challenged the regime for the establishment of South Africa as a unitary and democratic non-racial state. The Palestinian national movement, by contrast, dropped the goal of liberation and democratization in favor of national-self determination within the OPT. Thus it accepted the ethno-territorial logic of Zionism and the state of Israel as the base for a political settlement. The implications of this difference are enormous as this research unveils.
International position in the two cases is another important difference. The discrepancy in international intervention in both cases “illuminates the political and moral inadequacy of Western critical reticence” (Tilley 2005: 139) and helps to understand how and why racial colonialism and apartheid in South Africa couldn’t escape the logic and image of settler-colonial racist regime while Israel could. These powers never used the discourse of “mutual recognition”, “dialogue”, mutual concessions”, “land for peace”…etc in the South African conflict that it applies to the Palestinian-Israeli one. Rather international pressure was aimed at the very foundation of domination relationships in South Africa. Whereas international community supported the South African anti-apartheid movement in demanding a full democratic and non-racial regime and national unity, it stands strongly behind separation and ethnically-based solution in Palestine, which validates ethno-national domination of the Jewish and endorses the Zionist exclusivist ideology.

**Research Methodology**

This research departs from a methodological commitment that social phenomena do not result from or the function of a single ‘most important’ factor. Rather, it is more likely that phenomena such as ethno-national conflict that we entertain here stem from, develop, and terminate from dynamic and overlapped factors. The decline of a given ethno-national conflict is not a linear effect of correlated independent and dependent variables (IVs and DVs); rather it reflects the effects of overlapping factors. Thus, this research problematizes different systems of domination and separation deployed by a dominant
ethno-national group against the indigenous group/people. The goal in this sense is to uncover the causal path/s and causal chains that enable us to understanding the conflicts in South Africa and Palestine and how they developed in a divergent manner in spite of their similarities.

Ultimately, the methods deployed in this dissertation seek answers to the questions: What are the characteristics in common between these cases, and where and how they diverge to produce different outcomes? How similarities and dissimilarities between them enable us to understand the current state of affairs of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict especially the prospects for the emergence of one-civic-democratic state in Palestine? In other words, we seek to show how ostensibly similar situations have led to different outcomes. To be sure that the research is not comparing ‘calk and cheese’ the comparison is conceptually-oriented by concepts that pertain to the two cases, presented in the conceptual framework in Chapter II. Concepts of settler-colonial domination systems, ethno-national territorial nexus, separation and segregation, and apartheid are introduced as the anchors of comparison which embrace the two cases.

This research is a case-oriented for an in-depth empirical investigation of the two cases in hand through comparative strategy - ‘that is, it aims at rich descriptions of a few instances of a certain phenomenon…[and] seeks to understand the complex units’ (della Porta 2008: 198). As such, this inquiry aims at revealing the processes and explaining the causal chains that make a particular outcome of the two conflicts prevalent. Thus, this study presents an “interpretive case study” using theoretical frameworks to provide an
explanation of particular cases using two strategies: ‘method of difference’ and ‘process tracing’.

There are three major approaches to comparative inquiry that aim at studying social change or different historical trajectories of specific social phenomena. Each one of them has its own logic and has its strength and weaknesses (Skocpol and Somers 1980). This inquiry applies the ‘method of difference’ to contrasts ‘positive (affirmative) case’ - whereby ethno-national struggle ends in integration- to other ‘negative case’ whereby the integrative outcome is not existent in spite of important similarities the two cases exhibit. The figure below illustrates this strategy. Factors a through d are the similar properties of the cases examined and analyzed while factors e through g represent the combination of causal variables that explain the difference in outcome that appears in the last row of the table. The table below shows the logic of difference this research implements where the factors X represent the core conceptual attributes of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict and explain the difference of outcome it exhibits.

The research also applies the method of “process tracing” for within case comparisons. Process tracing is aimed at identifying the processes linking a set of initial conditions (colonial-settler domination systems in our research) to particular outcomes (integration and separation in our cases). Thus it examines multiple features of each case to assess causal and constitutive relations between factors; this requires a close examination of causal mechanisms that make the correspondence between these factors and their ultimate outcomes more concrete.
The importance of causal mechanisms in this sense is to go beyond correlations and to uncover the links between causes and their effects. Causal mechanisms reveal why and how these causes produce particular effects, which better captures the complexities of a unit (case) and empower the research with a tool that takes analysis beyond descriptive treatment toward explanation and understanding (Tilly and Tarrow 2007). Moreover, causal mechanisms explain why the same factors, in a comparative setting, can produce different outcomes. This is the ultimate goal of our research: why the same certain set of factors trigger different mechanisms and henceforth why the processes culminate in a very different manner. This approach aims at uncovering the ‘cogs and wheels’ that make the relationship between explanatory factors and their effects possible in the first place (Hedstrom and Swedberg 1998: 8). In this light the research aims at examining the following hypotheses:

- The salience of exclusive “regimes of territorial legitimation” as the defining element of settler-colonial ethno-nationality and the mechanisms they triggers endow the conflict with an indivisible subjective dimension that stiffens political demands and galvanizes identity manifestations. It therefore gives the conflict an existential property that reduces significantly, if not terminates integration;

- A segregation and separation system of domination is institutionalized on territorial and spatial imperatives; combining political power with geographical and spatial exclusion and control, further prolongs ethno-national conflicts and impedes
forging a common national identity necessary for integration. However, it may have unintended consequences that under specific conditions leads to integration;

- The dual international effect of legitimating and de-legitimating the antagonists’ demands to an ethno-national conflict plays a key role in integration or separation by creating convergence of external and internal pressure for regime change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘Positive (affirmative) Case’</th>
<th>‘Negative (disconfirming) Case’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Africa</strong></td>
<td><strong>Palestine</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Foundation and properties</td>
<td>State Foundation and properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic attributes</td>
<td>Demographic attributes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key actors’ interests and perceptions</td>
<td>Key actors’ interests and perceptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of the conflict</td>
<td>Duration of the conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National-territorial nexus</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing elements of the domination system</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External factors</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome:</strong> Decomposition of domination and integrated political entity</td>
<td><strong>Outcome:</strong> conflict continuation and separation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 ‘Positive’ ‘negative’ and ‘control’ cases in this context do not imply any normative or value-laden expressions. They are a mere methodological tool to show the cases that show consistent outcomes of the same phenomenon and the others that their outcomes vary (See Skocpol and Somers 1980).
Outline of Dissertation Chapters

In addition to this chapter, this dissertation consists of another eight chapters and a closing section. Chapter II details the conceptual and theoretical framework of the research. First it offers a critical review of the comparative research on the subject matter of the dissertation and then discusses the boundaries of ethno-national conflicts and the challenges and aspects of peoples’ struggle for self-determination. Then it proceeds to establish the centrality of ethno-national territorial nexus as the core concept that I represent the main analytical tool of the study. Finally it presents the concept of “state contraction” to examine the plausibility and explanatory power of the theoretical approach.

Chapters III to VI address the South African case within a historical approach: in chapter III addresses the foundation and underpinnings of racial-colonial Afrikaner ethno-nationalism to show the role of “regimes of territorial legitimation” in shaping the structures of the conflict; chapter IV presents an interpretation of apartheid as an ethnic-national territorial system of domination and separation; and chapter V discusses the decline of apartheid and the failure of Afrikaner ethno-nationality to re-establish the conflict in terms of ethno-territorial properties.

In chapters VI through IX the study engages in empirical examination of the main properties of the conflict as an ethno-territorial construct. These chapters are analytically formatted to discuss main themes of research conceptual treatment: chapter VI underlines the perspective of the study on the one-state solution; it critically presents
prevailing discussion on the issue and shows that approaching it as an emergence property is more useful to capture its conditions. Then the chapter addresses the origins of the conflict as a settler-colonial-indigenous struggle over ethno-territorial existence. Chapter VII presents a territorial-spatial interpretation of the Zionist movement’s settler-colonialism and examines the formation of the state of Israel in terms of its “regimes of territorial legitimation”. It emphasizes the ethnocratic nature of the state that makes it a peculiar type of apartheid. Chapter VIII addresses the expansion of Israel’s ethno-territorial domination well over the entire of Palestine in the wake of 1967 war and the occupation of the OPT. Finally, chapter IX addresses the rise and development of the Palestinian national movement. It emphasizes the dialectical constitution and reconstitution of the movement in its relationship and responses to Israel’s ethno-territoriality. The last section of this chapter is dedicated to discuss Israeli exceptionalism in terms of international effects on the main properties of the conflict. Chapter X presents the conclusion and main comparative findings of the research.
Chapter II
Conceptualizing the national-territorial nexus of self-determination

Introduction
This research, from a theoretical perspective bridges on the dichotomy between structural and agent-based approaches to ethno-national conflicts. In this sense, the research differs from traditional conflict resolution treatment that emphasizes decision-making and elite politics in explaining the conflicts in South Africa and Palestine (e.g. Gidron 2002, Knox and Quirk 2000). This study focuses on major structures and processes without undermining the effects of interaction between structures and human agency. Thus it complements holistic approaches (e.g. Akenson 1992, Connors 2000, and Macdonald 1990) by calling for attention the dialectics of events, actors’ actions, and contingency along with major structures in creating causal chains that determine the trajectory and outcome of the conflict.

This research draws on structural-historical analysis to understanding ethno-nationalism and conflicts related to ethno-national systems of domination and their trajectories. Thus it takes the settler-colonial origins of these conflicts as the reference point of conceptualization and analysis. However, structural-historical analysis does not tell the whole story of divergent outcomes of similar ethno-national conflicts: historical contexts and big structures have to be combined with the specificity and peculiarity of
each case to uncover the dissimilarities between cases that show how each case developed in a unique trajectory and different outcome.

Conceptual framework that follows addresses ethno-national conflicts as an eclectic approach through three moves: First it situate the issue of self-determination within the question of settler-colonial settings, then it highlights the main characteristics of ethno-national conflicts and their implications for the question of integration versus separation. Second, this chapter turns to examine the origins of ethno-national conflicts to show how the initial structures of the conflict determine the trajectory it takes; Third it discuss the centrality of territorial-national ideologies or ‘regimes of territorial legitimation’ as the most important factors in shaping the trajectories ethno-national conflicts take. Finally theory of “state contraction” presented in the way of examining the plausibility of the concepts suggested to explain the divergence of outcome in ethno-national conflicts.

**Self-determination in Settler-colonial domination systems**

The importance of the principle and right of self-determination is that it represents one of the most powerful sources of legitimacy for the struggle of both peoples against their respective adversaries. Indeed, the principle has been the premise upon which many national and ethno-national groups gained independence in Africa and Asia. The power of the principle and successful struggles in these regions has emboldened Africans and Palestinians’ struggle to gain the right of self-determination. It is remarkable the extent
to which this principle “developed into an anti-colonial norm of international law in the second half of the twentieth century” (Hannum 2006: 61); it reflected the change of international order as a whole in terms of embracing new norms and principles pertaining to the shifts in world-politics.

Although international order and regional configurations of power have changed the efficacy and prevalence of the principle of self-determination have not diminished or eroded. As far as colonial legacies are concerned, the principle still holds. For example, Farer (2008:177) asserts that the term “colonial entities acquired the generic name of ‘non-self-governing territories’ is applicable to Palestine” under British mandate of 1922. Farer argues that although the UN General Assembly Resolution 1514, that restricts or qualifies the principle of self-determination by the consideration of ‘territorial integrity’ of states, the principle still applicable to two precedents of “dividing non-self-governing territories where the desire of separation” is plain and evident; these two cases are India and Palestine.

Resulting from partitioning a particular country, or by colonial settlement enterprise, or by direct military rule, indigenous people’s right of self-determination is indisputable in international law (see Falk 2002: 31-66). However, the two cases of South Africa and Palestine show a very unique type of settler-colonialism by which the settler-colonial society developed an ethno-national identity and the structures of a distinct people. Dynamics of these types of conflicts show a number of patterns as to the ways in which the right of self-determination is being sought: from separation to integration and in between them different types of autonomy and power-sharing. In South Africa
democratization and civic self-determination prevailed while in Palestine liberation and national self-determination is still the main character of the conflict. Theoretically speaking, this divergent merits an appropriate approach to account for its underpinnings.

**Characteristics and manifestations of ethno-national conflicts**

The three most important of characteristics of ethno-national conflicts are: The asymmetrical power relationships inherited in them; demographic balance or the minority-majority syndrome; and their protracted character. They are embedded in the literature on ethnic-conflicts as the explaining factors of the rigidity they show, as discussed below. We derive from the discussion of each character the mechanisms and dynamics that underlay ethno-national conflict and shape their trajectory. This dissertation approaches these characteristics as interactive and overlapping system of subordination and domination in which the state plays a central role. The practice is aimed at depicting the circular manner in which these characteristics generate each other to yield a complex of grieves and grievances that galvanize national identities and increase the propensity of violence and hinders democratization.

*Asymmetrical Power Relationships and Domination*

Ethno-national conflicts arising from settler-colonial settings embody deeply rooted and persistent asymmetrical power relations between the adversaries. The dominating regimes in these settings have ruled the subordinate groups by means of force, coercion, exploitation and exclusion. State power in this context is harnessed by the
dominant ethno-national group to sustain and preserve its political hegemony and socio-economic privileges. We draw on Michael Foucault’s conception of power and domination as complementary forces deployed to create a sphere of deep influence over the subordinate with minimum costs and liabilities for the dominant. Thus the state resort to three strands of power: disciplinary (creating conformity in the behavior of individuals to norms and laws exerted by the state), bio-power (silencing the group as a collective mass by oppressing its political organization and preventing its mobilization) and sovereign power (imposing state sovereignty; juridical and legal systems partially or totally) to dominate, control, and silence the subordinate ethno-national challenger. The state implements a set of institutional and procedural instruments: economic, social, political, civic, and statistical in order to atomize the population and bore its national identity (Gordon 2008: 11-15). Domination, therefore, is defined as the processes, tools, institutions, and procedures that aim at directing the actions of individuals and the population in conformity with expected conduct. The role of state power in this sense is central in sustaining ethno-national and territorial underpinnings of domination and to tame, oppress, and annihilate national aspirations of the challenger.

One of states’ most prevalent structures of domination is exclusion and separation and/or segregation that implemented in different levels at differing capacities. Ultimately they aim at preserve the supremacy of the ethno-national dominating settlers’ society. Drawing clear lines of differentiation between ethno-national groups (defined racially, or on religious or ethnic grounds) assumes a powerful and central state with high degree of statism and institutional coherency to sustain such a system. Settler-colonial regimes
show a distinct level of statism as Akenson (1992) argues; they are preoccupied with asserting sovereignty and self-righteousness vis-à-vis the external world and internal challenges posed by the subordinate ethno-national group. State sovereignty and legitimacy in these contexts takes a supreme priority over all other considerations including democratic imperatives and the secular basis of modern liberal democracy. Statism implies the endowment of the state with a moral purpose (a higher purpose of preserving the ethics of a single ethnicity) that elicits loyalty to the state by invoking ethno-national and/or religiously-based discourse. Therefore liberal democracy can hardly provide answers to the questions of inclusion vis-à-vis exclusion that face any state with these structural properties (Juan Linz & Alfred Stepan 1996) and adopting democratic political systems and ideological justifications of domination invoke to give the regime legitimacy.

Under circumstances of power asymmetries subordinate ethno-national groups - that conceive of themselves as distinct and “affiliated to actual or commonly perceived ancestry with language markers and national or regional origin” (Nic Craith 2002: 136) tend to pursue some degree of independence whether in a sovereign political entity or in some form of autonomy or self rule to protect their existence and/or interests from state power. Self-determination, under these conditions turns into a mobilizing force deployed to challenge the central government or the state once the subordinate group has some leverage to squeeze political, economic, and social reforms from the state (Jenne 2006: 7). The levels and degree of exclusion and segregation decide the shape and component of self-determination whether in a civic or a national/ethno-national manner.
The effects of exclusion and domination coupled with oppression turns nationalist sentiments into a powerful driving force that imply, in the words of Bauman “exclusive sets of assigned rights and duties…moral significance and behavioral principles” (Cited in Nic Craith 2002: 139). Clearly this shows that coercion and domination do not turn into legitimate governance nor they imply the ability of the state to control the subordinate group. Force of ethno-nationalism may manifest and seek fulfillment in terms of civic nationalism: through civic strife and civil rights movements and revolutions that aim at transforming the polity and social relations into an inclusive democracy. National self-determination, in contrast, exceeds the limits of civil rights toward statehood as the fulfillment of ethno-national identity in a distinct polity (Nic Craith 2002: 139). Uncovering the patterns into which ethno-national conflicts develop and transform in either direction of civic or national self-determination is a key to explaining their divergent outcomes and types of accommodation of ethno-national demands. Dynamics of demographic change play a crucial role in changing the patterns of interaction between adversaries whereby the status of each group in the demographic balance is crucial.

Minority-Majority dynamics

Numbers matter in social and political interaction and “Regardless of the political context, there always seems to be power in numbers” (Cederman 2009). In ethno-national conflicts numbers account even more especially as they are loaded with identity struggles, long standing oppression and exclusion that give the conflict the urgency of existence struggle. Demography drives its efficacy from the ‘resource mobilization’ mechanism
(Tilly 1978) whereby substantial increase in subordinate groups’ numbers provides an opportunity and affects its members’ willingness to act collectively and to raise the ceiling of their demands up to the demand of political independence. Henceforth, the efficacy of numbers is primarily politicizing ethno-national groups and endows them with legitimacy. By contrast, dominant groups, as Connor (2000) notices, struggle for the preservation of a considerable majority status that enables them to sustain supremacy by establishing coherent democratic regimes to justify their policies against the minority group. The logic is simple; in a world that embraces more democratic rule the domination of minority groups is a scandal especially if applied by non-democratic means. In addition, the principle of proportionality is widely accepted as a main organizing political element of political power.

However, numbers do not transform into political collective action automatically. Demographic superiority needs other factors that turn it into a politically influential force: unity, purpose, resources and leadership among those factors. Primarily, these factors annul or diminish the effects of demobilization and internal divisions. Dilemmas of collective action, and inter-group splits are antithetical to group political efficacy. Assuming that the benefits of non participation in collective action are minimal, and inter-group splits come second in importance at a specific point, demographic balance and numerical increase of the subordinate group triggers powerful dynamics. Gurr (1993:123-129) clarifies that ethno-political activism is motivated by peoples deep-seated grievances about their collective status as subordinate and excluded which facilitates collective protest and revolt. Indeed, the more the state exclude, oppress, and deprive
these groups the more they become willing to act in a politically organized fashion. Dynamics of demographic change and their political implications do not show the direction of political protest; toward what end and objectives?

When the dominant group is a majority and shows no recognition of the minority’s political, cultural and civic rights, violence is expected to rise. Violence increases in ‘no-exit’ settings: if the minority is increasing in numbers and seeking relief from domination by assimilation that is being denied by the majority (Oberschall 2007:13-15). The ‘no exit’ impasse leads to coercion and militancy by the challenger and accommodation becomes far more elusive. Furthermore, the change in demographic balance whether it was real, impending or foreseen as pertained to the dominant majority drives it to initiate confrontation under the pretext of which the dominant majority “takes the move to curb what it perceives as a threat to its position and style of life” (Oberschall 2007, and Mishali Ram 2006) and strip it from sources of political leverage: unity, political organization and mobilization, territorial contiguity, and economic viability.

Demographic balance especially when it coincides with specific geographical attributes is found to affect significantly the prospects of conflict demise in ethno-national settings. In a quantitative research that covers the whole world between1951-2005, Cederman shows “that the conflict probability of marginalized group increases with the demographic power balance [of the minority] compared to the group(s) in power” shifts in favor of the former and leads to the minority rebellion (Cederman 2009). These ethno-political mechanisms hold for all ethnic conflicts, as Cederman’s study shows, and is crucial to understanding ethno-national conflicts and their patterns. The demographic
factor seems crucial to both protagonists, but a majority in rule would most likely resort to specific demographic policies that aim at countering the balance in its favor, which exacerbates the conflict and pushes the minority group further towards militancy and coercion that characterize protractible conflicts.

*Protractability and intractability*

Duration of the conflict matters. Protracted conflicts are defined “as hostile interactions that occur over prolonged periods of time” (Ben-Yehuda and Mishali Ram 2006), and therefore, they are processes, not events; they proceed in time and have no distinguishable point of termination. Being protracted, ethno-national conflicts gather their own life cycle and generate compound nature and magnitude that is affected by the time factor, which makes these conflicts seem intractable (paralyzed, intensive, stuck and destructive, and irresolvable). In this sense these conflicts “seem irresolvable; even when the ‘shape of a solution’ emerges such as in the two state solution of Israel/Palestine case, “the parties can’t seem to reach it” (Babbitt 2006: 116). Moreover, protractability of the conflict increases the prospects of its intractability by bringing new issues and actors into the scene (Oberschall 2007). Protracted conflicts transform into intractable under certain conditions as Babbitt (2006) indicates; the most important among which are: (a) when *Group Identity* (emphasis in origin) is essential which turns conflict into an existential struggle; (b) when leaders are not willing or unable to compel to negotiations because of political calculations; and (c) when there are external parties support factions to the conflict and hence contribute to the divisions’ sustainability.
The circular relationship between protractability and intractability suggests that breaking this circle is a key in accommodation and political settlement of ethno-national conflicts. However, the question is about the effects protractability and intractability has on the outcome of the conflict. In this sense protractability seems an intervening element. The compound or multidimensional nature of protracted conflicts hinders resolution. As Ben Yehuda and Mishali-Ram’s comparative research shows “a compound nature, or a primarily ethnic characterization of a conflict, not only prolongs the confrontation but also diminishes the prospects of conflict resolution” (Ben-Yehuda and Mishali Ram 2006). Indeed, Bar-Tal (Cited in: Gidron 2002: 7) defines intractable conflicts as those that are protracted and because of this the parties to the conflict accumulate hatred and prejudice that give the conflict a sense of existential struggle; “The Israeli-Palestinian conflict, for example, can be described as an existential conflict between two parties, each of which sees its very existence as a national group at stake” (Kelman 1997: 195). This spiral worsens as the parties to the conflict have interest in its continuation and makes vast investments that impede its resolution. All these features exacerbate the conflict by turning it into an all out confrontation that penetrate “the cognitive repertoire of individuals [that captures] the public agenda” (Bar-Tal, cited in: Gidron 2002: 7) and renders accommodation close to impossible.

Although complex, deeply entrenched, and elusive to resolution, ethno-national conflicts are not irresolvable. The evidence from different regions in different periods of times shows that these conflicts are not zero-sum games. Attaining a political settlement
to these conflicts is not a question of whether or not, but a question of when, how and under what conditions. This study contends that whenever, and wherever, the one finds asymmetrical power relation and domination, especially in the shape of state power that is based on coercion and subordination, ethno-national demands of national self determination rise. This is typical to settler-colonial systems of domination in which the state acts as an ethnizied entity; a state as-an-ethnic group syndrome that creates a type of a buffered colonialism that renders accommodation rather much less likely. There exist a number of factors that exacerbate these patterns of relationships amongst which the salience of identity, the demographic balance, oppression, and territory are the most crucial. Any given combination of these factors determines the trajectory of the conflict and its eventual outcome. However, none of the factors (characteristics) discussed here: state power and systems of domination, demographic balance, and protractability is sufficient to explain accommodation and integration or alternatively separation. They are necessary for the realization of the conditions required to reach a political settlement of the conflict as vital in shaping groups’ positions and demands contextually.

The trajectories ethno-national conflicts are determined to a large extent by the role of –national-territorial nexus or the ‘regimes of territorial legitimation’. The explanatory power of this factor is that it dialectically linked with demographic balance, power asymmetries and domination, and systems of segregation/separation. States’ territorial imperatives and ideology, and spatial aggrandizement essentialize the factors discussed above and give them a dynamic dimension as a single coherent system of exclusion and domination that faces not only the ethno-national challenger that lives on the same
territory, but also the dominant groups internal transformations as well as International intervening factor that legitimize or delegitimize the dominant state system. Considering state’s ‘regimes of territorial legitimation’ is founded and developed along the very properties of settler-colonial ethno-nationality where the dynamics of the conflict are shaped and shifts of structural features of the conflict change. We now turn to the foundation of these conflicts in order to show the centrality of the territorial-national nexus in the trajectory of the conflict, its direct and profound effects on systems of domination, and the effects it has on the rise and politics of national liberation movements.

The national-territorial nexus

Settler-colonial societies in domination present a more challenging and more complex type of ethno-national conflicts; they differ substantially from foreign rule (or imperialism and empires) by the process of implantation that transforms settlers’ societies into distinct ethno-national collectivity. The tendency settler-colonial regimes show to exclusiveness, exploitation, oppression, and racism explains, to a large extent, the nature of ethno-national conflicts. Settler-colonial societies as (Wynne 2002) notices dominion creates self-sustaining societies that gain life of their own that is combined with the traits of foreign rule that is “constituted by the annexation of territory; and by the rule of foreign metropolitan center [and] the insertion of military order; the expropriation of wealth; and the imposition of an external culture”. This combination, unlike traditional
colonial rule, establishes settler-colonial societies in as socially, economically, politically, and psychologically buffered societies vis-à-vis the indigenous peoples. They establish entities within a zone that inoculates their settlers’ society from the contamination of the indigenous peoples that is necessary for these societies to develop a strong sense of ethno-nationality that sustains their political and socio-economic texture. Harnessing state power is the precondition for this endeavor to succeed especially to contain the challenge of the ‘other’ ethno-national people who occupy the same territory.

Wynne (2002) remarks, colonial settler societies tend to extend their domination and supremacy over political, physical and cultural terrains. The ubiquitous presence of domination in territorial and spatial spheres of life creates the structures of a multidimensional conflict with the indigenous people over territory, identity, political power, and socio-economic resources. Being distinct- a key element to staking group integrity vis-à-vis other groups, dominant states tend to emphasize ethno-linguistic or ethno-religious aspects of its cultural-historical collective presence in order to consolidate an integrated territorial-national identity correspondence. By the same token national and ethno-national movements tend strongly to stake national identity they invoke to particular territory as a means of legitimation and survival especially if the subordinate group is a minority (Cederman 2009: 505). The contradictions and conflictual properties of territorial claims of national movements in the face of territorial and spatial control of the state represent the scheme within which the conflict takes place. In defiance of state exclusion and domination and to protect their distinct existence ethno-national groups/peoples often perceive territory as “a defining attribute of their identity,
inseparable from their past and vital to their continued existence as a distinct group” (Toft 2003: 19) whereas for states-as-ethnic-groups territory represents its demarcated boundaries in terms of recognized borders as well as a defining factor of their foundation and identity.

Different configurations and types of state regimes of territorial legitimation and the territorial-national nexus produce different types of ethno-national conflicts and outcomes. One can propose four types that derived from the discussion above and that illustrate the concepts that this research focus on: (1) Integration: The establishment of a unitary state and integrated polity non-ethnic political systems. This type shows minimum prevalence of exclusive “regimes of territorial legitimation”; (2) Quasi-integrative: The articulation of a power-sharing institutional design that in effect preserves ethno-national distinctions within one political system. Ethno-territoriality in this context is contingent on minority-majority balance and the geographical distribution of ethnic adversaries; (3) Minority Rights-based: types of autonomy and self rule especially among minority population in multi-ethnic states whereby minorities are concentrated geographically and have no separatist demands; (4) Separatist: Independence in a sovereign national state based on the realization of national self-determination. This type exhibits high degrees of exclusion and ideologically, institutionally, and culturally entrenched “regimes of territorial legitimation.
This typology is certainly not the only way to categorize the phenomenon\(^5\). Rather, it provides a conceptual tool to understanding the range of variance of outcomes these conflicts show in reference to the structures of territorial legitimation and ideologies.

‘Regimes of territorial legitimation’ in ethno-national conflicts

The analytical utility of the concept of “regimes of territorial legitimation” is that it uncover the dynamics of nation-building and state formation especially in settings where the regime in question is ethnocratic\(^6\), discriminatory, racial-ethnic or plainly traditional colonial one. Indeed, it helps to avoid the conflation of states and nations by thinking of states as, territorial constructs” (Murphy 2002:208). Thinking of states as such pinpoints the importance of territory as a homeland that is rationally perceived by the state and the challenging ethno-national group/people as the condition for survival and identity preservation. Whereas nation-states focus on the objective meaning of territory and space, states-as-ethnic groups or states of settler-colonial origins focus on the subjective meaning of territory and its indivisibility.

\(^5\) For example, Cederman (2009: 505) suggests that there are two main types of ethno-national conflicts in terms of the goals/ends raised by the challenger: (1) The goal is to seize political power from the ruling government (domestic civic); (2) A territorial-political goal in which the challenger seeks to obtain sovereignty over a well defined territory.

\(^6\) Yiftachel (2002: 220-221) define these regimes as “regimes [that] exploit the international legitimacy and autonomy bestowed on the ‘nation-state’, as the sole expression of ‘national’ self-determination, to facilitate the expanding political and material resources by the dominant ethnic group, often at the expense of minorities and peripheral groups. Ethnocratic regimes, which are chronically unstable, can be found in cases such as Serbia, Northern Ireland, Estonia, Latvia, Sri Lanka, Cyprus and Malaysia, to name but several notable examples.
The dialectical relationship between the settler-colonial state and the challenger constitute and reconstitute their ethno-territorial limitations; dynamics of inclusion and exclusion derived from the “regimes of territorial legitimation” draw the political geography of the conflict. This dialectic finds its antecedent in two geographic circumstances: the political-territorial status of states at the time of entry into the modern state system (whether they were pre-existing independent units, fragments of a waning empire, colonies, initiated by external powers, etc.) and prevailing ideas about the cultural-historical character of state territory (Murphy 2002:193, 200).

It is also a function of the challenging group’s capabilities and chance to control the territory in addition to its believe in the legitimacy of the cause of the group (Toft 2003: 21).

Territorial and spatial dimensions of the conflict and the dialectical relationships it has with demographic change and systems of segregation and domination has the potential to strengthen our understanding of ethno-national conflict as territorially anchored struggles for national recognition. Ethno-nationalism, in one main aspect, is deeply sentimental and abstract, and thus inter-subjective phenomenon “centering normally around a shared place and always on a shared identity” (Farer 2008:182). The space becomes inseparable from national identity and manifests all the collective meanings, symbols, emblems, narratives, and imagery of the group. As Yiftachel (2002) argues, territoriality (the where of the nation as he puts it) of the conflict, especially for expansionist colonial-settler societies becomes the “kernel of mobilization” for that society. This society generates its political coherency, consensus, its socio-economic interests, and political supremacy around territorial perceptions.
In settler-colonial settings territorial and spatial control is designed to exclude, deprive and alienate a particular ethno-national group/people. This phenomenon is the condition for the historical construction of the settler-colonial society as a people that has distinct cultural-historical mythologies (narratives) anchored necessarily to territorial ideology as two mutually constitutive processes. Understanding ethno-national demands for independence is necessarily linked to state

...forces against which minority and stateless movements are struggling...As such, it is imperative that we seek to understand the national territorial ideologies of groups that are in power within modern state system” (Murphy 2002:197).

This takes place within a dialectical and ongoing process of conflict with the challenging forces of subordinate ethno-national groups/peoples. Territory, in this sense, is the spatial arena of the conflict while the history (the when) turns into a tool to galvanize the territorial struggle. Territoriality becomes the most rampant aspect of ethno-national identity if not the supreme justification of collective self-defined history. The “where” of ethno-nationalism turns into the defining element of the nations, and “when the (when) and the (where) of the nation are still intimately intertwined, it is the later that provides the core of nation building” (Yiftachel 2002: 216). This attribute is typical to all colonial-settler societies. To be sure, the linkages between political processes especially nation-building and state formation on the one hand and territory and geography on the other are evident. It includes renaming of geographical sights and locations to conform to a certain ideology upon which the state and the nation are articulated. For example, Israeli policy of renaming a countless number of locations in Palestine is a “symbolic expression of Israeli nationalism in the face of Palestinian Arab opposition” (Cohin and Kliot 1992:
Giving names to settlements (colonies) that reflect national/religious ideology of “God-given” boundaries is paramount in this context. What are the implications of the centrality of the territorial-spatial dimension of ethno-national conflicts and how it is related to domination systems and segregation regimes?

**Territorial exclusion and segregation: Patterns of domination**

The construction of settler-colonial society as an ethnic-national people implies the establishment of necessary correspondence between ethno-national identity and territorial boundaries. Facing another ethno-national people the dominant group opts to alienate them from land and strip them from their own correspondence to territory, space, and historical relevancy. Since the nation is always constituted through territory (e.g. blood and soil), the attempt to erase the nation is also an attempt to undermine the connection between the people and their land and the right of the people to self-determination” (Grodon 2008:17).

The persistent challenge that all articulated ethno-national settlers’ communities face is that that they have to confront, at some stage of their own life, the presence of other ethno-national group/s on the same territory (Tilley 2005:132). The national-territorial nexus and the dynamics through which it develops, plays a decisive role in determining whether the conflict may or may not transform into a civic-democratic one or remains ethno-national and territorially driven. Ethno-national-territorial nexus endows the conflict with a normative dimension that stiffens political demands and galvanizes identity manifestations. This nexus travels beyond mere geography towards
ethno-national fight over the meanings, symbols, and heritage. Therefore, “ Territory has been, and continues to be, a major issue in [ethno-national] conflicts” (Ben-Yehuda and Mishali-Ram 2006: 86).

The nature and levels of territorial control, exclusion, occupying spatial spheres, and alienation determine the nature of the demands made by the challenging ethno-national group/people. Mechanisms of domination and political manipulation implemented by the state intervene the effects and exigencies of the ‘regimes of territorial legitimation’ adopted by the state. An ethno-national conflict that remains civic or transforms into a civic and communal struggle is the one, as (Tilley 2005:163) notices, that entails the re-definition of the state based on universal democratic imperatives that render territorial and spatial control irrelevant. By contrast, as the settler-colonial imperatives prevail the state turns into chauvinist-ethnic regime (Tilley 2005: 163) for the fact that the ‘the national project’ under such conditions does not aspire to merge a nation and state attempts to essentialise and segregate group identities” (Yiftachel 2002:216), which hinders exit from the conflict for long periods of time especially when the systems of segregation/separation and exclusion are deeply entrenched and internalized as state systems to which state and polity ascribe deep ideological and political significance for the survival of the state and society.

Separation and segregation serve the intentions of the dominant group in perpetuating the asymmetries in power relations and sustaining domination; they institutionalize that practices, laws, and policies that signify one type or another of apartheid regimes. Segregation works on different levels: psychological, legal, and
physical that may have different combinations in different cases and different periods in the same case. Examining variations in segregation types enables us to examine different types of state domination and their effects on the development of the conflict. The most important aspect of segregation is the dualism it creates through sign-posted areas, invisible albeit effective measures, and legal means. Segregation is also perceived as “a mechanism for coping with physical threat…for preserving group identity from alien influences, and to conserve cultural heritage and life style” (Oberschall 2007:5-6) and then serves to boost national-territorial nexus and hinders the development of mixed and integrated institutions, polities, let alone a common sense of nation-hood between the protagonists.

The context, shape, and ‘legal’ forms in which ‘regimes of territorial legitimation’ and domination systems are introduced are crucial for the state to harness international acceptance and legitimation. Presnting the regime as a democratic system plays a vital role. Strong state apparatuses alleviated by democratic political system serves a twofold strategy: sustaining a domestic coherent polity based on consensus over the conflict; and harnessing international legitimacy of an otherwise regime of oppression and a pariah state. International dual effect of legitimating and de-legitimating a particular process as the end of ethno-national conflicts has played a crucial role in sustaining or, alternatively eroding regimes of ethnic or ethno-national segregation. The adoption of a Western-like democratic political system by the dominating state affects international assumptions on the conflict and their legitimation or castigating the regime. International community’s acceptance or rejecting ethno-national domination on racial, religious, pr ethnic grounds
plays a crucial role in conferring lawfulness or exposing a regime of domination. Along with domestic developments of the conflict it determines the direction the conflict would take. Identifying with Western values has been a key factor that justified ethnic cleansing and mass expulsion of subordinate ethno-national groups. Farer (2008:201) remarks that, in the case of Kosovo for example

The dominators imagine themselves as part of Western civilization, as the forward edge of that civilization in a nasty part of the world, and invoked the West’s support in terms of their common values.

The Westernized discourse of the dominators is a pivotal strategy that shields them from international criticism, punishment, and delegitimizing. Regardless of the specific name that segregation, submission and expulsion might take, international legitimizing and de-legitimizing of regimes of domination is evident. However, this factor has to do with the changes in world-politics environment; the post-Cold-War era has witnessed a profound change that affected regional and intra-state conflicts in divergent manners. The demise of the Cold-War rendered some conflicts less important than others as the game of power-politics has changed. Upholding international law and various international Covenants on key norms and principles that pertain to ethno-national conflicts (self-determination being the most prominent) have become more a question of contingency of interests and balances of power. One of the most important elements that determine international level and pattern of intervention is that of the possible spillover of the conflicts to international conflict and crisis. Ethno-national conflicts, in this sense have multidimensional impact upon international conflict (Mishali
Ram 2006:584-585) and therefore international intervention has a crucial role in their developments and termination.

**The Theory of “state contraction”**

The properties of ethno-national conflicts discussed in this part result in a stalemate that is very hard to sustain for it is prone to violence eruptions, exposed to internal dynamics of socio-economic, political, and demographic changes as well as external effects. Analyzing the exit from stalemate depends on dynamics of the conflict how they materialize through certain structures and events at turning points. The ultimate answer to ethno-nationalism lies in democratization of nation and state building; however this process does not suggest how to forge national heterogeneity within a nation-state as Connor (1994) rightly contends. That is because ethno-nationalist conflicts emerge where the state does not “include and integrate the vast majority of the population into the imagined community of the nation” (Cederman 2009). Indeed, there is a profound distinction between state-building as an institutional project and the inclusiveness of nation-building that is a social construct. Colonial settings that represent the climax of exclusion and coercion are the least likely to accommodate ethno-nationalism in a non-coercive and legitimate manner.

Non-coercive means through which ethno-nationalism could be accommodated depend therefore on the foundation, properties and the composition of the state; the interests it represents; its perceived identity; and its institutional frameworks that may be
conducive to nation-building efforts and hence generates loyalty to the state that lead to integration and ethno-national heterogeneity. The case of foreign domination and settler-colonialism is the culmination of this state of affairs; settler-colonialism domination gives rise to territoriality as the material basis for the actualization of collective national identity, which exacerbates the conflict. These societies are dynamic political communities and they constitute “arenas of constant struggles over the very geography of the polity in question” (Yiftachel 2002: 222). Henceforth, understanding the dominant state system in terms of its institutional structures, the socio-economic and political configurations and interests it protects is a key task to examine the decline of ethno-national conflicts. Ian Lustick’s theory of state contraction is a useful analytical tool to accounting for the initial dynamics of conflict decline and ultimately the resolution of ethno-national conflicts in a colonial setting.

Lustick presents the state as an institution and examines different aspects of ‘institutionalization’ and ‘de-institutionalization’ of the state to explain its expansion and contraction (Lustick 2002:202). The ‘state as institution’ is a dynamic concept that enables us to answer the question of “what endows states’ boundaries with long term political significance and how and why they may change?” Boundaries are borders between political arenas and institutionalized constraints that set the rules according to which groups are included in, and those excluded from, the political game. The dynamics that may lead to state deinstitutionalization are depicted in the concept of contraction which is, as Lustick (2002: 204) puts it
…expected to trigger shifts in the distribution of power within a state by changing resource allocation among different groups and, ultimately, by changing prevailing norms and legal arrangements to correspond with the interests of newly dominant groups. Accordingly, unless the border of the state is accepted as an immutable given, different groups within the state will, under some circumstances, adjust their perceptions of what the proper border of the state should be based on their chances of achieving and/or maintaining political power.

This conception enables us to understand long term changes in state border as a *contingent dimension* of state attributes. Lustick explains why state contraction takes place less often than state expansion. He argues that there are thresholds of institutionalization whereby state boundaries expand or contract; the thresholds divide the state institutionalization process into three stages each of which entails a different degree of difficulty to contraction. This difficulty depends on the degree to which state boundary is deeply ingrained in the polity: The more threatening contraction is to the integration of the polity, the institutional building of the state, and the prevailing ideology, the harder contraction will be.\(^7\)

---

\(^7\) The three contexts of Britain/Northern Ireland, France/Algeria, and Israel/West Bank-Gaza included in Lustick’s study are set to examine this comparative framework; each case represents a case of state expansion and contraction (institutionalization and deinstitutionalization). In the Britain/Northern Ireland case British deinstitutionalization (contraction) of 1922 by the partition of Irish Islands was the culmination of a “long process deinstitutionalization of the territorial shape of The British state as it was established...early in the nineteenth century.” Britain had to cross the two institutional thresholds (Ideological hegemony and Regime thresholds) to disengage from Ireland which took along incremental development from 1845 to the 1920s. The French colonization of Algeria did not culminate in creating a hegemonic belief that Algeria was an integral part of France. However, France had established Algeria as part of its central institutional buildup beyond the ‘regime threshold’. This threshold implied more difficulty to disengage from Algeria than the decolonization of other French colonies overseas. The case of Israel/Palestine reveals the same dynamics as the PLO negotiated with Israel on the OPT of 1967. These territories have not been institutionalized hegemonically as an integrated part of the state of Israel; however, they were institutionalized at the regime threshold and beyond towards expansionism especially starting the year 1977 when the right (Likud party) took power in Israel. Crossing regime threshold amounted in more difficulty in disengaging form the OPT.
This research applies the theory of “state contraction” to assess the extent to which the South African regime involved in state contraction as it yielded to democratization and the abandonment of apartheid, and the extent to which Israel’s involvement in the peace process was an act of contraction. Ultimately this inquiry aims at assessing the conditions that may or may not lead to democratization in the latter case by examining the effects of the combination of national-territorial nexus, domination systems and processes embedded in conflict dynamics. However, this research qualifies Lipstick’s model by bringing to attention another crucial conceptualization of the state; the state as a political-territorial entity. Introducing the concept of “regimes of territorial legitimation” as the founding construct of the state is a decisive factor in interpreting state contraction and expansion in settler-colonial settings. The institutional constructs of the dominating state in our understanding is affected profoundly by the determinants of state’s territorial ideology. State contraction, furthermore, as a process of deinstitutionalization is the embodiment of a dialectical relationship between state forces and challenging ethno-national groups/peoples. This dialectical relationship and its manifestations in a struggle over identity and territoriality induces dominant colonial states to establish regimes of domination and segregation in an attempt to sustain its ‘regimes of territorial legitimation’ and subordination. The struggle over identity-territorial boundaries as Lustik remarks is then a struggle over the rules of the political game: a struggle over transforming or changing the structures of domination and power asymmetries between ethno-national protagonists within a unitary state system. The following empirical chapters illustrate these conceptual treatments.
Chapter III

Ethno-national colonialism in South Africa

Introduction
The dramatic escalation of the conflict in South Africa in 1970s and 1980s reflected an advanced stage of regime’s erosion and the downturn of Afrikaner nationalism. The rise of African nationalism within a deeply divided society indicated to a dynamism that would have led to the total collapse of the state (Horowitz 1991). Indeed, the increased levels of violence between the years 1984-1992 and the rise of a African nationalist and anti-apartheid civic-democratic movements on the one hand, and regime’s oppression on the other made the sustainability of the regime more costly. Moreover, regimes regional failures and international increased pressure that turned South Africa into a pariah state. R. W. Johnson (1977: 314) remarks that regimes police strategy in dealing with anti-apartheid movement, and its regional setbacks that stemmed from regimes aggression undercut its ability to endure. The eclipse of apartheid also marked the downfall of Afrikaners’ racial ethno-nationality as the basis of political life and socio-economic privileges. The latter represented the essence of apartheid regime as well as the source of Africans’ discontent and resentment that led to the convergence of African nationalism and civic democratic organizations on the objective of thwarting apartheid. At the point where African nationalism was gaining the higher political and moral ground,
the regime of racial-ethnic domination was losing ground. Dan O’Meara (1996: 136) maintains that “by the end of 1977, virtually all commentators were agreed that on the burning issues of economic, social, and political policy, behind the overt face of hard-line control and repression, the government was virtually rudderless” (O’Meara 1996: 136).

The erosion of Afrikaner domination, however, started long before the 1970s as this chapter argues: apartheid collapse was a staged process that accompanied and sprung from the very structures of exclusion, territorial separation, and domination systems that were based on racial differentiation and premised on Afrikaner ethno-nationalism as the defining essence of state system. However, the contradictions and weaknesses of the racial-ethnically based regime rendered its sustainability rather precarious. Historical developments that led to the collapse of apartheid and the establishment of a non-racial democratic regime makes the case of South Africa illustrative for the purposes of our research: unveiling the conditions under which a racially base ethno-national conflict resulted in an integrative outcome. Thus our analysis addresses the conditions; structural and contextual that culminated in the collapse of a failing regime of ethno-territorial domination. As such the inquiry here is not concerned with the process by which the regime and the Africans’ national movement negotiated the provisional democratic transition; we emphasize the premises upon which the parties came to negotiate an integrative, unitary political entity that would preserve South Africa as one nation8.

8 Research and scholarly contributions on the process are many. To mention few: Lowendberg and Kaempfer (1998) and Lipton (1986) emphasize the role of domestic interest groups in the process; Sisk (1995), and Friedman and Atkinson (1994) are leading examples of research agenda that focuses on actors’ perspectives, opportunity, constitutional and institutional design using core concepts such as ‘mutually hurting stalemate’ and elite politics. Other studies’ pursue the effects of the combination of internal-
Initially, the conflict in South Africa was rooted in a settler-colonial enterprise that was characteristic of settler-colonial type of domination discussed in our conceptual framework. However, Afrikaners’ regime territorial ideology and the ‘regimes of territorial legitimation’ it adopted were not conducive to the construction of the whites as an ethnic core that is united and coherent to create and sustain a white South Africa. Moreover, dynamics of partial exclusion and exploitation contributed significantly to the failure of the regime to ethicize the conflict by ethnically homogizing the African people and the white society that was divided between Afrikaners and English-speaking communities. There are four major explanations for the rise of Afrikaner nationalism to power, its racial-colonial tenets, and the dynamics that led to its demise: (1) emphasizing ideology as the main driving force of racial-colonialism apartheid in 1948 (e.g. Jan J. Loubser 1968, p 379-80, and W.A. de Klerk 1975); (2) Economic explanations that focus on economic imperatives and the contradictions (especially exploitation and production relations) they created in the establishment and the collapse of apartheid (e.g. Legassick 1974, legassick and Innes 1977, Lowendberg and Kaempfer 1998 and Lipton 1986); (3) racist-colonial analyses that focus on white domination as a system of institutionalized unequal distribution of resources and opportunities based on skin color. Ultimately, this system aimed at the construction of white society with the Afrikaners in its core as a nation endowed with cultural and ethnic euphemism (Adam 1979: 33) and sometimes scientific discourse (see Rich 1994); (4) An eclectic perspective that looks upon especially structural and external factors that led to regimes acceptance to negotiate the conditions for its own end (e.g. Fredrik van Zyle Slabbert’s 1999). These perspectives explain the dramatic transition from apartheid and white domination to what Arend Lijphart (1994: 222), depicts as a consociational democracy and “optimal power sharing” political system based on constitutional arrangements and majoritarian rule that is prone to sustainability.
socioeconomic structures and their dynamics as well as structures of meanings and subjective aspects of the conflict as determinant sets of factors that contributed significantly to the eclipse of white rule in South Africa. Herman Giliomee (1995, 1979) shows how structural factors: a weak demographic base, a dramatically different regional and international conditions, and economic recession led to a serious debate within the white polity, which made the transition to democracy conceivable.

This research takes into account the dialectical relationship between two main sets of factors: the relationship between structures of territorial legitimation and separation, and systems of domination on the one hand and the certain events and interactions between the adversaries on the other, as combined forces that led to the staged demise of white rule in South Africa. The apartheid regime represented a rational group dictatorship of a collective social entity justified and partially driven by ethno-national ideology of racial differentiation, which was by and large mutable and adoptive to socioeconomic and political power shifts. Therefore, what accounts more is to pinpoint the features and the unique forms of racial segregation and apartheid as domination systems of a settler-colonial society seeking to reconstruct itself into ethno-national people. The causal chain that led to the demise of white domination rule is found in four principal factors:

First: the inability of the regime to create a valid separated territorial ideology accepted externally and ceded internally. Afrikaners’ regimes of territorial ideology were contingent, instrumental and indeterminate;

Second: the persistence of white cleavages that prevented coherency and unity based on an ethnic core that may have gained the properties of a nation/people;
Third: the minority status of the white society undermined its ability to sustain domination as an ethnic-territorial group; and

Fourth: indeterminate territorial ideology and lack of ethnic unity had yielded two weaknesses: first the dynamics of exclusion and exploitation showed contradictory consequences that gave Africans a political leverage, and second divisions and weak ethno-territorial identification generated the inconsistency of the ideological justifications and mobilization especially in 1960s and 1970s. Weaknesses and inconsistencies were worsened by the rise of African nationalism starting early 1960s. African nationalism challenged the kernel of Afrikaner objective manifested by Bantustan policy and showed that Africans have maintained their sense of national identification with South Africa.

The following empirical interpretations examine these factors through a process tracing method within a historical deep description narrative of the development of the conflict from colonial segregation to separation and apartheid as outlined in the introduction chapter of this research.

**South Africa: British imperialism and Afrikaner colonialism**

Afrikanerdom; Afrikaner ethno-national ideology was shaped and developed its political aspiration for power within a dual conflict: (1) a conflict with the British colonialism and English-speaking settlers that resulted in the wars of 1880-1 and 1898-1902. However, the convergence between British colonial interests and Afrikaners’ ambition for statehood yielded the establishment of the Union of South Africa in 1910; a
new member of the Commonwealth that would serve British objectives in the region. Taking over the keys of power in the new state divided the white colonial communities; Afrikaners and English-speaking settlers. White cleavages have remained a salient challenge for the regime that compromised the unity and cohesion of the white polity and amounted in governments’ inability to “achieving complete political hegemony over society as it was much more difficult for the government to take action against white opponents” (Guelke 2005: 23) who possessed considerable economic, cultural and political power. This structural condition will affect regime’s pursuit of ultimate domination and shall hinder the efforts to construct a white ethno-nationality as one nation; (2) the conflict with the indigenous black people and other ‘Coloured’ groups who struggled for their right of self-determination, which had been a great challenge to white domination and a core factor in its eclipse.

Internal challenges and external uneasy relationship with a colonial superpower founded the historical initial conditions that determined the main properties of the state as a settle-colonial construct. The Union of South Africa (read the Union) represented a system of state power based on racial differentiation. For the Afrikaners state power was the main source of political power that would enable them to establish their hegemony as a distinct ethno-nationality vis-à-vis other whites and in the face of the indigenous Africans. For a small minority (in 1904 the white community was roughly one-third of the population) capturing state power was a decisive condition for their supremacy in social, economic and political spheres of life. The state in this context was born outside and against the will of the majority of South African society whose exclusion and
subordination was a necessary condition for the success of white settlers’ enterprise. However, the foundation of the state, although externally imposed by Britain, had maintained the territorial integrity and contiguity of South Africa as a single country. The implications of political-territorial demarcation of the state would have fundamental effect on the political-geography of the conflict with the African national movement. The Union gained recognition as a modern state within this condition. Thus, slicing the territorial or spatial spheres of the country would be too costly for the regime while a system of segregation and exclusion would take a racially-based scheme whereby territorial segregation is instrumental in serving other supreme goals and objectives.

**Racial colonialism: Segregation and exploitation**

Although racial prejudice and segregation prevailed in the 18th and 19th centuries prior to the establishment of the Union, it was fragmented as each of the four European colonies enacted its own policies and measures. Lack of conformity in racial policies was fostered by geo-political fragmentation of Afrikaners’ ‘republics’ and British presence that blocked the emergence of a solid Afrikaner collective identity. Afrikaner identity emerged as a colonial-nationalist articulation of scattered settler groups in their fight against the natives for resources, and as a self-proclaimed anti-colonial (British) domination. The formation of the Union was welcomed by the Afrikaners as a perceived bottom-up process of state building that they were entitled to control in order to protect their interests and self-proclaimed national identity which otherwise was conditioned by
frontier (inland struggle for a foothold) conditions; a period that is out of the scope of our study and aptly covered in many studies (e.g. Giliomee 1979, Giliomee 2003, Worden 2000, Adam 1971, and Thompson 1995). The Frontier conditions are considered, in some accounts, to have shaped Afrikaners’ deep sense of distinctiveness as a nation superior to natives and distinct from English-speaking white settlers in their struggle for political power within a racially defined context.

White society in general was the locus of domination, coercion, and disdain of non-whites especially following the discovery of gigantic reserves of minerals in the interior. White settler, supported by the British colonial power became superior vis-à-vis the Black Africans (Guelke 2005: 56-58). Capturing the interior turned the settlement enterprise of white Europeans into extremely brutal and inhuman practices. Hobson (1900: 53) describes modes of coercion, subordination and enslavement of the indigenous and taking over their lands which placed them “in such a position of political and economic weakness that they are unable to refuse wage work upon terms offered by white masters.” The conditions Hobson depicts, in agreement with most of his contemporaries had created the foundation for formal policies of colonial rule in which

---

9 John Barrow; the British traveler in Southern Africa in his book An Account of Travels into the Interior of Southern Africa in the Years 1797 and 1798 shows the features of frontier Afrikaners’ attitudes. He blames the Afrikaner for the plight of the indigenous who were pushed to live under conditions comparing to which slavery is a better life. It is remarkable that he doesn’t attribute these practices to any notion of a divine mission or religious mandate. He asserts that they are the inhuman deeds of peasantry that took place away from any government’s eye, which gave them the opportunity to practice absolute power over the indigenous. Dr. John Philip’s Researches in Africa corroborates Barrow’s conclusion on the underlying reasons of Afrikaners’ inhumanity in this era. He noticed that oppressive practices of the colonists had not sprung from peculiar religious traditions or racial ideologies; rather they were in large part due to material interests namely finding forced labor. By the same token the Missionary David Livingstone articulated the objectives of the Christian mission in Southern Africa as being the “promotion of commerce, imperial expansion, and the general diffusion of the ‘blessings of civilization as intimately and providentially linked.
territorial separation and segregation served a racially defined socio-economic system of differentiation and subordination. However, the economic imperative coupled with political power considerations were also combined with ideological justifications and other typical European colonialist notions. Other explanations recognize the effects of the frontier as the structure within which Afrikaners’ racial practices developed.

Divinity and secularism in Shaping Afrikaner ethno-nationality

Ideological explanations focus on Afrikaners’ Protestant Calvinist\textsuperscript{10} belief that the Afrikaner community constructs a Chosen Biblical people. This ideology remained salient and represents a major source of Afrikaner ethno-nationalism. Thus B. J Vorster (South African Prime Minister from 1966 to 1978) pressed the messianic role of the Chosen Afrikaners by stating: “Yes, I believe profoundly, as always, that we have been appointed by Providence to play a role here and we have the human material to play that role” (quoted in Adam and Giliomee 1979: 17). Afrikaner nationalism as a grid of ethno-religious thinking and ethno-national identity offers a plausible explanation of racial

---

Livingstone though attributed the brutality and racial attitudes of the frontier Afrikaners to the conditions they endured that had a degenerative effect on their morality. (Cited in Du Toit 1989: 933-4, 939)

\textsuperscript{10}The origin of the Calvinist myth (the chosen people) leys in the fact that the pioneering Afrikaner settlers were Calvinists who came to the country with the Dutch East India Company (DEIC) whose main aim was to take South Africa as a refreshment point on the long trip to and from India. As Calvinists settled in the country they brought with them some Calvinist cultural traits (Du Toit 1989: 923). This implies that neither these settlers were fully indoctrinated as Calvinists nor they settled for primarily ideological reasons. Most early settlers, as Adam and Giliomee (1979: 24) remark, arrived to South Africa as individuals and employees of the DEIC “many of them adventurers, usually representing the opposite attitudes of those found in a cohesive persecuted religious community.”
segregation and, for this matter apartheid. However, the effects of Calvinism and the Covenant ideology remain controversial in terms of the degree to which they shaped Afrikaners’ racial attitudes and policies. Calvinism, beyond its religious prevalence, was a system of social and political affiliation that provided for integration and constructive social life. It provided for the demarcation and safeguarding of the relationship with the other, whether it be the indigenous or the other white British settlers. Thus Calvinist ideology was a politico-religious system of differentiation with political implications based on cultural supremacy of a nation in mission to carry on a divine mandate to redeem the culture of Voortrekkers (the pioneering settlers in the frontier) and reduce the heathens (as Afrikaners described the Africans) to a position of perpetual servitude (Du Toit 1983: 920).

Calvinism had fulfilled political, cultural and social functions that shaped Afrikaners’ self-conception and distinct identity as an ethno-national people. Calvinism was functional in drawing the lines of relationship between the Afrikaners and other peoples according to their racial biological origins. The effects of ideology were intertwined with typical European secular colonial notions of modernization that introduced Afrikaners as a civilizing force. Both discourses converged to produce a single practice characterized with conquest of the indigenous people and taking over their land (Du Toit 1983: 920) while segregating them to maintain distinctiveness.

The colonialist-secular nature of Afrikaner’s racialism becomes striking when we move from racial attitudes of individuals to social sphere where the structures of social relations unveil the political nature of racism in a colonial setting (Adam and Giliomee
The functional nature of Afrikaners’ Calvinism indicates its mundane origins; Afrikaners’ minority status resulted in high levels of anxiety, which made security and the privileges accrued from unity and conformity paramount. Cohesion and conformity are crucial for the sustainability of the social system of domination and racial segregation that protected white supremacy. Indeed, once well established, Afrikaners’ notions of nationhood and distinctiveness were a major source of political thinking and mobilization that bolstered racial discrimination and segregation as the base of political power and domination, and for social supremacy. In this sense Afrikaner ethno-nationalist sentiments was an adaptive response to particular opportunities as well as new exigencies of the prevailing socio-economic and political conditions at the eve of establishing the Union and along the track that led to apartheid.

To be sure, Afrikaner nationalism was not articulated and materialized as an organized political force until the last decade of the 19th century. Afrikaner Bong that was established in 1881 as the first political expression of Afrikaner national unity was indecisive in its politics as to whether or not it would attract the votes from groups (Giliomme 1979:101) other than the Afrikaners. Afrikaners’ racism and political organization was the product of a sphere of struggle within the white society and between the whites and native Blacks. The construction of Afrikaners as an ethno-nationality had to endure this structural difficulty of Black African existence as an overwhelming majority and the privileged English-speaking white competitor. Thus, the term Afrikaner itself was an exclusive that applies to white settlers of Dutch or Huguenot descends and Afrikaan speaking persons who believed in the common cause of Afrikaners as a nation.
The salience of Afrikaner ethno-nationality in this sense exacerbated the divisions within the white society and among Afrikaners as segments of them supported unity with British while Afrikaner nationalists sought independence from British influence: this cleavage would prevail until 1948 when the Nationalist Party ascended to power. The rise of the white as a distinct ethno-nationality based on the notions of Afrikanerdom remained blurred, weak, and adoptive to the developments in the social and, socio-economic, and political spheres at certain historical contexts (Giliomee 1979: 83). Ideological underpinnings of Afrikaner ethno-national identity were immutable, protean and subject to political power configurations and socioeconomic changes related to shifts in the economic system of exploitation intertwined with the sought for political power.

Afrikaners’ racial colonialism was shaped under the conditions of the ‘frontier’ conditions that created what Du Toit (1983: 931) conceptualize as the “Degeneracy Paradigm”. This syndrome depicts how Afrikaners’ morality had been by the harsh struggle for viability to the extent whereby demonizing the indigenous was inevitable. Thus lack of morality and religious constraints drove Afrikaners’ racial prejudices rather than religious impulse. Moreover, the minority status of the Afrikaners – and whites in general - generated another syndrome: security dilemma. Confining indigenous Blacks and dominating them can be seen through this lens (Laundahl 1992, cited in Loenberg and Kaempfer 1998: 31). Perceptions of security threat worked on two levels: separating the non-whites and solidifying Afrikaner identity; both processes required a certain degree of political power and institutional arrangements. Afrikaners’ ability to practice such a power in per-state period relied on the geographical isolation they had in their
barren colonies from a central government. In the inland colonies Afrikaners exploited, by brutal means, the indigenous for their own material interests especially as forced and cheap labor. Therefore ideas of national destiny and mission can be understood as a rationalization of expansionist and greedy actions.

Practices of racism were materialized through a set of legislations in the Colonies that aimed at achieving two complimentary imperatives: to territorially separate Africans from white communities and simultaneously to provide for labor in mines and farms. Colonial governments and local Afrikaner republics enacted several laws that separated black farmers from their lands. At one level Africans’ success in managing their own farms enabled them to compete with white farmers and in some regions black peasant farmers earned higher returns than white smallholders (Lowenberg and Kaempfer 1998: 33). Eliminating the competition was necessary for white economy to flourish. At another level, alienating blacks from the land was a modality of subordinated through which landless Africans were forced into a property-less labor in white-owned farms and mines (Lowenberg and Kaempfer 1998: 33) and to live in reserves at the periphery of white communities. Black workers were crucial for the performance of South African economy as cheap and manageable work force but at the same time they were perceived as a menace to Afrikaners’ sense of distinctiveness and the social order they espoused.

As Loenberg and Kaempfer (1998) notice South African economy had suffered from the shortage of working force in farms and mines and the “existence of a viable and flourishing black peasant sector raised the opportunity cost of black labour to white farmers” and min-owners who relied on coercive measures to deprive blacks from their lands and later to rely on state power to enforce political and legislative tools to achieve this objective. These governments resorted to a variety of methods to deprive the blacks from their land including the imposition of cash taxes, outright confiscation of land from Africa tribes, and the confinement of black land ownership to designated reserves.
Thus, territorial separation and the creation of reserves was not the linchpin of racist colonial enterprise; it rather was instrumental although it exhibited certain ideological aspects to justify it. The main feature of territorial segregation until the enactment of apartheid in 1948, therefore, was the separation of residential areas that was perceived by Afrikaners and English-speaking whites in terms of “different geographical regions of white and black land settlement” (Rich 1990: 667). It did not show any profound territorial ideology beyond drawing the boundaries of Black communities in the low areas and regions that are clearly less developed, over-crowded, and stigmatized. To be sure prior to 1910 the main features of territorial segregation were determined by each of the four former colonies and republics, each of which “had pursued separate policies of residential segregation” (Christopher 1989: 421). They had some conformity at specific aspects of segregation such as the colonies of Good Hope and Natal’s policy of denying citizenship and the right to hold land to all who were not officially white. The core issue of racist segregation was depriving non-white communities and especially the Africans of all means of economic, social and political viability and simultaneously exploiting them. Social and political was structures along a partial exclusionist policy that allowed exploitation. Partial exclusion, segregation, and exploitation would become systematic, formal, and consistent in the post-state era.

12 For example, the British colony of Good Hope maintained a nominally colour-blind franchise policy where segregation was based on class and wealth. By the year 1910 this colony had diversified its system of segregation. The Natal colonial government on its turn was far more restrictive whereby blacks were expected not to remain in the towns except as single workers (see Christopher 1989: 425-6)
The Afrikaners: from Republics to state ethno-nationality

Understanding Afrikaner nationalism as a system of settler-colonial differentiation and segregation starts from the point where Afrikaners revived as the state system of the Union of South Africa (USA). This development wouldn’t have been possible apart from British colonial policies. British Empire and English settlers in South Africa played a major role in shaping the nature and dynamics of South African white rule before and after the establishment of the Union. British colonial authorities turned a blind eye to the practices of settlers in the interior and failed to uphold a color-blind franchise; instead and in spite of British victory in the 1898-1902 the Treaty of Vereeniging of 1902 that ended the war enshrined the white-only franchise (Guelke, 2005: 63) which was the most important legalizing underpinnings of segregation that served the interests of English-speaking white settlers who sought the perpetuation of the pre-capitalist economies in the African reserves” (Rich, 1990: 665). Indeed for English-speaking whites who captured the biggest chunk of the economy, segregation was crucial for them to maintain the source of their economic power and social supreme status through exploiting Black labor. However, and in contrast to Afrikaner’s total segregation, they opted to maintaining a narrow separation system that would create social differentiations within the African community that facilitate containment. This contrast was deepened by the question of the relationship between the new state and its backer, Britain.

The formation of the state was a compromise between English-speaking settlers allied with segments of Afrikaner community who espoused a lasting tie between South
Africa and Britain on the one hand, and the Afrikaners who sought independent from the Empire as a free nation on the other. Thus the issue of white settlers’ unity had been a fundamental concern for the Afrikaner ruling elites that was threatened by these opposing trends. Afrikaner control over the state and the political system would be undermined by white divisions and their sought to establish their ethno-national identity would be compromised by lack of unity. Divisive pattern would be exacerbated by Afrikaner control of the state as we discuss below.

The establishment of the Union in 1910 was a major turning point in the institutionalization of racial-colonialism that provided Afrikaners with the source of political power they pursued for decades. Primarily, this development sparked Afrikaner ethno-national colonial ambitions (Rich 1994: 55) as the first and most organized and coherent institutional success they gained. As of 1910 the dynamics of social relationships and socio-economic structures of racial domination and segregation would become the state system and settler-colonial practices would become systematic and guided by vision of exclusive racial ethno-national nation-building. However, this task was conditioned by the compromise upon which the state was established. Until 1948, the rise of apartheid, Afrikaner efforts to ethno-nationalizing racial-colonial state system was significantly hindered by this condition (Giliomee 1979:104). Both parties that ruled the most in this period; the South African Party (SAP) and the United Party (UP) focused their political and institutional energies on creating one white nation out of the two competing settler groups.
Unifying efforts had been opposed by a strong Afrikaner political force of nationalist leaders mainly J. B. M Hertzog (Prime minister from 1924-1939) and D. F. Malan (Prime minister from 1948-1954) who believed that South Africa was entitled to separate development and full independence from Britain; the Afrikaners, within the political entity they espoused, “Should retain their unique nationality” as Hertzog contended. Malan went further to give this claim a divine dispensation (Giliomee 1979: 105-6). Separating the development of the two white communities was perceived by nationalist Afrikaners as a precondition for the development of their community to achieve parity with the English-speaking white community who was much more well-to-do economically and stronger culturally. For Afrikaner nationalists asserting Afrikanerdom was more important than unity and their ethnic identification preceded their class affiliations, which resulted in the deepening of the divide within the white society and widening the colonial buffer that separated white settlers from natives. Although the nascent capitalist economy exploited Afrikaner workers as well as Blacks and Coloureds, for Afrikaner nationalists it was ethnic and racial issues that came first and prevented cross-class interactions and coalitions.

Afrikaner community was mobilized mainly by language, Afrikaans, in order to establish the social and political bases of racial segregation within a hierarchy that would guarantee Afrikaners’ supremacy as a collective ethno-national group within production relations that prevailed in this period. Job market - already segregated when the Union

---

13 Comparing to the well-established urban Anglo workers the Afrikaners who migrated to the towns often entered the job market at a low point of wage and skills beneath their Englishmen counterparts. The vast gap between the two communities in terms of their wealth was striking; the ration of the per capita income of the Afrikaners and the English is estimated at 100-300 in 1910 (Giliomee 1979, p107)
was established- was distinguished by the significant gap between black and white wages whereby the later gained much less than the former for the same job\textsuperscript{14}. This competition explains partially white workers prejudice against their African counterparts and white workers refusal to receive the same rates as blacks for the same job in the same market indicates that underlying assumption that white workers must have a European living standard that blacks were not entitled to. As Malan put it “The white man, because he is white, is expected – whatever his chances in the labor market – to maintain a white standard of living” (cited in Gilomee 1979: 108). Segregation in this sense was not only a system of exploitation but also a means of asserting white supreme identity as racially defined ethnic group.

The exigencies of unity coupled with Afrikaner’s effort to tighten their grip on state institutions postponed the creation of a well-defined segregation strategy. Segregation of races between 1910 and 1930 remained fragmented. However Afrikaner colonial ethno-nationalism with its strong segregationist impulse has had the appeal as the locus of white supreme status and privileges among the majority of the Afrikaner community. Opposing trends within the white community rendered the question of the Native an ultimate issue in the first years of the Union. This was a period of Afrikaner turmoil in which the effects of early capitalist industrialization\textsuperscript{15} and urbanization generated different reactions in the white society especially Afrikaner community. The

\textsuperscript{14} For example, between 1900-1940black workers in the cities accepted to do unskilled jobs for two shillings and six pence per day while white workers were not willing to do the same job for less than three shillings and six pence (Giliomee 1979: 108)

\textsuperscript{15} At the beginning of the 20th century only 10 per cent of the Afrikaners lived in cities and villages; in 1911 this figure had risen to 29 per cent and to 41 per cent in 1926 to 75 per cent in 1960 (Giliomee 1979: 104).
latter, under the effects of modernization had shown diverging levels of ethnic-national affiliation which represented a threat to Afrikaner nationalist sought to reconstruct Afrikaners as an ethno-nationalist people.

Following its victory in the war of 1899-1902 Britain enacted the legislation of South African Act of 1909 that founded the legal bases of the ‘Constitution of the Union of South Africa’ that enshrined white minority rule. Britain was preoccupied with retaining its power over the country through the Commonwealth, and had maintained its economic lucrative ties with it while offering vocal support to peaceful change and majority rule (Ohlson and Stedman, 1994: 44). The formation of the Union contributed significantly to the rise of Afrikaner ethno-national mobilization and segregationist practices. State system would become the main source of power utilized by Afrikaners to consolidate segregation as the defining system of social relationships. Harnessing state power enabled Afrikaner nationalists to mobilize Afrikaans speaking whites regardless of class status or social affiliation, behind a common objective: the achievement of Afrikaner nationalism involved the pursuit of both cultural and political goals. Invoking Afrikaner nationalism transcended the particularistic class interests within the group and inter-group relations alike. The result was the emergence of powerful collective nationalist actors (Adam 1979: 62) especially political parties and nationalist associations who believed in Afrikaners as a nation. Indeed “It was the entrenchment of Afrikanerdom as a political class, encompassing all economic classes of the ethnic group that made possible an ethnic revolution through the capture of state power” (Adam 1979: 36), which
gave significant popular support for the implementation of segregation as a state system. In this sense, segregation was a dual system of social status differences and unequal political entitlements on the one hand, and exploitation of the subordinate group on the other.

In the social realm it was a system of expected conduct by the subordinate group that conforms to the criteria of the super-ordinate especially separate residential locations and social hierarchy; the defiance from such a conduct was intolerable. State discipline power and bio-power strands were deployed to facilitate exploitation and to tame political dissent while maintaining a certain level of exclusion. It was through administrative and regulative methods in the realms of economic and social relationships that the state sustained and consolidated segregation in this period. Segregation and its modalities were conditioned upon Africans political weakness and fragmentation; in so far as African nationalism was tamed state power worked on those two levels (discipline and bio-power) which endured until 1930s where sovereign power was also introduced to entrench racism and social differentiation. It was in the wake of 1948, though when the state deployed a blanket sovereign power to reconstruct racial relations within ethno-national separated terrains as we will see.

Thus, segregation policies in the 1910 until early 1920s remained contextual but primarily aimed at excluding non-white communities from property rights regime and from central political institutions of the state but not from the production process as a work force. Indigenous Black community was confined and exploited simultaneously; two inseparable imperatives for the white society to accumulate and dominate within a
growing capitalist and rapidly industrialized country. To be sure, Afrikaners had shown a persisting permanent existence through which they invested capital and resources, which further increased their collective sense of identity and entrenched their interests in sustaining and maintaining racial-colonial relationships. Afrikaners conceived of their existence as an independent nation rather than compradors for a metropolitan center, Britain. As argued in chapter I, settler-colonial dominant groups differ from classic colonialism in this particular aspect that is a necessary condition for their transformation into an ethno-national entity. Therefore, formalizing and institutionalizing segregation practices was crucial in order to mobilize and unify the white and especially Afrikaners and give them a viable and stable system of social relations that champion and uplift their distinctiveness and independence taking advantage of state power and a tradition of segregation established before state formation and Afrikaners’ ascendance to power.

Shortly before 1910 Lord Alfred Milner (the British High Commissioner of South Africa, and Governor of Cape Colony since 1897) formed the Lagden Commission in 1903 to examine what he described as ‘native policy’. The aim was to found a compromise between racial extremism within the white community that demanded an overt racist interpretation of political life on the one hand, and the colonial establishment that sought to reduce the effects of racial extremism on the other. The Commission represented the need for a unitary or an agreed upon policy on the Native issue (Rich 1990: 670) and it proposed that the existing division of land and separate holding of land should be the foundation of territorial separation between the Africans and the whites.

[16] It was dubbed the “South African Native Affairs Commission”, 1903-5 and was chaired by the secretary of native affairs in the Transvaal, Sir Godfrey Lagden.
while it “recognized that Africans’ reserves could serve as labor reservoirs for the white areas” (Guelke, 2005: 64). Thus the recommendations espoused a segregated territorial-residential social sphere within which the inclusion of African labor in economic processes imply social costs for the white society namely, the ability of Black Africans to disrupt white endeavor for a distinctiveness. “Proletarianizing” the Black African workforce as an indispensable factor for the development of white capitalism granted the former to practice political leverage over the latter. Spatial and territorial separation wouldn’t become absolute or sought as a precondition for the constitution and consolidation of Afrikaner or white racial ethno-nationality. Lagden Commission’s propositions were formalized in the Native Land Act of 1913\(^\text{17}\) which meant to create conformity of social practices to organize an already established social reality of domination and subordination structured in territorial separation. The Act was a victory to segregationists amongst the Afrikaner community and deepened state involvement in shaping segregation policies including labor market regulations and resources allocation. The colonial buffer separating settler-colonial society from the indigenous was expanded by a top-down and formal procedure that attempted to circumscribe the effects of Black integration in the economic system of the state but also it represented the interests and attitudes of white electorate (Christopher 1989: 421).

The conformity with which the state sought to practice segregation was a necessary policy for the articulation of a unitary white political entity that was otherwise split over the question of the natives and over white intra-group relations. On the level of

\(^{17}\) The Act defined the areas designated for the Africans as reserves owned and used by Africans, which comprised less than 9% of the country. Moreover, it enacted that purchasing or renting land outside these reserves is prohibited for the Africans.
white politics state adoption of segregation as a formal policy aimed at bridging over
divisions that plagued white politics through ethnic-class stratification across races
whereby the widening gap between people of the same class category and different ethnic
affiliation became more pervasive. Introducing state power to homogenize the whites and
non-whites created a distinct domination system whereby African ethno-national identity
and their class status and economic exploitation intersected to accumulate grievances of
economic exploitation, social status and political injustice within a socio-economic
structure of partial exclusion.

In spite of state efforts to legalize and institutionalize segregation the Afrikaner
polity remained inconsistent in its position over the level of segregation necessary for the
social order and economic system to hold (Guelke 2005: 44). Thus while some political
leaders warned against extreme segregation measures such as General Smuts who
believed that such a policy would cause the gravest trouble for South Africa (Quoted in
Rich 1990: 673), the supporters of all-out segregationist policies demanded more state
intervention in consolidating segregation and differentiation especially labor regulation
and residential areas. Moreover, for some Afrikaners segregation and especially the
resettlement of the African population in reserves - that is required for segregation to
work - would disrupt the pattern of paternalistic structure of colonial control that was
established in the preindustrial era (Rich 1990: 673). The most important outcome of
these opposing currents was the politicization of the question of black-white relationships
against the background of increasing anxieties accompanied the beginning of industrial
era that gave more salience to Afrikaner national mobilization. Socio-economic changes
of industrialization and the salience of the native question turned political process especially elections into a tool of mobilization based on racial issues (Adam 1979: 67-68). Thus, white politics would be one of the most decisive elements in the development of segregation and racial-colonialism in South Africa as the Union entered the 1920s and well into the 1930s.

**White politics and the climax of segregation 1920s-30s**

The SAP lead by Jan Christiaan Smuts dominated the political arena since the establishment of the Union. The main opposition party was the English-speaking Unionist Party. However, socioeconomic changes emanating from the transition to a capitalist industrial economy came to change this balance of power. The main social force that stood behind political alignment shifts was Afrikaner workers who demanded political arrangements that promote their interests and protect them in the face of rapid urbanization and the increase of black competition. With the increase of industrialization as Giliomee (1979: 108) remarks Afrikaner workers were more attracted to nationalist notions of separate unions and separate classes in order to preserve Afrikaners’ status and privileges. Industrialization processes of 1920s had triggered profound dynamics of socioeconomic changes that formed the social base of political polarization within the Afrikaner community. One of the most striking socioeconomic changes of the era was the
increase of the poor among the Afrikaner population\textsuperscript{18} especially in the cities and towns, which resulted in a remarkable rise of nationalist sentiments.

The increasing Afrikaner nationalist sentiments had driven those workers away from white unions especially because most these unions were led by non-Afrikaners and considered foreign entities. On the psychological level Afrikaners in the 1920 through 1930s faced social dislocation that stemmed from urbanization and resulted in a deep sense of insecurity and uncertainty. Poorest Afrikaner strata and middle class (especially clergy and educators) were the most attracted to nationalist rhetoric and political mobilization (Giliomee 1979: 111) in support of Afrikanerdom. Questions of racial and national affiliation and political identification had become overwhelmingly prevalent and were related to the native question and segregation policies; the later would become one of the most – if not the most, important issue in polarizing white society as it pertained to the very interests and social superiority of a wide social strata of Afrikaners.

Social stratification resulted from industrialization only exacerbated malicious political cleavages that started to surface as early as the formation of the Union. Following the election of 1910 J.B. Hertzog; the leader of the Orange Free State defected from the government and formed the National Party (NP) in 1914. Further divisions occurred as a result of South African participation in the First World War alongside Britain. This decision instigated a white military rebellion that was soon crushed by force. Although the SAP remained in rule it could not sustain the support of majority

\textsuperscript{18} The Carnegie Commission Report of 1932 estimated the number of poor white population at 300,000 or 17 per cent of the white population (Guelke 2005:76).
Afrikaners\textsuperscript{19} (Barber 1999: 76) following the workers’ uprising and the controversy on the war. South Africa’s participation in the war allowed the regime to gain a regional role as an imperialist regional power\textsuperscript{20} which strengthened an outward focus of Smuts’ government that contributed to SAP loss of the 1924 election. Regional focus of Smut’s government overshadowed crucial domestic issues of racial relations and the amelioration of social repercussions of industrialization.

The election of 1924 had shown the serious political polarization in the white community: The SAP lost for the alliance of the National Party (NP) and the segregationist South African Labor Party (SALP), which was a significant victory for the proponents of overt segregation and nationalist intransigence. While the SAP was supported by land and mine owners, and industrialists the winning alliance was widely supported by white labor and farmers. These allegiances were reasonable taking into account socio-economic changes we mentioned above that brought with it a strong unionized white labor aristocracy in new urban centers (especially in Witwatersrand and Orange Free State). For white workers segregationist policies will serve their interests by protecting them from black labor competition and by legislations that will promote their

\begin{footnote}

\textsuperscript{19}The National Party under the leadership of Hertzog gained 78,000 while the South African Party polled 94,000 votes. Taking into account that the SAP had the English-speaking whites’ support whereas the NP gained his votes exclusively from the Afrikaners, the results were indicative of the change of political power.

\textsuperscript{20}South Africa was appointed the status of a Mandate over South West Africa with the support of the British government. South Africa went so far in its Mandatory jurisdiction to allocate vast areas of land for the settlement of white settlers. This encouraged the regime to start seeking the annexation of Southern Rhodesia as well (Gulke 2005: 71). This expansionist attitude will witness a reinvigorating effort later by the P.W. Botha government in the late 1970s and 1980s. However, Smuts’ government could not change the territorial boundaries of the state that remained the same until 1960s. But the regional role the regime fulfilled and the alliance with Britain consolidated regimes position and the Union’s importance as an influential state in the politics of Africa.
\end{footnote}
standard of living (Lowenberg and Kaempfer 1998: 35). Thus segregationist policies appear to have been the result of interest groups pressure on the regime. However, although economic and status calculations played an important role in these political shifts, mobilizing Afrikaner working and middle classes relied heavily on cultural and identity discourse. This was evident even as both the NP the Purified National Party (PNP) of Malan resorted to Afrikaner nationalist rhetoric to mobilize political support for diverging, and indeed conflicting, political goals. While Hertzog sought to redefine Afrikanerdom by building a white cross-ethnic middle-class coalition, Malan sought to unify the Afrikaners politically to go it alone and achieve their political superiority (Giliomee 1979: 113). Moreover, tightening segregation and territorial separation coupled with increased Afrikaner nationalism was bound to the structural changes rather than to merely the pressure of certain groups. To be sure, social order during the transition into a modernized capitalist social system and economic performance depended on state measures to protect whites’ interests and at the same time to maintain economic vibrancy and stability of the country. The latter goal required the preservation of the ‘reserve economy’ that provided for a portion of the means necessary for the reproduction of the migrant Black work force to urban white areas. The imperative in this era was to “maintain separate areas with distinct production relations” (Legassick 1974: 6), which formed the basis for segregation in terms of its spatial, territorial and property rights spheres.

Segregation policies continued apace in the 1920s as well as in 1930s their territorial and spatial aspects. The government tightened influx control measures to
restrict Black Africans from moving from their reserves to white towns and cities. Influx control and other geographical constrain on black mobility and property rights increased the number of black workers who moved constantly to and from urban white working areas to their reserves. The increase of black workers in urban industrial projects driven by capitalist sought of more profits gained from cheaper labor raised the levels of competition with white workers. Therefore restricting the number of black workers turns to be a condition for better wages for the whites. White farmers also benefited from the existence of a large pool of unskilled black workers (Lowenberg and Kaempfer 1998: 37). Thus to say that segregation was driven mainly by white working class and farmers’ interest groups is partial as the whole change in the structures of the economy and social relations required a remodeling of segregation policies and territorial separation.

Racial segregation remained the dominant state policy during the 1925-1939 regardless of the controversy within the Afrikaner community in particular and the white community in general over racial policy. Following on the footsteps of former governments21 this period witnessed an intensification of measures that extended and confirmed the essential features of segregationist strategy. However, resorting to legislation was increasingly characteristic to segregation policies in an indication of increased state sovereign power to sustain racial differentiation. Governments’ main focus in 1920s-1930s was urban areas and aimed at restricting Black integration in white

---

social life and to fixate the geography of racial boundaries\textsuperscript{22}. The Pact government (1924-1938) under the Premiershiop of J.B. Hertzog\textsuperscript{23} enacted a series of measures to protect mine-owners and white workers from the shortage of labor and from African labor competition\textsuperscript{24}. The ultimate aim was to secure a higher level of life for white workers and a cheap African labor for the mining industry. The Pact government also curtailed the electoral power of non-Whites especially in the Cape, and furthered the system of allocating reserved areas for Blacks as permanent homes while regulating their movements in the remainder of the country. These measures not only created conformity of the social order but also, and as a result, contributed profoundly to relaxing white class and ethno-national cleavages and tensions between Afrikaners and English-speaking communities and within the Afrikaner community between nationalists and their political rivals as Legassick (1974) notices.

Policies of racial segregation in this sense were a safeguard to mobilize the entire white community in defense of white settler power and domination, and the preservation of controlled influx of forced cheap Black labor that was a condition for economic

\textsuperscript{22} For example, the Housing Act of 1920 remained intact and unchanged well through the 1920s-1930s. It provided for financial assistance to municipalities in building houses for the poorer section of the community. The condition for this project was to establish racially homogeneous housing estates. The Act resulted in the creation of mono-racial belts of residential areas on the margins of white urban towns. (Christopher 1989: 426)

\textsuperscript{23} Hertzog was Prime Minister and also Minister of Native Affairs, while his comrade in the nationalist Afrikanerdom stream D.F Malan was the leader of the NP in the Cape, and became Minister of the Interior, Public Health and Education. The English Labour Party was rewarded with two ministries (ministry of Defense, and Ministry of Public Works, Posts and Telegraphs as a sign of gratitude by Hertzog for the Party’s help in getting him into power.

\textsuperscript{24} The most important measure was the enactment of the Industrial Conciliation Act of 1924, which created an industrial council with the powers to lay down minimum wages in particular industries. This Act was complimented by the Wage Act of 1925, which enabled the government directly to set minimum wages for the employees who are not part of a trade union.
performance of white economy. Neither of these two related goals was achievable, the way Afrikaner elites saw it, apart from forming a coherent white community through an organized effort of mobilization and nation-building of racial ethno-national quality. The base of mobilization had changed at this turn; language alone was not sufficient to mobilize diverse political perspectives and the need for all-white unity rather than Afrikaner unity and ethno-nationalism, which was the core of Hertzog believes. This was a reasonable change as Afrikaners gradually became more confident in their grip over political power and their socioeconomic and cultural status vis-à-vis the Anglo whites and the natives. The accommodation of English-speaking community within Afrikaners’ polity had become of a paramount importance for the creation of a single ethno-nationality that will provide for the hegemony (Terreblanche 2002: 261) that Afrikaners lacked over the social sphere. Indeed white-white cleavage was a profound hindrance to a successful and ethnically viable nation-building and the consolidation of Afrikaners’ political power on a unitary white state.

English-speaking whites, Rich (1990: 666) remarks, were in favor of a segregation policy based on discipline power and social control rather than segregation. Disciplinary power in this sense would suppress class struggle and stratifies African community along social rather than racial-ethnic lines and reduce its ability to political mobilization. Therefore they aimed at the establishment of a social rather than a racial hierarchy, which gives the regime a significant degree of legitimation from the society at large including certain segments of the native Africans and Coloured communities. Afrikaners, by contrast, were more preoccupied with racial and latter with racial-ethnic hierarchy as the system that
guarantees white supremacy regardless of the degree of legitimacy it derives from the non-white. The success of the Pact government to silence these cleavages in the 1920s, however, changed at the turn of the decade.

The divisions within the Afrikaner community in 1930s were more salient; according to C.T. Loran’s classification three strands of thought on racial relations prevailed: “repressionists”, “equalists”, and “segregationists” with the latter hold the middle ground (Cited in Rich 1990: 667). Many justifications of racial inequality were articulated to support the segregationist perspective and present it as a benevolent endeavor that aimed at upgrading non-white in separation from white communities, which allows both communities to develop each on its own right and by its own means. Segregationists’ camp gained a new force with the emergence of the PNP (1935) that advocated Afrikanerdom and the supreme objective of constituting Afrikaners as Volk. Malan protested the silencing of Afrikanerdom and aimed to counterweight what he saw as United Party selling out of Afrikaners’ interests to the British Empire. The UP that found its social base mainly among capitalist strata of Afrikaners and Anglo settlers represented a direct threat to the Afrikaner petty bourgeois that saw it as an imperialist coalition with the UK. By the same token, Afrikaner middle class (lawyers, teachers,

---

25 The formation of the PNP resulted from a break away from the National Party of Barry Hertzog as the latter formed the United Party as the merger of the NP and Smuts’ SAP. Daniel Malan and other 19 MPs protested the step and defect the NP to establish the PNP.

26 The expression volk had a twofold function: in the first it asserted the distinctiveness of the Afrikaners from the indigenous not only as a race but more importantly as an ethnic-nationality with well defined boundaries, which amounted in the enactment of apartheid. It also emphasized the struggle to wrest the country from the English-speaking British and place its future in the hands of the Afrikaners, which indicates the long and eager lust for sovereignty and political power. In the latter sense it is striking that once the NP was in power in 1948 English-speaking bureaucrats, soldiers, and state employees were sidelined by reliable Afrikaners, with key posts going to Broederbond members. The electoral system itself was manipulated to reduce the impact of immigrant English speakers.
professors, and low-level civil servants) saw their positions and status threatened by the influence of English language, English bureaucrats, and the more sophisticated English culture. Moreover, UP strong commitment to capitalist development implied the denationalization of the Afrikaner working class as a result of mobilizing class relations rather than racial affiliation (Giliomee 1979: 110-14) under the influence of English-speaking elites. These material interests and cultural anxieties culminated in a wide range of polarization and mobilization between the UP and the PNP; both resorted to Afrikaner Nationalist tenets that each party defined and interpreted in ways that suited its political aims. The chief victor of this era was Afrikaner national identity and the revival of strong Afrikaner cultural sentiments, which the two political rivals competed to uplift and utilize in their political rivalry and struggle for power.

The PNP strong tendency in favor of “extending the scope, depth, and details of segregationist policy (and apply it to the Coloureds) gave a high degree of saliency to its nationalist stance. The main success of the NP in this period was rallying most intellectuals - who joined other social forces that opposed UP policies - to form the ‘Afrikaner Broederbond’, which focused its energy in the cultural arena and the promotion of Afrikaner language as well to “igeologize Afrikaner history and identity” (Giliomee 1979: 112) as sacred, which amounted to the evolution of a civil religion or a politico-religious thought in the Afrikaner community based on the belief that Afrikaners

27 By the year 1937 over 300 organizations were affiliated to the Broederbond, which put the movement in the lead to reinvigorate the cultural and ideological aspects of Afrikaner identity: the resurrection of the Great Trek mythology and its meanings that reminded the Afrikaners with the frontier settlement and heroism of the pioneering Dutch who colonized the inlands of South Africa.
belonged to an elect people. Notions of Afrikaner bond gave political rise and social viability to the aspirations of Republicanism and Afrikaners’ nationalism.

The period of 1930s was strikingly an era of a politico-religious grid of thinking among Afrikaners as the bedrock of establishing the Afrikaner nation. Thus the NP “with its immediate concern to preserve the ‘taal’, the ‘Kultuur’ and the priority of ‘South Africa first’ within the politics of the larger Commonwealth” (Rich 1994: 56) gave it more political viability especially with Hertzog powerful concept of a united Afrikaans and English-speaking volk united in a new Afrikanerdom. Hertzog’s new approach, which indicates a profound change in the ideological underpinnings of Afrikaner ethno-nationalism, can be considered the intellectual genesis of apartheid: escaping the logic of racial colonial features of white-native relationships by ethnicizing the conflict as between one ethno-national group (the white) and other ethno-nationally defined black groups. Perceptions of white ethno-national entity increased significantly as political elites where in the race to win the minds and hearts of Afrikaners through nationalistic outbidding. This process will be seriously disrupted following Smuts government’s decision to participate in Second World War alongside Britain, which instigated fierce opposition within the Afrikaners especially within the UP government.

Segregation and territorial separation until the turn of 1940s was part of a wider pattern of modernization processes that engulfed South African society” (Rich 1990: 666) and turned it into a capitalist system of social relations. Racial differentiation ideology and practices are less the product of Afrikaner unique cultural roots than the result of the ideological labors of modernizing elite seeking to insure social cohesion in transitional
times (Du Toit 1989: 9520) that threatened the already divided white community. Consequently, socioeconomic changes and political volatility radicalized the Afrikaner community and resurrected Great Trek ideology and culture, which reemerged not only from mere convictions; rather, as an outcome of a set of social, economic and political dynamics that spurred further evolution of the Afrikaner nationalist agenda. However; World War Two came to interrupt this pattern and divide the Afrikaner community again and to set the scene for the ascendance of the Nationalist Party apartheid. Smuts decision to take part in the war alongside Britain, in the words of Giliomee (1979: 114) “rekindled all the old anti British and anti-imperialist sentiments and was ultimately decisive in persuading the majority of the Afrikaners to go it alone politically, which gave rise to forces of apartheid.
Chapter IV
Apartheid as an ethno-territorial control system

Introduction
The landslide victory of the Herenigde Nasionale Party (Reunited National Party from the PNP and the faction that had merged with the SAP) in the election of 1948 was a dramatic event that changed the political landscape in South Africa and introduced new notions of racial relationships and political power. The victory came within a process of mobilization of the Afrikaner community led by Malan who stirred Afrikaners’ bitterness against British taking advantage of wide opposition to participation in the war. In this sense the political appeal of the NP in the election can be seen through the lenses of Afrikaner strong identification with their sense of distinctiveness and their longing to ultimate political independence from British influence. However, NP revival in 1948 is fundamentally related to the dynamics within the Afrikaner community and its political identification that made this victory possible. Until 1948, Afrikaners did not seem to be close to their original objective to constitute their distinctiveness into a coherent territorially based ethno-national people. As a minority threatened by a vast indigenous and partially integrated majority and another adamant rival, Afrikaners’ drift toward chauvinist ethno-nationalism under the leadership of the NP represented a strategy that would impede assimilation and integration. Apartheid can be seen as an answer to the no-
exit stalemate within the system of segregation and an answer to white society fractured ethno-national identity.

**The National Party and the advent of Afrikaner ethno-territoriality**

The tenets embedded in apartheid were not entirely new to Afrikaner nationalist leaders of the NP. D.F. Malan assured in 1944 that one of the aims of the ‘Republic’ and the NP was “to insure the safety of the white race and of Christian civilization by the honest maintenance of the principle of apartheid and guardianship” (Guelke 2005: 3). Malan’s statement reflects Afrikaners’ disillusionment with their achievements after three decades of rule where rapid socioeconomic changes allowed the Black community to achieve a measure of social and economic viability and thus political leverage that threatened to bore the segregation system from inside out. Processes of modernization had given African community a chance to develop their income, education, and unionist bargaining power and therefore created a feeling among the Afrikaners that their “self-proclaimed racial superiority over the black Africans was melting away” despite racist legislation (Olson and Stedman 1994: 41). Afrikaners’ feeling of threat also stemmed from the rivalry with the English-speaking community that possessed economic and cultural edge, which raised the stakes for the Afrikaners to unify their ranks in order to gain preponderance within the white society. Apartheid as the centerpiece of the NP portfolio was the gravitating notion that attracted Afrikaner electorate and at least partially explains NP victory.
National Party’s ability to interrelate ideology and notions of Afrikaner culture with political and socio-economic policies granted it a remarkable appeal among the Afrikaner electorate: its adoption of the demands for South African National independence, the promotion of Afrikaners’ economic interests, and its championing of the Afrikaans culture (Giliomee 1979: 114-115) put the NP in an undefeated position. The NP invoked not only nationalistic ideology, but equally asserted what the Afrikaner middle class (professionals, educators, and civil servants) saw as a redemption of the their country and the reclamation of their own political control over the state from the UP that sold it out to the British. The NP presented itself and apartheid as a salvation force that has the capacity to give nation-building efforts of white society a significant momentum through total territorial separation of putative ethnicizing of the population. Apartheid came to assure Afrikaners the security and certainty they sought: Although they maintained control over political power they were uncertain about their survival as minority that needed constant, stronger and more penetrating legislations that will secure their survival in the face of all challenges and threats real and conceived, present and forthcoming. The NP seemed to have the potential to achieve these goals and bring about unity of the white race as ethnicity.

Apartheid: the creation of the ethno-national nexus

Racial relationships of segregation had been institutionalized and pervaded every corner of South African society when the PA -group relations and intra-group affiliations (Adam 1979, p32) in an irreversible way. Introducing sovereign state power to change the constitutional and legal underpinnings of the state by changing the political-
geography of the conflict was assumed to provide the answer ascended to power in 1948. As a qualitatively different system of domination Apartheid came to change the expressions and modalities of social relationships through changing the patterns of inter for Afrikaners’ debacle. Territorializing the domain of the conflict along ethnic-national stratification would have the effect and consequences of reshaping the entire structures of social, economic, and political aspects of racial-colonial relationships. Redefining racial inequality in accordance with new developments within the structures of the society was the main objective of apartheid; the differentiation of distinct ethno-national groups rather than races would be less costly and more durable for the survival of Afrikaner rule.

Racial segregation within a minority rule system was doomed to failure taking into account socioeconomic shifts in the South African society as a whole especially African community’s socioeconomic developments and the shifts within the white community. Racial segregation fall short from materializing the Afrikaner nation-building project based on racial differentiation and subordination. Indeed At the turn of 1950s Afrikaners and English-speaking communities were still racially self-defined ethno-national groups occupying the top two positions in a racially defined social hierarchy. Redefining the conflict in ethno-national terms has had the capacity to unify the whites in general as a unitary ethnic group. To be sure Afrikaner identity within apartheid became a question of an ethno-national group that has fundamental claims of a privileged status in a country it perceives as its own (Giliomee 1979: 127). Cross-ethnic and cross-racial interactions based on class affiliation, regional belonging and interest are less likely in this context, and therefore social and political integration less conceivable; ethnicity
becomes the element that determines political behavior and identification. Apartheid, in this sense preserved and quantitatively deepened discrimination and exploitation directed against Africans and other non-white communities. Simultaneously it introduced qualitatively new ideological justifications of a different type of domination based on ethno-national differentiation and representation. Analyzing apartheid in depth is an exercise to grasp on the convergence and divergence between two distinct but interrelated eras through which the system of white domination evolved. Apartheid can be looked upon and assessed as a move of state contraction to preserve white supremacy with minimum costs to Afrikaners in terms of economic, political as well as cultural costs.

Seen from this perspective, apartheid was a dynamic and adoptive response to particular socio-economic and political developments that South Africa had witnessed in four decades since the establishment of the Union. Thus one would not question apartheid per se as much as examining the conditions within which it sprung and developed. Therefore this section of the research contends that the state had been a unitary actor in the pursuit and the implementation of apartheid and it did not merely responded to the interests of these or other political or social actors. Rather the state practiced its central institutional capacities and sovereign power to produce as a purposive actor aimed to maintain a distinct and privileged social status for the Afrikaners, and to enforce the separateness of white from other ethno-national groups (Giliomee 1979: 118); the state was acting as an ethno-national group. In this we assume the presence of a high degree

28 In this we contrast most of economical perspectives that assume certain supporters (workers and farmers) and particular opponents (capital owners and industrialists) of apartheid amongst the Afrikaner social stratum. This approach further assumes that politicians who sought to maximize their electoral gains enacted apartheid policies following these calculations. The state within this reasoning was a passive player that responded to these rational calculations (Lowenberg and Kaempfer 1998: 42).
of conformity between the state as a political system and the socioeconomic structures in producing social relations of domination and inequality that led to the emergence of apartheid; a feature that can be seen in state intervention in labor market and economic processes as we discuss below. Thus the victory of NP and the enactment of apartheid is not a mere result of interest groups pressure as some analysts suggest (e.g. Merle Lipton 1986; Lowenberg and Kaempfer 1998). Rather, it is the emergence of a specific system of social domination that stemmed from and responded to certain historical developments within which the Afrikaner community maintained its demand for social and political hegemony that was not exclusively related to apartheid; it has been the main characteristic of Afrikaner politics since early 1920.

**Changing the political-geography of the conflict by partitioning**

At one level, apartheid represents a quantitative extension and continuation of racial segregation in two ways: it expanded the system of forced and unequal labor to include the increasing urban industrial production, and in the significant increase in state intervention in economic processes and labor market through legislative measures. Both reflected the resilience of exploitation as an imperative for the secondary industry characteristic to the rising industrial society (Legassick 1974: 9). However, exploitation under new conditions required more strict political and union organizations measures

---

29 As the Board of Trade and Industries put it: “The extension of manufacturing industry can be stimulated through a reduction of the high cost structure through increased mechanization so as to derive the full benefit of the large sources of comparatively low-paid non-European labour” (quoted in Legassick 1974: 10).
that would circumscribe Black labor unionism and political mobilization. This would not have been attainable without state intervention in labor regulations and in market operation at large. Thus state institutions regularized labor market through measures such as labor ‘color codes’ and ‘work-roles’ that assigned certain jobs’ classification on an ethnic basis to preserve white (mostly Afrikaner) workers. White working class enjoyed many privileges and was turned into a kind of aristocratic working class, but it was under constant threat of cheap black workers competition that market preferred, which drove the government to intervene and fix what it saw as a replacement of European by non-European labor. Two measures were put forth: restricting black labor mobility within urban areas and between different jobs, and raising the wages of white workers; both measures were apparently antithetical to capitalist economic growth. However, as Legassick (1974: 6) notices, rising white workers’ wages did not make a whole difference in economic performance. NP government’s labor policies hadn’t differed but a little from that of the 1940s and by the time the legislation of ‘job color bar’ was implemented in 1956 South African economy was in a boom phase, which marginalized the issue of labor replacement. To be sure “South African economic growth since 1948 has proceeded apace – exceeded in 1960s only by that of Japan- while at the same time the system of racial discrimination has grown more effective and pervasive” .This explains why the NP government applied job color bar in a dynamic way that followed the requirements of the industry and the market rather than ideology. Therefore apartheid existed as a result of something essential within the structure of social relations that yields different benefits

As the minister of Economic Affairs stated, the government “will not lose sight” of this problem in “the formulation and application of its industrial policy” (quoted in Legassick 1974: 12).
(material and ideal) and that is a priori to mere capitalist economic growth imperatives, which manifests in a racially stratified socio-economic system.

Apartheid came to deepen and perpetuate the intersection between ethnic-national affiliation with class and social status exerting an ascribed status allocation in a racially-ethnicized social hierarchy. Thus privileges that certain social groups accrued were one major aspect of the socioeconomic structure and the political economy of domination not a contradictory element. While it is true that private capitalists might not had reaped the full benefits of their business in a system of labor restrictions and state’s heavy intervention in the economy, but capital would not have made huge profit margins without state suppression of bargaining capabilities of the black unions, and without the low social costs of production that resulted from apartheid (Adam 1979: 46). Therefore apartheid deepened and intensified social, economic and political inequalities prevailed before 1948. But more equally important and dialectically linked to these continuities are the qualitative features of apartheid that made it a unique domination system.

Capitalist industrialization in South Africa since 1920s and the accompanied modernization processes (economic growth, urbanization, education, and the spread of communication) did not culminate in effective nation-building and national integration of diverse ethno-national peoples in the mainstream of national life. Modernizing South Africa had been exclusive “due to the fact that … implementing the modernization process [was] controlled by a single ethnic group at the political center” (Simpson 1994: 463-474). Dynamics of economic integration and social and political exclusion of Africans coupled with indefinite Afrikaner territorial-national identification created a
situation whereby neither assimilation and full integration ensued nor ultimate separation realized. ‘Regimes of territorial legitimation’ of the South African regime remained a function of a socio-economic and political dynamics and the reemergence of Afrikaner ethno-nationalism in s 1940 had to overcome undetermined territorial contours of an ethnicized system of differentiation and separation. Apartheid was a response to the prospects of cross-race, cross-class and cross ethnic affiliations and aspired to prevent the fusion of national life that transcend ethno-national affiliation through the establishment of a new regime of territorial legitimation as the defining structure of ethnic-national distinct identities. The ultimate goal was to craft a white South Africa by permanently excluding Africans in a separate sphere of political, economic and legal context. To serve this end, NP had envisioned the notion and policies of ‘separate development’ of white and non-white communities as the rationalization of permanent ethno-national separation that would totally ‘Afrikanerize’ the state.

Apartheid was a partitioning solution to a ‘problem’ that had been adamant; the existence of the indigenous Africans as part of the state. Partitioning is a form of territorial arrangement usually embodies in it the element of sovereignty, necessary for the formation of a new state. However, political ‘sovereign’ entities result from partitioning, as Muir (1975) described are ‘politico-territorial anomalies’ with a de facto sovereignty, and represent a geographic realignment of political forces (Falahl, 2007: 1344-1345). In essence Africans would be totally territorially and legally separated from state structure as foreigners of other ethno-national sovereign entities. As the last resort to solve the challenge of the Africans, apartheid was alleged to enable Africans to claim
their separateness not as a race rather as putative ethnicities. Afrikaner political leadership introduced the policy as a measure of justice, progress, prosperity, and peace. However, the new sovereign power deployed as embedded in apartheid only deepened inequality and exclusion which revealed how illusive notions of separate freedoms and development were. But, these inequalities were not any more justified by crud racial ideology; rather by economic and political realities of life that “do not allow the gap between black and white wealth to be narrowed more rapidly” as H. F. Verwoerd (Prime minister of South Africa 1958-1966 and the mastermind of apartheid) contends. He further argued that the causes of inequality were historical differences that do not allow but a separate development of the white and the black; it is not because blacks are inferior race, as he puts it, but because Afrikaners are different from others and will not give up their different status (Simpson 1994: 463-474).

Thus apartheid represents a redefinition of social relations in terms of ethnic differentiation to block the development of South Africa into a plural society of mixed and integrated social groups that form one national identity based on equal civil and political rights (Posel 1991: 1). The erosion of racist colonialism loomed as the levels of industrialization and urbanization brought more Africans and Coloureds to the city and skilled labor market, which the NP was determined to reverse (Guelke 2005: 25). The ‘influx control’ policies before 1948 set the stage for apartheid as a legal practice based on the Native (Urban Areas) Act of 1923, which restricted the rights of Africans to stay in urban areas. It responds to the failed in reducing the number of Africans in cities and towns that had increased by 60 per cent during the World-War Two years ( Guelke 2005:
In this context, apartheid incorporated more in-depth measures based on social engineering to control black labor as an organized and militant working force and as a political and social menace. Complete physical territorial separation was presented as the ideal solution for the non-white and particularly the Black indigenous existence in the state; a solution that would propagate Afrikanerdom and Afrikanize the state permanently. Two levels of apartheid were introduced in which state sovereign power prevailed: ‘petty apartheid’ and ‘grand apartheid’. While the former embodied Afrikaner racist attitudes against social intercourse or cross-racial interactions through total separateness, grand apartheid aimed at constitutionally enforce a system of territorial ethno-national separation and partition.

Grand apartheid is a qualitatively profound social engineering that creates ethnic classifications and separate spheres of life and the achievement of racial homogenization

---

30 As early as the year 1942, the South African government criminalized black workers’ strikes and took measures to tighten up the pre-war influx control. In 1945 the government enacted the Native (Urban Areas) Act to achieve this control. But the number of Africans in Urban areas maintained an annual increase of 7 per cent.

Petty apartheid was a set of legislations: The Prohibition of Mixed Marriages Act of 1949 that made marriages across races illegal; The Immorality Act of 1950 which outlawed sex across color lines; the Population Registration Act of 1950 which compels every citizen too have an identity certificate showing his race, The Reservation of Separate Amenities Act of 1953 that consolidated daily life segregation; Bantu Education Act of 1953 and The Extension of University Education Act of 1959 aimed at a separate educational systems. The latter illegalized the admission of non-white student to certain universities except for those the government allows on an individual basis.

31 Petty apartheid was a set of legislations: The Prohibition of Mixed Marriages Act of 1949 that made marriages across races illegal; The Immorality Act of 1950 which outlawed sex across color lines; the Population Registration Act of 1950 which compels every citizen too have an identity certificate showing his race, The Reservation of Separate Amenities Act of 1953 that consolidated daily life segregation; Bantu Education Act of 1953 and The Extension of University Education Act of 1959 aimed at a separate educational systems. The latter illegalized the admission of non-white student to certain universities except for those the government allows on an individual basis.
of residential areas\textsuperscript{32} territorially separated from each other. In this respect the dominant group doesn’t seek to control territory or to expand in the spatial sphere of the subordinate group. Rather, the dominant ethnic-national, especially as a minority, seeks exit by guaranteeing total disengagement from the indigenous population. Thus grand apartheid works on the level of collective entities per se to change their constitutional, political, and territorial identification.

Apartheid, in addition of being a state system, concentration and separation of races reflected a strong attitude within the Afrikaner community to separate itself from other non-white communities (Christopher 1898: 428). State regulations before the enactment of apartheid responded to these attitudes, which sharply increased levels of urban and residential separation and ‘harmonization’ of races (Ibid). More significantly, patterns of white settlement were not related to the size or location of the land or the place, which indicates further the instrumentality with which residential and territorial separation in general played. Apartheid then represents a qualitatively different set of domination modalities of state sovereign power whereby the regime established physical and territorial segregation that aimed at articulating new boundaries of state sovereignty and the control of non-white communities as collective ethnic entities mainly through legal measures (legislations)\textsuperscript{33}. The most important pillar of apartheid legislative and

\textsuperscript{32}The NP governments were determined to curb black residency in urban areas not only through ‘influx policies’ but beyond it forced the removal of Blacks living in privately owned or rental properties in or near the centers of towns, and their resettlement on the urban periphery. One of the most known among these evictions was the elimination of Sophiatown in Johannesburg. Moreover, they exerted pressure on the employers of Blacks to reduce the number of those living in white areas (Christopher 1989: 427)

\textsuperscript{33}The regime imposed ‘separate representation’ on Coloureds’ and they were removed from the common roll in the Cape in 1956 before this policy was abolished in 1968. Likewise, Africans were excluded by the Bantu Self Government Act of 1959 that set the legal basis for the creation of the ‘homeland system’ of territorial separation.
institutional base was the Population Registration Act of 1950\(^\text{34}\) that classified the entire population of the country (Guelke 2005: 25) in terms of assigned ethnic affiliation. Ethnically classified and zoned, Africans were to be the reserve immigrant labor that works for the whites without being part of whites’ life.

The NP aimed at achieving this ethnic hierarchy through realizing three objectives: (1) to create an entirely separated communities that would preserve Afrikaner identity; (2) to sustain and secure white control over political life and the related economic privileges against all threats; and (3) to achieve Afrikaner parity with the English-speaking community (Olson and Stedman 1994: 41). These goals that are reminiscent of D.F. Malan’s statement of 1944 we cited earlier, epitomize the ultimate end of apartheid: guaranteeing white domination in perpetuity through separation and control practiced in terms of sovereign arrangements. The most striking aspect of apartheid was the implementation of the ‘homeland’ policy that was claimed to be a benign policy aimed at separate development. In essence apartheid fragmented the African community into separated homelands based on the classifications enshrined in the Population Registration Act and The Self-Government Act of 1959. The policy reestablished black community into a number of ethnic groups\(^\text{35}\) which was meant to trigger new local and territorially based Black identities in place of collective sense of national identity. Simultaneously, this policy gave boost to Afrikaner and white identity as a distinct ethno-nationality not

\(^{34}\) The Act classified the population into three main categories: Native: the black; white; and Coloured. In addition, the Group Act of 1950 also came to enforce mobility restrictions and the zoning of non-white communities.

\(^{35}\) The Self-Government Act of 1959 classified African community that lived until then in black reserves into eight initial ethnic groups: North Sotho, South Sotho, Tswana, Zulu, Swazi, Xhosa, Shanagaan-Tsonga, and Venda. Ndebele were added later to raise the number to nine.
merely a white race divided in two groups. Afrikanners of different classes and political affiliations were mobilized behind the apartheid regime by the power of ethno-nationalist political discourse rather than a cultural and linguistic parlance. Afrikaner identity in the apartheid era turned into a political code of status and privileges that gave Afrikanners a hegemonic edge where interests, spoils, and privileges are protected and sustained by political control and separate development. The completeness with which apartheid sought was an effort to reconstruct South Africa as a pure white state surrounded by belts of pauperized and client pseudo-autonomous African homelands.

Against all the opposition that the Bantustan policy encountered domestically by the African National movement and on an international scale, the South African government was persistent to carry it on as the only answer to the question of racial relationships. Prime Minister Verwoerd pushed the plan forward and worked consistently to turn South Africa into a Republic. Apartheid and ‘homeland’ policy was presented as an actual implementation of the right of self-determination and independence for the Africans; a step akin to formal decolonization as Afrikaner elites alleged (Olson and Stedman 1994: 41). To make it more formal the NP government recognized the Bantustans as independent sovereign homelands. As a matter of fact conferring ‘independence’ on some Bantustans amounted to a major violation of the principle and the right of Self-Determination as the UN General Assembly ruled 36. As a

36Separate development plan envisioned the establishment of 10 Bantustans on area that comprises 13 per cent of the total land of South Africa. The plan aimed at the resettlement of 50 per cent of African population in the country. These Bantustans were territorially separated from one another by white-only integrated areas. This policy did not change the applicability of United Nations Charter on decolonization especially article 2(7) on apartheid. Bantustan policy cannot be considered as an implementation of the right of self-determination as the regime invoked. The UN General Assembly adopted resolution 2775 E
geographically-based independence plan the Bantustan policy amounted to a gross violation to international law as it forced the resettlement of 900,000 Africans in 800 exclusively designated areas separated from white areas (Richardson, 1978: 186-7). The most important aspect of the plan is that it deprived Africans in the Bantustans from their South African citizenship and turned them to foreigners. Moreover, the fact that the white community at the time represented only 19.3 per cent of the population of South Africa (out of which 58 per cent Afrikaners and 38 per cent English-speaking), popular support for the Republic and Bantu policy was shallow (Guelke 2005: 102), which undermined its legitimacy significantly. Africans’ resistance to the policy would soon ensue and reveal the inherited injustice embedded in apartheid. The implementation of the plan counterproductively revealed the very nature of apartheid as a neo-racial colonial system that embodied “a complex new version of a type of colonial nationalism in its dual capacity to secure white interests while directing black political aspirations towards disengaged ‘homelands’” (Rich 1994: 60).

The profound change of the structural properties of the conflict apartheid introduced triggered the powerful dynamics of two forces that exposed the essence and features of apartheid: the polarization and divisions within the Afrikaners, and the African national opposition and resistance. The interaction between these two forces helps us to a large extent to understanding how the regime survived the crises of 1960s and 1970s while, comparatively speaking it could not endure when the crisis of 1980s hit.

(XXVI) that stated that the Bantustan policy was in the pursuance of apartheid and it condemned it as a violation of the right of self determination and as prejudicial to territorial integrity of South Africa. The resolution was again consolidated by UNGA Resolution 3411 D (XXX) of 1975 on the same grounds (for a detailed discussion see Richardson 1978)
The most remarkable shift that started to take place as a result of this process in the 1970s-80s was that the locus of political mobilization and power moved from the Afrikaner to the African National movement arena; a momentum shift that changed the balance of political power in favor of the later and contributed significantly to the eclipse of apartheid and white domination.
Chapter V

The Decline of Afrikaner ethno-nationalism

Introduction

The African uprising of early 1960s made apartheid a politically obsolete project as it unveiled its lack of legitimacy. Opposition and resistance to apartheid uncovered the illusions of separate development and deepened political divisions within the Afrikaners on the efficacy and consequences of the ‘homeland’ policy. Along with international and regional environments that became profoundly more conducive to Africans’ struggle for self-determination, these developments put the country at the onset of a spiral of escalation and violence. Nonetheless, the regime endured the 1960s and achieved economic growth and crushed the uprising, and survived the 1970s crisis. There are three reasons that enabled regime to endure in this period: the first is the ideological pragmatism of the Afrikaner political elites that bought apartheid more time and ability to maneuver and combine flexibility with coercion that helped the regime to circumscribe the scope of protest and violence. The second is the limited ability of the African nationalist movement at this turn to mobilize on a mass popular scale against apartheid for long enough time that would make the persistence of the regime more costly than the regime could manage. Third, International inconsistent rejection to apartheid provided the
regime with a measure of legitimacy and endurance. We turn to discuss these factors in some detail for their importance in understanding the decline and ultimate demise of white domination and apartheid.

The Contradictions between ethno-territoriality and social stratification

Afrikaner political elites during the 1960s were more assertive and clear as to the response conceived adequate to the black challenge; oppression was the answer. Regimes police strategy against anti-apartheid movement would turn into one of its greatest misgivings as it pitted the whole non-white population against a brutal state oppression. The inability of the regime to implement territorial separation, the hallmark of apartheid, through modalities of bio-power and sovereign power triggered coercion as the only method remained. The dynamics of this phenomenon would yield more challenges to the regime in the coming years. However, the Sharpeville massacre\(^\text{37}\) not only showed regime’s brutality and willingness to coerce descent but more importantly revealed Afrikaners’ political strong grip over the state and its apparatuses and their self-confidence as a nation defending their white state from African menace. Facing a growing mass upheaval and protest, Afrikaners became mobilized more strongly on the bases of their ethno-national identity and the political unity their leaders espoused.

\(^{37}\) The ANC had announced that it would hold a massive protest against the Pass Law. The protest was called for on 31 March. The PAC, in a move to pre-empt this call announced for a demonstration to defy the pass law on 21 March. This latter took place in front of the police station in Sharpeville. The police at the station opened fire against the peaceful crowd killing 69 and injuring another 180 people.
Crushing the African upheaval of the early 1960s and oppressing their most organized and influential political organizations; the African National Congress (ANC) and the South African Communist Party (SACP) had given the government and the community a sense of strength and control that extended well into the early 1970s when a new African nationalism protest and resurrection irrupted.

Thus 1960s was a decade of tranquility and economic growth that resulted in serious shifts in Afrikanerdom notions; it created an atmosphere within which the deracialization and denationalization of the Afrikaners would not have been a threat to their unity and status. The identification that Afrikaner elites sought to emphasize was broader and more to the purposes of apartheid, namely with the state per se (Giliomee 1979: 122-4). The state at this point was to a large extent Afrikanized and imbued with white identity and politics and Afrikaner nationalist ideology became less significant and more flexible. Gerritt Viljoen, head of the Afrikaner Broederbond, stated: “Apartheid is neither an ideology nor a dogma. It is a method, a road along which we are moving and is subject to fundamental reassessment” (quoted in Giliomee 1979: 120). Self-confidence and tranquility of 1960s would recede in 1970 with the renewal of African nationalist militancy and upheaval.

African resurrection of 1970s and the rise of violence reintroduced the most fundamental questions of Afrikaner domination: political survival, unity, and socio-economic status. Unprecedented levels of violence and adamant African nationalism triggered the mechanisms of survival for a minority undetermined on the path it would take to solve the challenge of indigenous majority. African rising challenge in 1970s had
provoked significant changes of Afrikaners community’s attitudes, values and political perspectives toward partial accommodation. Regime choices of action and policy in response to the 1970s events became more complicated but less costly in terms of internal cohesion of the Afrikaners. To be sure, although more than 80 per cent of the Afrikaners in the 1970s still supported the NP there existed serious divisions on the most crucial questions of political survival and the aspects of Afrikaner identity that must be stressed.\(^{38}\) Opinion surveys in this period reveal these trends and their underlying political values: the strong Afrikaner commitment to the notions of ethno-national distinction envisioned by the NP in the 1950s and 1960s has changed significantly in the 1970s\(^ {39}\). Surveys indicate the growing agreement among Afrikaners on a more relaxed notion of politics, and the relative acceptance of less restricted labor policies. More striking is the persistence of Afrikaners’ opposition to social intercourse; The same period has shown that a minority of Afrikaners (between a fifth and a third) accept measures of social integration such as the admission of blacks to white churches and schools and an increase in Afrikaners’ support of the prohibition of mixed marriages. These trends show that the Afrikaners were willing to expand the scope of economic interaction while maintaining
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\(^{38}\) Giliomee (1979: 121-6) identifies three strands of Afrikaner identification with the group and its relationship with the other in this period: (1) exclusion; seeing Afrikaners as an exclusive nation; (2) integration; seeing Afrikaners as the core and hegemonic power of a white South African nation ; and (3) there were Afrikaners who envisioned the de-ethnicizing South Africa. Afrikanerdom in this view is seen as one of several identifications and Afrikaners as an interest group in a South African nation that encompasses all ethnic groups without exception.

\(^{39}\) In 1972 45 per cent of the Afrikaners indicated that they would call an Afrikaans speaking Coloured an Afrikaner. The same survey was repeated in 1977 and showed the increase of this figure to 52 per cent. In another survey undertaken in 1975, 47 per cent of Afrikaners thought that Coloureds should represent Coloureds in the Parliament. In the realm of labour regulations only 32 per cent of Afrikaners in 1974 agreed that nonwhites should be trained for the same jobs as whites and receive the same pay, but in 1976 42 per cent of Afrikaners agreed to the abolition of job reservation, and 62 per cent accepted the admission of nonwhites to the same jobs as whites in 1977. Also 62 per cent accepted the principle of equal salaries for whites and nonwhites.
their social and political hegemony, which makes a lot of sense if we take into consideration socio-economic changes within the Afrikaner community in this period: Social and economic developments within the white community during the 1960s-70s gave rise to significant social forces that didn’t give a blanket support to apartheid policies.

The Afrikaner middle class grew significantly; a bureaucratic stratum in diverse administrative institutions came to share portion of the political power; and a new business class arose out of the economic boom of the early 1970s resulted from industrialization. These new social configurations, as much as they benefited from the system, they developed certain vested interest in the political stability of the country to sustain their status. It is also important to notice that the 1970s were alarming for the regime as white immigration rates to South Africa declined, which testified to the widespread pessimism and uncertainty about the future of the regime. It is against this background and the pressure accompanied with the Soweto uprising of 1976 that Afrikaner political elites had to enact a new policy. As Adam and Giliomee (1979: 7) remark, inaction was not a choice facing rising costs of apartheid. The alternative policy will also have costs and was to be calculated against its consequences on the Afrikaners’ interests and unity.

The government has had to enact a synthesis between coercion and police strategy and co-optation. Ruthlessness and political oppression were proven to have their limits and constraining conditions amongst which maintaining white community’s unity is
paramount. The persistence of English-speaking and Afrikaner split\textsuperscript{40} and the existence of a strong concern among the whites to present their rule as just and legitimate; police brutality deprives the ideologues of their rational and ability to make justify apartheid. Large scale oppression would have alienated important segments of Afrikaner community and threatens the already delicate unity of the white in general (Adam 1979: 27-29). Unleashed oppression was also perceived as a source of political and institutional threat to the state for it implied the increase intervention of strong and powerful security and military apparatuses, which would require more centralization of the state, the hegemony of a one-party and the rise of authoritarianism. Oppression assessed, as well, in terms of its economic consequences since it will be directed to black community whose workers represented 80% of the working force of a capitalist economy that can’t afford sacrificing these workers to the nationalist movement.

The inability of the regime to gain the consent of Africans for the homeland policy made the regime realize the need for having allies within the black and the Coulouerid communities in order to confer a measure of legitimacy to apartheid. Co-optation of particular segments of the non-white communities that goes hand in hand with coercion was the optimal alternative. Thus on the one hand the sustainability of apartheid in the 1960s through 1970s and its ability to avoid revolutionary change refer to the sophistication of the coercion system it had established that stratified to permeate all

\textsuperscript{40} Although This period showed the increased anxiety within the Afrikaner and English communities alike following the Soweto upheaval it revealed different attitudes in regard to the best policy to face the Soweto uprising: “two-thirds of the white electorate expected a lower living standard for their children, as well as black upheavals...there is also 75 per cent who were ready to fight rather than make concessions among Afrikaners...but the enthusiasm for war instead of accommodation is markedly lower among the Anglo-whites” (Adam and Giliom 1979: 6)
aspects of life and followed very well calculated measures. Heribert Adam (1971:16, 61) argues that apartheid was “one of the most advanced and effective patterns of rational, oligarchic domination” and the power with which the system sustained was derived from the combination of coercion and a legal system that justified oppression and introduce the state as an impartial arbiter, which helped in concealing oppression. Co-optation of the Africans in the new policy still relied on atomizing their community by offering certain segments short term benefits within the Bantustans. The new policy meant that the same course was followed with some insignificant changes. Verwoerd and Vorster’s insistence to implement the self-government Bantustans policy reveals that the regime was running out of ideas to overcome the conundrum of sustaining white rule in the face of all contradictions and protest. As Paul Rich (1994: 60) eloquently puts it:

The Afrikaner fascination with group identity, ethnicity, and government by ‘own affairs’, has been the constant answer which has run like an ideological thread through modern South African history.’’

The fascination was actually the only alternative of reality in which a mass society; the majority of black South African was determined to achieve access to state system and into a common society. NP policies in this period can be understood as a state contraction move towards a narrowly defined political entity with clear territorial boundaries and institutional and social contours.

The contraction that might have been achieved through the implementation of the Bantustan policy would have granted the Afrikaners what they have sought for so long; a free and united folk of whites in their own state. The move would not have threatened Afrikaners internal cohesion in terms of their identity; it rather was in part a response to
Afrikaners’ attitudes as we noticed above. Territorial disengagement from the majority of the Black community was not conceived as a concession; rather it was the prerequisite for realizing a white South Africa. The meaning of territory and territorial boundaries was subjugated to a supreme value: Afrikaners pursuit of a state and nationhood based on their sense of exclusive ethno-national identity that had not been necessarily corresponded with a territorial ideology or particular regimes of territorial legitimating. As we noticed earlier territorial segregation and separation were instrumental and prevalent ideology and political power requirements had not confer a pivotal meaning on the territory as such and focused on peoples and racial-ethnic differentiation. The minority status of the Afrikaners was also a major factor in this respect; the prospects for the political survival of the white rule were proven very uncertain and a short-term endeavor in the face of great majority of discontent and increasingly militant Africans. Territorial separation, apartheid seemed the only chance for Afrikaner hegemony to endure.

To be sure, the NP consolidated its parliamentary political power by winning the elections of 1970 and 1974 with a comfortable mandate (54.9 per cent and 56.2 per cent of the votes respectively) and put its white rivalries in a weak position. Economic performance of the country showed strong indications of growth; and the regime regained the West acceptance if not support, which reinvigorated its international legitimacy. The government took advantage of these circumstances to expand and consolidate apartheid and furthering state contraction in terms of territorial and institutional disengagement from the African population. Within this context two new important legislations were
enacted: the Bantu Homelands Citizenship Act of 1970 and the Bantu Homeland Constitution Act of 1971: The former turned the entire Africans into citizens of their assigned homelands where very African now has a citizenship outside his mother country South Africa. The Bantu, whether an African had ever lived in or not, had become a homeland with pseudo political power. The later Act gave the government the authority to confer self-government on those territorially invented entities. These Acts implied that the end result of Bantustan policy would be cleansing South Africa from the majority of the Black community. Africans who stayed ‘illegally’ in the white urban areas were now regarded as ‘foreigners’ and their presence in these areas amounts to violation of another state’s rules (Terreblanche 2002: 327).

**African nationalism: restoring the political geography of the conflict**

Ironically the Homeland policy made Africans more aware of their mutual faith as one native people and a majority ethno-national group under the rule of a minority group that is self-identified as a racial ethnicity. Separation and exclusion dynamics made Africans more conscious about the injustices inflicted upon them by the white society. In spite of governments’ oppressive laws and measures African opposition to apartheid only increased and gathered momentum. Apartheid came to dismember an already long entrenched South African identity of Africans. The dynamics of partial exclusion and the levels of economic integration and undetermined regimes of territorial legitimation of the segregation era resulted in a strong African identification with South Africa. Democratization rather than liberation and ethno-territorial self-determination prevailed
especially in 1980s with the emergence of mass democratic anti-apartheid movements that coalesced with the ANC to further consolidate this inclusive African identification.

The 1960s uprising and the prevalence of democratization

Although in early 1960s organized black opposition was smashed, African resistance was resurrected in the 1970s through 1980s more persistent to achieve the end of apartheid (Posel 199: 1). The main African militant opposition during this period came from three politically organized movements: Black labor unions, the alliance of the ANC and CPSA, and the popular democratic mass movement of the 1980s. South African apartheid regime relied heavily on large and powerful arsenal of security laws and orders, and had launched unprecedented assault on its political enemies in the 1950s and 1960s in order to prevent the development of any effective and mobilized African resistance. Thus the government illegalized and outlawed any actions of resistance to government policies41. However, oppression added to the grievances of the Africans and raised their militancy and will to mobilize. The ‘defiance campaign’ and the Sharpeville massacre of 1950s and early 1960s, although were limited and did not persist set the background for African nationalist movement politics and organization.

Following governments measures in 1950s the ANC adopted a ‘Program of Action’ that put forth the objectives of the struggle to end white domination and
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41 In 1950 the government passed the Suppression of Communism Act, which outlawed the CPSA and empowered the minister of justice to take a wide range of measures to suppress political opposition. The Act granted the minister the jurisdiction to declare any similar organization illegal, to restrict political activities, to prohibit gatherings. The Act considered any ‘political, industrial, social or economic change by the promotion of disturbances or disorder’ as communism as subject to suppression.
achieving self-determination through militancy and the use of mass protest including civil disobedience. The declaration was followed by the joint initiative by the ANC and the South African Indian Congress (SAIC) in 1959 to launch the Defiance Campaign against the injustice of apartheid (Guelke 2005: 94). The campaign was peaceful in a large measure and aimed at virtual ‘violation’ of government segregationist policies. The campaign gave rise and political legitimacy to ANC and SACP as mass movements with a wide base of membership (Guelke 2005: 95) especially following ANC adoption of the “Freedom Charter” that drew the political philosophy of the movement as achieving racial unity and the reform of the state system on the bases of democracy and human rights. The charter established African nationalism’s consistent political position as nationally not ethnically driven movement; a feature that was further strengthened in the 1980s and had been a major factor in the failure of the regime to creating a white South Africa by ethnicizing Black community. However, this progressive position did not prevent the emergence of radical nationalist African movements. The more the government implemented apartheid measures and oppression the more rigid some African nationalists became. The leading example of this trend is the emergence of the Pan-African Congress (PAC) in 1959.

The ANC represented a profound challenge to the regime precisely because of the charter that aimed at abolishing the very core of apartheid and white rule; democratization and inclusion were the antithesis of racial ethno-nationalism of the Afrikaner rule. Confrontation turned more violent and showed regimes determination to quill this challenge; the government outlawed the AVC and the SACP while the Sharpeville
massacre of 1960 and its consequences that a serious blow to the apartheid regime domestically and on the international arena. The massacre had changed the nature of opposition to the apartheid from protest to resistance and militancy; it radicalized the ANC and other anti-apartheid movements. The ANC formed its armed wing: the Umkhonto we Sizwe (the spear of the nation or the MK) which gave the organization more legitimacy and capacity to mobilize. Protests over the ‘pass law’ were launched and the government imposed a state of emergency over the country.

Banning the ANC and the SACP allowed the emergence of new Black movements such as “Black Consciousness’ in the early 1970 that was soon crushed as well. For the regime it was too risky to tolerate such a movement especially as black workers’ organization and activism started to regain momentum and self-confidence in the early 1970s. Economic changes of the 1960s and early 1970s that resulted in a significant increase in the employment of skilled and semi-skilled non-white workers and the ability of African workers to organize mass strikes uplifted their bargaining power and organizing capacity, which represented a major platform for African nationalist struggle against apartheid in the 1970s and 1980s. Government’s measures to restricting black workforce mobility and bargaining power had caused disruptions in the functioning of the economy and put whites’ interests on the line (Olson and Stedman 1994: 60). Moreover the resurgence of African nationalism in the region (in Rhodesia, Mozambique, South West Africa, and Angola) has complicated the South African regime’s status in the

42 In the first three months of 1973 there were 160 strikes involving over 61,000 black workers (Guelke, 2005: 123).
region and at home; a pattern that continued to collect momentum especially after the Soweto uprising of 1976 that reintroduced the question of ethnic racism and the failure of the Bantustans policy.

The Soweto uprising and beyond: popular resistance and convergence

Soweto uprising was a bottom-up movement that emerged in the townhomes of the Black population, thus it represented “new path of liberation which was based on the lived experience of ordinary people” (Mamadani 1996, cited in Neocosmos 1998: 200). The resurrection gave the struggle against apartheid a profound democratic feature as more people participated and a number of popular democratic organizations emerged as the protest accumulated more strength and continuity in the 1980s, which played a decisive role in toppling apartheid. The uprising of 1976 planted the seeds for the eclipse of apartheid as it announced the vibrancy of African national sentiments and their strong identification with South Africa (Neocosmos 1998) and the persistent rejection of the homeland policy. Soweto laid the grounds for the rise of people’s power in the face of state hegemony, which gradually but consistently mobilized most of the African population and segments of the white community in a sweeping anti-apartheid movement.

Following regime change in Portugal in 1974 and the resulted decline of Portugal’s colonial rule in Southern Africa, South African Nationalism was gaining momentum by the impact of decolonization in the neighborhood. Angola, in this context, was the most significant case. The involvement of South Africa in the civil war in this country that ended with defeat had exposed the regime and gave an opportunity to its opponents to take the initiative. It was at this juncture when the Soweto Africans’ uprising of 1976 irrupted to represent a major turning point in the history of the country along with the Sharpeville massacre of 1960.

The uprising was triggered by police oppression to schoolchildren who protested the imposition of Afrikaner language as a medium of instruction in Transvaal. The imposition of Afrikaner language was offensive and provoking, and police brutality against students came to exacerbate the situation and spark the uprising.
People’s power and wide range participation in the resurrection reflected social developments within the African society: economic growth of the 1960s-70s resulted in a huge increase in the employment of black workers in industry (from 308,332 in 1960 to 780,914 in 1980). It also witnessed a remarkable increase of educated Africans, and simultaneously the rise of blacks’ consumption of domestic production. All of which made Africans more vigilant and willing to mobilize and protest against their inferior status as a majority, which undermined significantly the legitimacy of the regime and its ability to endure.

Although Soweto uprising had dealt a serious blow to regime’s ‘internal stability’ (Saul 1993: 2) it did not undermine its ability to endure in terms of the capabilities of state power and institutions that was able to absorb the shock. The significance of Soweto uprising is that it marked the beginning of a shift in the locus of political action from Afrikaner internal politics and socioeconomic changes to African nationalism arena and its vigor to take the initiative, and hence a significant shift in the balance of political power in favor of African nationalism was in the making. These indecisive elements prevented a revolutionary change of the regime or its entire decline in the 1970s but as African masses flooded the streets of townhomes and reserves, the issue became clearer. The conflict was on the verge of a new phase where African nationalism would consistently challenge the foundation of the state as a racial-ethno-national regime while the state would persist on apartheid. Minority-majority syndrome would compel the Afrikaners to grasp on what they gained while territorial separation failure would make
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45 Between 1965 and 1975, the number of black students in secondary schools increased nearly fivefold, while between 1980 and 1984, their enrollment doubled from 577,000 to over a million; the number of graduates tripled during the same period (Neocosmos 1998: 200).
African nationalism more assertive to overthrow the regime. As Johnson (1977: 290) argues:

> There is no precedent in history anywhere of an ethnic minority of over 4 million people voluntarily dismantling the dominance they enjoy over more than 20 million ethnically different others; anything other than white supremacy is, in this sense, unthinkable.

The Afrikaners were not in a position to give up their preponderant status nor to give in and offer any significant concessions to the Africans, which created a state of impasse that would put the adversaries in a spiral of escalation and ‘mutually hurting stalemate’ that prevented revolutionary change but paved the road for thwarting the regime.

**The eradication of Afrikaners’ ethno-territoriality**

The ill management with which Vorster’s government handled the rising nationalist attitudes inside South Africa and the surrounding countries in the 1970s and its economic consequences compelled business elites allied with high-ranked military officials and pressured Vorster to resign. Vorster was blamed for his government’s “unwillingness to reform apartheid to allow greater labor mobility, the training of black skilled labor, and recognition of organized black labor” (Olson and Stedman 1994: 61). Vorster clearly couldn’t realize or recognize the changes in Afrikaner values and attitudes discussed above that brought more willingness to reform specific aspects of economic and political systems. P. W. Botha; the new Premier and the President has had to overcome the impasse that the regime was facing; at the core of this impasse was the
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46 The official statement referred Vorster’s retirement to ill-health. Some resources indicate the role of the dubbed ‘info scandal’ or Muldergate. Vorster was accused of misappropriation of funds as his government sought to buy influence abroad (Guelke 2005: 136).
need for new racial policies and the restoration of South Africa’s regional and international role as a major African player. Botha’s government was fortunate that it came to power when the main conflicts in the region (Namibia and Zimbabwe-Rhodesia) were resolved, and at the time of right-wing revival in key Western countries: Ronald Regan administration in USA and Thatcher’s government in UK, which presented an opportunity for the South African regime to recover and to have a considerable margin to maneuver and adjust domestic and regional policies. Botha adopted the dubbed’ total strategy’\textsuperscript{47} that aimed at accomplishing three interdependent objectives: turning South Africa into a military state; destabilizing the region of Southern Africa; and reforming apartheid.

(1) Militarizing the state: militarizing South Africa was primarily a response to international embargo on arms sales that was imposed earlier by the UN. Counterproductively, the embargo gave the government every reason to seek military strength by establishing a strong military industry, which gave the regime a political edge over its domestic and regional opponents. South African white rule seemed to be in a position to endure as a result of this military might, it has been argued. Comparing to the decline of Portugal’s colonial power as Gann and Duignan (1981: 291) argue South Africa was well prepared to deal with domestic insurrection and regional challenges. Whether this assessment is warranted or not is debatable. The military might of the regime did not eliminate domestic opposition to apartheid; the use of military might

\textsuperscript{47} ‘Total Strategy’ was not entirely invented by Botha. As a matter of fact attempts to reforming apartheid took place in the last year of Vorster’s government; the concept of ‘total strategy’ was incorporated in a Defense White Paper in 1977, and this was followed by the appointment of two commissions to inquire into labor issues in order to introduce some reforms in labor regulations and laws.

121
domestically has its limits and constraints as we discussed earlier. Botha’s government, while aware of the regime’s shaky position sought to strengthen it to a degree whereby adopting reforms would not weaken its grip on political power and security. This was clear as the government of Botha continued to implement the Bantu self-government plan by adding two more Bantus: Venda and Ciskei (Guelke 2005: 139). Military strength in this sense has to be seen through the other two elements of the strategy, destabilizing the surrounding and political reforms.

(2) Destabilizing the surrounding: the establishment of a strong military power was deployed to gain a regional dominant role. To the contrary of Vorster’s ‘out-look’ strategy that aimed at stabilizing the region in order to gain the acceptance of the West, Botha’s destabilizing belligerent strategy against neighboring Soviet-backed countries aimed at taking it by South Africa’s own initiative to gain regional hegemony and simultaneously introduce the regime as a pillar in containing Soviet imperialism in the region. Gaining this role embedded South Africa within the West and particularly the USA strategy of containment, which diffused international rejection to apartheid. The strategy found encouragement and acceptance by Regan’s administration that soon showed its intention to establish close working relationships with South African government and enacted the new policy of ‘Constructive Engagement’ with South
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48 The way Chester Crocker; the Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs – who crafted the policy put it, the USA wants to open a new chapter of relationships with South Africa based on the mutual interests of the two parties in the Southern African region and their ‘shared perceptions of the role of the Soviet Union and its surrogates in thwarting’ these interests. He goes on to describe the co-operation between the two countries as indispensable for the efforts to stabilize Southern Africa, and to assert that this co-operation should be premised on US ‘recognition of South Africa’s permanent stake in the future of Southern Africa’ and South Africa’s recognition of US ‘permanent interest in Africa as a whole’ (quoted in Guelke 2005: 140).
Africa; in effect the policy gave the latter carte blanche to militarily destroy the neighboring countries\textsuperscript{49} and to carry on a new domestic policy with a modicum of international legitimacy that allowed the regime to carry on apartheid and implement more of the Bantustan policy within a ‘reformed’ political structures.

(3) Political and Constitutional reforms: Botha aimed at introducing a new concept of apartheid that has the potential to sustain Afrikaners’ political and economic domination while permitting a margin of flexibility to co-opt certain segments of the black and Coloured communities into the state system (Olson and Stedman 1994: 61). The main goal of the plan was to grant the regime a measure of domestic legitimacy especially for the Bantustan policy, and to gain world’s acceptance to an otherwise a pariah state. “Total strategy” represents a major amendment to segregation and apartheid alike. Although the majority of black community in townhomes (reserves) was excluded from the agenda Botha’s version of apartheid accepted for the first time the accommodation of non-white political demands in the central state institutions. This metamorphosis in essence aspired to stratify the non-white population in another dimension: the first being through the Bantustan policy. Political and constitutional reforms would have established a dual non-white social reality by selectively accommodating some of the political demands of some significant non-white social strata in part of the country. The concept re-classified non-white population in terms of their eligibility for the entry to white state system. To achieve this goal the new policy

\textsuperscript{49} Between 1980-6 South Africa had involved in number of assaults against the surrounding countries: it invaded three capitals (Lesotho, Botswana, Mozambique) and our other countries (Angola, Swaziland, Zimbabwe, Zambia); backed dissident groups that had brought chaos to two countries (Angola and Mozambique); disrupted the oil supply of six countries and attacked export and import railways of seven countries. (Guelke 2005: 140)
categorized the black community into ‘useful blacks’ - those who would benefit the economy as a labor workforce and specific elites who may function as intermediaries between the regime and the whole community, and ‘recalcitrant blacks’ - who continue their struggle against apartheid and then had to be oppressed. To make the reforms permanent constitutional reform and legal steps in the realms of political life and labor were enacted.

The centerpiece of constitutional reform was the ‘tri-cameral’ Constitution Act of 1983\(^\text{50}\) that mimics some aspects of power-sharing that would enhance regimes domestic position vis-à-vis the rise of African nationalism and introduce South Africa as a democratic state. According to this plan African ‘useful blacks’ especially the urban growing middle class were to be upgraded socially and politically, which represents a profound departure from Verwoerd’s total apartheid that suppressed social differentiation and mobility normal to a capitalist society (O’Meara 1996: 323). In order to gain some credibility within the African community, especially the working class and its rising organizations, the government amended the Industrial Conciliation Act which distinguished between white workers as ‘employees’ and Africans as not employees and pealed the job reservation policy that discriminated against black skilled and semi-skilled workers and other previous Acts that restricted the development of skilled black workers.

\(^\text{50}\) According to the Act the parliament will be consisted of three chambers: white, coloured, and Indian each served by its own ministerial council and have jurisdiction over its community’s own affairs. In case of a dispute among chambers over ‘general affairs,’ disputants refer to the ‘President Council’. The latter body is formed proportionally from chamber representatives: 4 whites, 2 coulards, and 3 Indians. The new constitution also provided for the election of the president, who was to be both the president and the head of the government.
The ‘total strategy’ and the momentum shift

The ‘total strategy’ and particularly constitutional reform agenda put the regime in the defensive as it became clearer than ever that the regime is running out of answers to the growing difficulties apartheid was facing especially regime’s inability to find a permanent solution to the problem of a growing mobilization of indigenous. The reforms provided the African national movement with an opportunity to take the initiative and mobilize for new wave of protest and popular resistance to apartheid. The government allowed a significant margin of political expression in order for the reforms to succeed, which gave opposition forces a significant margin for political movement and organization that it took to undermine the reforms. African nationalist opposition to the plan sprung for the limited scope of reform and for the fact that it excluded the majority of Africans. Reforms further deepened Black Africans’ sense of demoralization and alienation at the time when the reforms offered Coloureds and minor black strata some political and social gains. It was clear that the regime will never entertain the accommodation of the Black African into the system and the plan aims at perpetuating the Bantustan policy.

Nevertheless, the government rectified and put the reforms in effect in 1984 following its approval by a white-only referendum in 1983. Non-whites, ‘Coloureds’ and ‘Asians’ were to be represented disproportionally in the new parliament, while whites were assigned a majority veto on general affairs, which implied that the structures of political power will not be changed in any significant way. The arrangement granted the government the final say in all “general affairs” of the country leaving “own affairs” of
each racial configuration to its vaguely self-ruling entity. The reforms, although limited, attest the failure of the regime since 1948 to recreate South Africa as a white state: the inability of the regime to construct the Afrikaner community as an ethno-territorial nation exclusively or through integration with English-speaking whites compelled the regime to reconsider its strategy. Thus Botha sought to sustain the main features of the regime but with the consent of particular non-white elites, which doomed the reform to failure sooner than the government might have figured. The plan “intensified the impact of the continuing denial of political rights to the African population outside the homeland system” (Guelke 2005: 143) and provoked the Africans political will to act. The opportunity and the deepening feeling of exclusion within the African community were exacerbated by the increase of life expenses in townhomes 51, which founded a combustible mixture that resulted in a new nationalist uprising that irrupted in the townships in the Vaal Triangle in 1984 and 1986 52 and was accompanied with workers’ campaign of strike in a major ‘stay-away’ from work. The African insurrection of the 1980s had been more organized, largely mobilized in a bottom-up manner that made it a popular uprising bar excellence. It also was more succinct in terms of its political

51 The economic crisis of 1980s had left many Africans unemployed. Over 25 per cent of the Africans’ working force was unemployed, and two-thirds of them were under the age of thirty; most of whom lived in the townships where the economic crises coupled with governmental measures that raised the rent costs through Black Local Authorities Act of 1982. Moreover and in order preempt black workers’ unionism and ‘stay aways’ the government enacted the Industrial relations Act of 1979 that aimed at restricting union activities to the workplace.

52 The South African Institute of Race Relations (SAIRR) estimated that 175 people were killed in the last two months of 1984 in addition to another 20 at the beginning of 1985 when government troops used live munitions to quell a protest in commemoration of the Sharpeville massacre of 1960. Violence continued in 1985 causing the death of 859 people half of them killed by security forces according to SAIRR while the rest were killed in within-black clashes.
demands as a democratic and civic movement, which the regime found more difficult to quell.

*Popular insurrection of 1980s: peoples’ power reveals*

The reform agenda triggered the unified organizing effort of a wide range of South African civil society movements in challenging the apartheid. The vibrancy of civil society movements in South Africa was vital in the emergence of a strong popular anti-apartheid movement. Civil society movements in 1980s offered an opportunity to large numbers of people to get involved in the process of liberation that encompassed a whole variety of social organizations: parties, trade unions, women’s organizations, youth movements, and peasant cooperatives, to mention few. All of which represented the aspirations of the oppressed population for equality and freedom. These organizations “had distinct forms of organization and demands for social transformation, popular forms of democracy and equality, which went beyond the slogans of political parties” (Neocosmos 1998: 197) although it worked in coalition with them especially with the ANC.

The movement was inspired by the non-racial stance of the ANC and the SACP and adopted its notion as the main slogan of the anti-apartheid movement especially the United Democratic Front (UDF). The UDF main slogan “UDF Unites, Apartheid Divides” reflected the essence of the ‘Freedom Charter’ that espoused a non-racial democratic one South Africa. The democratic essence and popular character of the mass movements and its convergence on a single goal namely, overthrowing apartheid made it a dangerous challenge to the regime. The movement established peoples’ politics in the face of state

Generally I can say that the community is the main source of power, because the state has really lost the control over the people. [The state] has no power over the people in terms of controlling them…What has been preached in the past about the Freedom Charter, even now we are trying to do that particularly.

This political strength and clarity of vision contributed significantly to the momentum shift in the conflict in favor of African national movement and anti-apartheid mass struggle. As one UDF leader asserts this democratic goal can be summed up in the principal slogan of the Freedom Charter: “The People Govern” (Neocosmos 1998: 206-7)

The unifying philosophy of the movement and its political slogans attracted a huge number of civil society organizations which increased their ability to organize popular resistance to the regime. At the peak of its activism the UDF included seven hundred affiliate groups with a total of over two million people. The activities it espoused were mainly actions of civil disobedience (bus and rent boycotts, housing movements, squatter revolts, labor strikes, etc), and the most important popular organizational aspect of it was the formation of “street committees”53 that served as local governments in the ungovernable areas where the state lost control. The well-organized efforts of the UDF to boycott the election of the tri-cameral parliament undermined the legitimacy of the reforms as the vast majority of the Coloureds and the Africans boycotted the elections. The UDF not only encompassed a variety of local community associations in the black

---

53 Street Committees flourished on a wide scale in urban townships. For example the year 1987, 43 per cent of the inhabitants of Soweto were reporting the existence of those committees in their neighborhoods. The committees provided for rudimentary services, maintain order, settle disputes, and formed ‘peoples’ courts’ to check and punish criminal acts. Furthermore the committees initiated a program of ‘peoples’ education’ in an attempt to bring local schools under the control of the people.
townships, militant student groups, and organized labor, but also the established alliance between with the ANC, which galvanized the latter’s political standpoint. The new resistance coalition was able to turn most of the country into arenas for protest, strikes, riots, and demonstrations during 1984 to 1986. Along with the organized activism of labor unions under the Congress of South African Trade Unions (COSATU) that was instrumental in pushing the business to exert pressure on the government to negotiate democratic transition African national movement gained a profound political power vis-à-vis the state per se.

Facing an escalating revolt and widespread violence the government imposed the state of emergency in most of the country, which turned 1986 into one of the most violent times of the decade. The government sent the South African Defense Forces (SADF) into townships to restore order, which only further undermined regimes legitimacy. Even worse was the involvement of the government in a clandestine campaign to assassinate UDF and ANC leaders, and its conspiracy to train and instigate black groups to create violence and chaos in townships. During the 1986 security apparatuses imprisoned and isolated more than 25,000 people, which crippled the organizational and contact capacity of the UDF and the Committees; the popular aspect of the struggle was seriously damaged by these measures. The UDF moved to a more territorially based activities espoused by a national leadership and the scope of popular resistance had shrunk remarkably and substituted by a militaristic and militant activism. Nonetheless, the spiral decline of the regime that started in the late 1970s was deepened and there is no question that African Nationalist revival and bold reaction to Botha’s reforms was one of the most
important factors that caused its failure. However, there is another crucial factor that contributed profoundly to this failure: Afrikaner divisions on the ‘total strategy’.

‘Total strategy’ provoked instant and bitter debates within the ruling party and the Afrikaner polity. The first reaction came soon after the revelation of the agenda in 1982. A group of NP members of the parliament defected from the party and formed the Conservative Party. The reforms had put the National Party in the defensive and the pursuit of political survival as it abandoned the orthodoxy of apartheid: white only political control and domination. Botha’s attempt to salvage white-only rule by partial accommodation of non-white aspirations had failed particularly since it explicitly implied, no matter how superficially, changing the structure of social relations and political power dispensation. This move as it failed amounted to disastrous political consequences: it created an irreversible serious crack in the edifice of the apartheid. Constitutional reform that franchised ‘Coloureds’ (even within a well-designed social engineering) is considered as “the first decisive break with the concept of a white nation” (Knox and Quirk 2000: 152). After more than thirty years of apartheid white Afrikaners could not turn their sense of shared identity into an ethno-national people with well-defined territorial, legal, and psychological boundaries. Effects of undetermined regime of territorial ideology doomed Afrikaner ethno-nationality precarious and fill short of facing an overwhelmingly mass revolution that aspired integration and democracy. The control over state power and using it to perpetuate the system of racial domination was proved to be insufficient to “dislodge imbedded social structures, or alter the economic ‘facts of life’” (Cohen 1988: 95) that were in the making for decades and within which African
nationalism maintained its affiliation with South Africa that prevailed over the narrow and ethnically based Afrikaner notion of a white state and nation.

The revolt of 1985-6 unleashed international condemnation of apartheid on large scale. Protests against apartheid in many countries especially in the USA that were widely covered on the media demanded the overthrow of apartheid and exerted significant pressure on Western governments to take serious steps against South African government. Under this immense pressure and in spite of President Regan veto the American Congress passed the Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act in October 1986\textsuperscript{54}. The Act imposed a wide range of sanctions against the regime in South Africa, part of which were to be suspended if the regime made significant steps towards a non-racial democracy. The last of the six steps the Act listed reveals that the role of South Africa in the containment strategy was dwindling and with it the cart blanch the US gave the regime to destabilize the region and maintain apartheid. Botha’s reign counterproductively exacerbated regime’s impasse and created new political facts that were very hard, if not impossible, to reverse.

International sanctions against the regime escalated and with it economic crisis worsened, and the later had generated more opposition and protest. The spiral decline had turned into a major crisis that the new government had to manage. It was clear more than ever before that apartheid could not be maintained, at least not the way it had been

\textsuperscript{54} The Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act listed six measures that the South African government was expected to take, the most important are: repeal the present state of emergency and respect the principle of equal justice under the law for citizens of all races; the release of all political prisoners at the top of them Nelson Mandela; establish a timetable for the elimination of apartheid laws; negotiate the future of political system with representative of all racial groups in South Africa; and end military and paramilitary activities aimed at neighboring states.
crafted and amended by different governments of the NP. Botha’s government sought to implement the reform agenda by coercion when carrying it out failed by way of persuasion and co-optation. Oppression against opposition not only was directed to African Nationalists but also to political opposition within the Afrikaner polity especially against Afrikaners who demanded to open the system and conduct a dialogue with the ANC. As a result the divides within the Afrikaner community were deepened as the government “excoriated critics who advocated and indeed practiced dialogue with the ANC, such as the Afrikaner intellectuals who travelled to Dakar in Senegal to meet with leading figures in the ANC in exile” (Guelke 2005: 154). By late 1988 white polity’s disaffection with Botha’s policies was insurmountable and Botha stepped down and F.W. De Klerk assumed power.

State failure or democratization

The new government main task was to control the pace and scope of political changes required to reform the system for it had become a commonplace to see that apartheid could not proceed on the same path. When De Klerk became the prime minister – and afterwards the president in 1989- he recognized that the NP policies derived from ‘total strategy’ reached a dead end (Olson and Stedman 1994: 131). Taking advantage of the majority the NP gained in the election that followed his inauguration De Klerk launched his reform agenda starting with the dismantling of the National

---

55 Although the NP lost ground to the Liberal Democratic Party and the right-wing Conservative Party, it maintained majority; 48 per cent of the turnout. De Klerk as well took advantage of the political support of the Liberal Democratic Party, which had replaced the Progressive Federal Party. It is important to notice here that the Conservative party came second in elections with 13.2 per cent of the votes (39 seats) whereas it gained 26.4 per cent in the previous election of 1987 These results indicate that fluctuation of voters’ political affiliations that reflected the volatile and uncertain political processes in South Africa in the 1980s that resulted from the failure of strategies and the lack of answers to the challenges the regime faced.
Security Management System that Botha established and the release of eight long-term political prisoners including leading figures in the ANC. Furthermore, De Klerk announced that his government has repealed the ban on the ANC, the PAC, and the SACP, and that Nelson Mandela would shortly be released. These dramatic steps were considered a leap forward towards the liberalization of the political system. However, it seems that De Klerk realized the irreversible nature of the changes during 1980 and sought to minimize the damage by containing the trend. In this De Klerk’s policy can be seen as a logical extension of his predecessor: Botha in spite of his rigid stance before he left office had met with Nelson Mandela and he acknowledged that in public, and he released a leading member of the ANC; Goven Mbeki. However, De Klerk reforms went a qualitative step ahead of Botha’s reforms. As Saul (1993: 67) remarks, De Klerk’s agenda was more assertive than Botha’s in pursuing the reformation of a new political terrain and thus it has to be assessed in terms of its further departure from the orthodox apartheid tenets. Thus in December 1989 De Klerk announced that his government “accepts the principle of power-sharing and the involvement of the ANC in the process” (Guelke 2005: 157).

Power-sharing was envisioned as an institutional arrangement that would maintain the underpinnings of the current social relations order although it was perceived as a step that detached political power from the old convictions of Afrikaners nationalism. The latter would not have tolerated any claims to political power of non-whites and political supremacy had been the clearest and most important domination tool in the disposal of Afrikaners as a minority. Therefore the arrangement De Klerk sought was
primarily a power-sharing that gives the non-white a share in political authority and keeps the power of the state, in the hands of the Afrikaners. Thus De Klerk offered a power-sharing formula based on a bi-racial rather than a non-racial political system and institutions in an attempt to prevent the total surrender of political power. De Klerk stated bluntly: “I do not believe in the existence of anything like a non-racial society in the literal sense of the word. What we have to build is a non-racist society…the diversity of our people would not disappear in such a society” (Rich 1994: 53).

The new strategy was totally and fiercely rejected by African nationalist movement that saw the offer as euphemism of Botha’s reforms in which the center-piece of apartheid namely, racial ethno-national differentiation prevails. Racial domination and apartheid had strengthened the ethno-national identity of the Africans within a context where the nexus of national-identities and territory was not a decisive element which accentuated ethno-national demands for civic self-determination and democratic political system for all South Africans; a formula that De Klerk power-sharing fills short of accommodating. This dynamism suggests that assimilation in a single nation-building process rather than consociationalism was the answer for African nationalists, which De Klerk sought to bypass since it will lead to majority rule. Instead he attempted to offer a plan that will freezes ethnic divisions and “elevate ethnicity to the status of primary organizing element of political life of society” (Simpson 1994: 469). By offering a power-sharing plan De Klerk attempted to reach a synthesis of the apartheid and a democratic state based on the concept and prerogative of citizenship; a synthesis that would sustain certain and core aspects of domination.
De Klerk’s rapid move came to the surprise of every observer of the South African conflict and to those involved in it, especially the ANC. In some accounts, De Klerk was profoundly affected by the fall of the Berlin Wall; as he himself writes, this moment implied that one of South Africa’s greatest fears; the Soviet threat and its influence on the ANC had disappeared. This looked as a window of opportunity “for a much more adventurous approach than had previously been conceivable” (De Klerk 1998: 160-1). This development also meant that the ANC had become weaker since one of its main sources of support disappeared, which gives De Klerk the opportunity to reach a better political deal for his power-sharing agenda.

These events around the world and in the region affected De Klerk’s perspectives. However, these events did not weaken the ANC alone, the regime in South Africa also and maybe more profoundly, was weakened by world events. The regime was deprived of a major pretext to justify his position and diffusing international castigation: containing communist threat in the region became obsolete. Moreover, the debacle South African government faced was exacerbated by the politically-oriented as well as market driven sanctions against the regime. These dynamics had embodied the intersection between political reality of increasing resistance to apartheid regime within the country and abroad, and the economic reality of growth decline. The growing linkages between democratic anti-racist struggle and resistance to capitalist system that overlapped with it have become a source of great threat to the white economic and political existence, which moved the reform program of De Klerk.
On the face of it, De Klerk seems to have engineered political changes from within the power structure of a coherent and impervious system by a top-down revolution. A closer insight to the events that preceded De Klerk’s moves shows that necessity rather than choice drove his policies. Inasmuch as he had the strength and political will to pursue his agenda he could not stand against the forces of change and the dynamics of the conflict that had led to the impasse we above detailed. As a matter of fact De Klerk was a hard core Afrikaner and he came to power “because the elite group would no longer tolerate the obstinacy of his predecessor, P. W. Botha” (Rich 1994: 103). Internal pressure on the government to change course sprung from diverse interests and ideological transformation within the Afrikaner community. De Klerk was the head of a seriously fractured regime and polity that was in a state of division and profound changes. Thus, a lot of pressure came from the business strata - a successful class of entrepreneurs and professionals to profoundly reform the regime. More telling are the demands for reform that came from one of the main leading Afrikaner ideological organizations; the Broederbond. This indicates that changes took place also on the level of convections reflected in the Broederbond call for an inclusive polity, which gave De Klerk’s initiative a significant measure of legitimacy within the Afrikaner community. The Broederbond circulated a secret document in 1989 that argues that

…the exclusion of effective black sharing in the political processes at the highest level had become a threat to the survival of the white man…there could no longer be a white government and the head of the government did not necessarily have to be white” (Olson and Stedman 1994: 133).
This position was a watershed in Afrikaners’ attitudes towards apartheid; a major ideological and political shift that contributed to De Klerk’s aggressive agenda and the dismantling of apartheid.

One can conclude that De Klerk’s agenda came in tandem with already ripe conditions for the changes he put forth. Needless to say that he did not expect that his policy would trigger dynamics of its own that will yield different outcomes: he did not anticipate that his reforms will “lead to black majority rule and the end of Afrikaner nationalism before the end of the decade” (Sparks 1994: 12). Therefore it can be said that without the conditions prevailed when he came to office De Klerk wouldn’t have been in a position to present his reforms. It was in this context that De Klerk took the “bold steps of February 1990 seeking to break the political log-jam” (Saul 1993: 69) that crippled the country for years and threatened to push the country into chaos. The release of Mandela was yet another remarkable step in this direction. However, to many observers De Klerk’s new stance was dangerously limited as he envisioned a multiracial South Africa based on the protection of “group rights” with strong veto power to the white South African community which would have maintained the structures of power intact. Moreover, De Klerk’s expediency can be seen as he sought to regain political initiative and reclaim the locus of political power. His rapid move was designed to create a novel arena that was not familiar or comfortable to the ANC and other nationalist forces who found themselves in a hard position to respond to De Klerk’s proposal.

The apparent weakness of the ANC was perceived by De Klerk as an opportunity to speed the pace of reforms to capitalize on the moment. However; regional
developments especially in Angola and Rhodesia gave rise to African Nationalism in general and to South African National movement led by the ANC in particular. Late 1970s through 1980s were catastrophic to apartheid as we discussed above. In contrast, the 1980’s had witnessed the reemergence of the NAC as a central political force in the broad resistance movement by virtue of its ‘historical legitimacy’ and its ability to sustain unity and to adopt ‘armed propaganda’ (restrained armed resistance) against apartheid. The ANC had shown a remarkable political skill in uniting the broad resistance movement (including the UDF and the COSATU) around its slogans and program mainly the slogan: ‘first, ungovernability’ and then ‘from ungovernability to people’s power’ (Saul 1993: 15). The legitimacy of the ANC enabled it to mobilize the masses behind these slogans that were virtually implemented during the townships revolt of 1984-6. Thus the ANC popular appeal and its leading position in the South African national movement gave it a political edge over De Klerk especially with ANC consistent political vision that was based on two mutually enforcing pillars: (1) to establish a counter-apartheid hegemonic socio-political base relying on a broad class front of black Africans in alliance with other anti-apartheid movements in order to overthrow the regime by means of mass action; (2) to perceive the conflict as one of democratic struggle against injustice and racial discrimination, not as an ethnic conflict. The apparent weakness of the ANC was at best contextual and was compensated to a significant degree by the strength and effectiveness of other national movement forces such as the Communist Party and the UDF. Thus when the ANC announced its willingness to involve in negotiations that would transform South Africa into ‘untied democratic and non-racial country’ it did not give in its core objective of thwarting the apartheid regime. Thus De
Klerk’s power-sharing offer was rejected and the ANC maintained its demands for a profound structural change that goes beyond the reforms of De Klerk.

**South African from a regional power to a pariah state**

The events of 1960s in Southern Africa and worldwide had affected apartheid regime in contradictory ways; while at one level they undermined it, at another it gave the regime a measure of legitimacy and strength. As Guelke (2005: 100) notices “even without the Sharpeville massacre, the 1960s would have presented a severe challenge to the South African government” as many African countries gained independence. The decolonization era and the change in international political climate that upheld peoples’ right in self-determination and human rights represented a challenge and a source of threat to European settlers and colonists in Africa. South African white settler rule echoed this threat with the most assertive manner. The fear of the spill-over effect of this trend urged South African regime to resort to a new form of colonialism; one that would escape the logic of decolonization; apartheid. However, the severity and brutality with which the regime sought to implement apartheid instigated international condemnation that undermined regime’s legitimacy. One of the earliest among these reactions was the 1960 British Prime Minister’s ‘wind of change’ speech to the South African Parliament that generated deep discontent among the Afrikaner political leaders as it regarded African Nationalism as an irresistible force (Calvocoressi 1961: 9-10). The speech was followed by a short-term investment crisis as the confidence in the country’s stability declined as a result of Sharpeville massacre. Capital fled South Africa at a rate of 12 million rand
(domestic currency of South Africa) a month (Spence, 1965: 47). However, international pressure on the regime was inconsistent and fluctuated in accordance with regional and international political environments and the interests of the super powers and Western countries. It was until a late stage of the conflict in 1980s that international pressure took a constant rise and gave a measure of conformity to all efforts aimed at thwarting apartheid.

Fluctuating international attitudes and policies toward South Africa had played a crucial role in the ability of the regime to endure. The early 1970s had witnessed the failure of South African government to relax its regional relations through dialogue (Guelke 2005: 115-16), which undercut the ability of the regime to gain regional power that would have strengthened its domestic position vis-à-vis African nationalist movement. However, a counterbalance development came from the USA when the newly elect president Richard Nixon adopted a policy to establish

broader association with both black and white states in an effort to encourage moderation in the white states, to enlist cooperation of the black states in reducing tensions and the likelihood of increasing cross-border violence, and to encourage improved relations among states in the area (Guelke 2005: 115-16). This policy clearly turned a blind-eye to the apartheid and accepted the presence of South Africa in South West Africa as a de-facto situation that was expected to sustain. It was a significant gain to the South African government at all levels and was further reinforced by the ascendance of the Conservative Party to power in Britain in 1970 that soon resumed arms sales to South Africa and sough diplomatic disengagement from Southern Africa through a settlement with the South African government. These important developments came in the context of the Cold-War as the two superpowers entered an era
of détente in which each power tacitly recognized the spheres of influence of the other and refrained from intervening in one another territories. Western powers’ interests in the region at this juncture were linked to their ties with the regime in South Africa as the latter was expanding its regional influence especially in security affairs creating its own sphere of influence. South African leaders in their turn claimed that their regional growing power and identification with liberal democracy could make them “serve as a bridge between Europe and Africans in the region…as profoundly anti-colonialist” force (Olson and Stedman, 1994: 45).

In 1976 the USA administration of President Jerald Ford adopted a policy that promotes stability as the ultimate consideration whether achieved by majority rule or otherwise. In order to engage this policy in a way that put South Africa in position as the guarantor of regional stability, the government of Vorster adopted a stabilizing strategy with neighboring countries; playing such a role would allow more implementation of apartheid with minimum international objection. This policy had its own detrimental consequences on the regime. Government’s acquiescence to the transformation of political power to a nationalist movement in neighboring Mozambique that was a price for stabilization precipitated a spell over effect that hit South Africa and weakened its position in the face of the nationalist challenge especially following the South African disastrous intervention in Angola in 1975-6. South African ability to maneuver on the international arena also was diminished after Jimmy Carter’s victory in the Presidential elections in the USA. The new Administration, with Carter’s doctrine of Human Rights protection dealt a serious blow to the South African position. In Africa this new doctrine
implied that the USA would back mainstream African opinion and work closely with the non-aligned bloc to reduce military intervention in Africa and especially the Southern region. It also implied that America would align with non-aligned bloc’s commitment to liberate this region from white minority rule (Guelke 2005: 134); apartheid regime was going to be at the top of the list.

In response to these developments that had put the regime in a precarious position and in order to pre-empt the rise of nationalism inside South Africa, the government resorted to far reaching measures to undercut the nationalist tide. International reaction was prompt; in 1977 the UN Security Council adopted a mandatory ban on arms sales to South Africa. It seemed clear that further sanctions were to follow as the South African government went further with apartheid policies especially after the election of 1977 that gave the NP more political power in the domestic arena as it gained 134 out of 164 seats of the Parliament. The victory, as much as it revealed Afrikaner strong commitment to apartheid, couldn’t conceal how rudderless the government was under the circumstances we discussed; the major sign of this precarious position was the changing the prime minister Vorster. P.W. Botha had become the new prime minister who entertained a different strategy to remedy regime’s maladies.

**Conclusion**

In early 1990’s South Africa seemed to be at the brinks of chaos and collapse. The rising stalemate threatened the country with the danger of political vacuum that may have led to an all-out civil war or state failure. Negotiations seemed to promise the least evil for the adversaries since sustaining the status quo was perceived as a costly alternative
that either party was prepared to accept. The stakes were high for both adversaries: for the Africans accepting racial-ethnic classifications and ethnically-based power sharing was anathema to their long and persistent struggle for restitution and justice in a democratic life. It also amounted to conferring legitimacy on a regime they fought to delegitimize and overthrow. As a majority that identified with South Africa as a single country and nation, Africans possessed the political leverage to change the foundation of the state. Afrikaners on their turn sought to preserve the political power they obtained for decades as the main guarantor for their status and privileges; their ultimate fear was that a democratic majority rule will strip them of all privileges and status they possessed through racial domination over the majority of the population.

In spite of Afrikaner’s efforts to transform their settler-colonial domination into ethno-territorial neo-racism through apartheid, African national movement’s struggle and consistency coupled with international pressure had exposed the inherited weaknesses and vulnerabilities of the segregation and separation domination system.

First and most decisive, the regime couldn’t find a permanent solution to the problem of the indigenous especially as the latter represents a strikingly vast majority of the population and has a crucial role in the economic system of the country. Nor were Afrikaners able to augment their minority status by any source of European settler groups of immigrants.

A majority, especially when ethnicized and entirely excluded from the central structures of political power and resources while exploited and demoralized can’t be easily, if at all, dismissed. Afrikaners’ domination system manifests the dynamics of
majority-minority syndrome in all its complications. A minority in domination finds it harder to manage its political power and supremacy that secures its socio-economic interests when the majority comes to shape its collective awareness and shared identity, and mobilizes through struggle against domination. As a permanent small minority whites in South Africa were not able, and could not, totally exclude the indigenous as the latter labor was crucial for the economic system of the white to operate and function properly. The permanent minority status although generated deeper fears of political and social annihilation had significantly weakened the very structures of the white political system as a democracy; the intersection of skin color and deprivation and disfranchisement of a huge majority mocked white regime’s attempts to confer a veil of liberal democracy on an explicitly racial domination system. Minority-majority relationships in South Africa can be considered as the main factor that impeded territorial total separation thus also undermined Afrikaner sought for gaining the properties of a territorial ethno-national people. As the Afrikaners did not seek to ethnically cleanse the indigenous Africans they decided to establish a racist system of domination. However, African existence in itself represented a structural impediment to racial exclusion and domination. Under apartheid the African majority for itself became a hindrance to establish a territorially defined white entity as African became more aware of their identity and common goals.

Second, South African regional surrounding remained elusive to control. South African efforts to impose hegemony in the region failed and the policies it implemented created a hostile region especially with the revival of nationalism in surrounding
countries. Third, although white regime gained independence from Britain’s direct influence and South Africa succeeded in constructing a strong economic and military state, international pressure only increased against regimes racial policies. These vulnerabilities affected directly and profoundly regime’s ability to maneuver as it involved in the negotiations with the ANC.

The negotiations between the ANC and De Klerk’s government was a struggle over the main features of the nation-building process in South Africa that will take the place of apartheid and white domination. On the micro level negotiating nation-building within the context prevailed in South Africa reflected the conflicting elements embedded in each party’s perspective and political demands. However, on the level of macro conditions, and as the history of the conflict attests there were four conditions that sustained and deepened Afrikaners’ regime vulnerabilities above-mentioned and led to the prevalence of the democratic solution and a nation-building that enshrines the rights and prerogative of equal citizenship in a unitary state system:

(1) The inability of the dominant group to form an inclusive nation-state out of the conditions at state formation moment: first, white population is a small and divided minority. The formation of a nation-state would have threatened Afrikaners status and their sought for political and social hegemony. However, the minority status and the lack of a strong ethno-national territorial identification impeded the construction of Afrikaners as an ethnically-defined people; second, modern state in South Africa was formed within a territorially integrated geography whereby territorial legitimation of the state was bound to top-down institutional process based on racial differentiation. This constitution
implied that the main goal of the state system as a settler-colonial project was aimed at managing the indigenous majority rather than shaping the state as a territorial and spatial construct. Thus state formation and territorial ideologies it espoused targeted the population of the subordinate group in order to preserve the dominant interests and status.

Afrikaners and white society cleavages had weakened the coherency required to constitute a well-defined ethno-national group. Moreover, the lack of clear and well demarcated territorial boundaries which the establishment of a white state would actualize. In fact Afrikaners on the level of elites and the populace –and to greater degree English-speaking whites- had shown weak territorial self-identification. Although Afrikaners possessed a significant degree of self-identification as a nation, they were not able to establish their entity as an ethnic core of a broader process of nation building. They were preoccupied more with establishing their political power position by controlling state institutions through which they guaranteed their domination over the non-white groups. In this sense the Union of South Africa was not a coherent nation-state that identify with solid territorial boundaries. As a matter of fact Afrikaner elites did not peruse a project of a nation-state; rather they espoused the perpetuation of a separated society.

The case of Afrikaners’ rule shows that a minority in rule remains unable to establish a strong claim of territorial-national ideology that shapes the material and subjective bases of ethno-national political identity and institutions. This factor rendered Afrikaner identity and believes not fixated and the types of segregation and separation they practiced contextual. Furthermore, profound divisions within the white society
between Afrikaners and English-speaking communities have weakened the claim of racial supremacy and prevented the articulation of a unitary white ethnic-national group. Even when the regime attempted to overcome this structural condition by collapsing the whites in a single group after 1948, Afrikanerdom was perceived as the hegemonic social and political power that provided the process with its tenets.

(2) The weakness of the national-territorial ideology as the bedrock of demarcating a well-defined nation-state was dialectically linked to the contextually established domination and separation systems deployed by the Afrikaner ruling elites. Since Afrikanerdom had never envisioned the establishment of a nation-state, territorial-national nexus lacked the driving force to be materialized and consolidated in state system and institutions. Afrikaners were mobilized on the bases of language during racial-colonial segregation era, and on the basis of their cultural identification as a volk during the 1939-1960s and at a very late stage they were mobilized and identified with the state per se. The belonging to a territorial nation-state arrived in a very late stage of ethnic-national constitution, which unveils the undetermined regime of territorial ideology of Afrikaners. Territorial separation at all phases of white domination was sought for its instrumentality and the political functions it provided and aimed at confining the Black community not for drawing institutional and normative boundaries. Thus state contraction that was embedded in the Bantustan policy was implemented with minimum divisive consequences for the ethno-nation identity of the Afrikaners that was not linked essentially to territorial underpinnings. This is why in the 1970s Afrikaners were able to redefine their ideology and self-identification in order to redefine the core of
their tenets that was perceived as immutable before 1970s events. Moreover, the weakness of the territorial-national nexus overlapped and at least partially explains the contextual nature of the systems of domination Afrikaners implemented in different phases of the conflict. As we discussed in details neither racial-colonial segregation policies nor apartheid represented integral systems and their modalities and organizational elements were associational; they were protean, adoptive, and at many levels pragmatic. This characteristic allowed the gradual decay and erosion of the whole system as cracks within its edifice started to surface especially when challenged by a well-organized counter-hegemonic project of the African National movement, and faced external shocks; sanctions, castigation, and regional failures.

The indeterminacy of Afrikaner ethno-territoriality was further deepened by the partial integration of the Black African population in the white economic and to a lesser degree at different times- into the system. Exclusion in this sense was based on social differentiation of racial-ethnically defined grounds not on ethno-territorial grounds although it included territorial separation before and during apartheid. The dynamics of economic integration and exploitation mitigated the effects of segregation and territorial separation and enabled the African national movement to assume political leverage and to develop a strong sense of national belonging to South Africa as such not to territorially-defined affiliation. This factor maintained African struggle as a pursuit of democratization.

(3) The dynamics above-mentioned had diminished the ability of the dominant group to atomize their adversary and turn their struggle into a centripetal rather than centrifugal
One of the main features of Afrikaner rule in South Africa was its failure to widen the colonial buffer that separated the dominant group from the rest of the population; the subordinate Black majority. Although the regime resorted to the three strands of power: disciplinary, bio-power, and sovereign power in order to widen and consolidate legal, social, political and territorial buffer of white settler-colonial society the dynamics of partial integration and the indeterminacy of territorial ideology rendered the buffer less effective. Apartheid and ‘homeland’ policy represented the climax of this paradox: as segregation and other differentiation racial measures filed the regime attempted to homogenize the white race in a single territorially separated ethno-national group and atomizing the Africans into distinct putative ethnic groups. Apartheid, counterproductively have strengthened the sense of African collective national identity and sentiments of belonging to South Africa among African as a majority. African struggle for self-determination had shown a great deal of consistency in the sought for equality, justice, and self-determination in civic terms; a pattern that was strengthened and consolidated in the most decisive periods of the conflict in the 1980s when popular democratic elements of Africans’ struggle prevailed.

(4) International legitimation that fluctuated through different phases of the conflict and in accordance with changes of world politics. The point at which international and regional effects against apartheid and white domination converged in terms of delegitimating it and legitimating African struggle for self-determination, the regime couldn’t endure the costs of sustaining white minority rule. The minority in a world where democratic notions of governance and the eclipse of colonization and
authoritarianism lost all possible justification to protect its rule and it became clear that
democratic transition is the least costly of all other alternatives; the most prevalent of
which was a racial civil war that might have weathered a way all that white settlers
accomplished.
Chapter VI

Democratization, self-determination and liberation in Palestine

Introduction
In the wake of the second Palestinian intifada and after a decade of the peace process initiated in 1992 the Palestinian national movement found itself in a precarious position as it neither remained a national liberation movement nor it achieved a genuine independence and a sovereign state. For Israel, the decade enabled it to reorganize its occupation: Israel now is practicing occupation with less liability and responsibility towards the Palestinian population while simultaneously Israeli authority consolidated its grip over the Palestinian people in the OPT and has introduced a new set of segregation measures: The construction of the separation wall that “graphically illustrates the territorial essence of the conflict” (Roy 2004: 32); cutting of Palestinian territories from each other by a regime of military check point (more than 500 military checkpoints had been established since the year 2000), by-pass roads, and permit policies; and isolating East Jerusalem from the rest of the OPT and the establishment of border-crossing gates between the city and the WB, all of which only consolidated Israeli virtual control of the space and time of the Palestinian population and reduced the Palestinians into groups of noncontiguous cantons—essentially, Bantustans.
Palestinian population in the years of the peace process and especially after 2001 (the high day of the Intifada) has become more dispossessed and slowly dismembered like it never has; “Not since 1948 perhaps have Palestinians faced such loss and displacement” (Roy 2004: 32). The prevalence of virtual Israeli sovereign power through its control over the vast majority of the West Bank and occupied East Jerusalem, and its control over the borders of Gaza Strip, and the tremendous increase in the establishment of Israeli-Jewish-only settlements\(^56\) virtually impedes the formation of meaningful Palestinian state. Rather, these policies and changes stiffen the status quo and stifle Palestinian efforts to gain self-determination.

The PA possesses a nominal jurisdiction over main residential urban areas that Israeli military forces conquer whenever Israeli authorities render necessary for security considerations. While the PA is responsible to provide civil services in the rest of the OPT, Israeli authorities maintain direct military, security and legal control over the territory and resources. This matrix not only turned the Palestinian territories into enclaves but also has red Israel from its legal responsibilities towards the population. The realities Israel created under the auspices of the peace process are reminiscent, and indeed resemble, the Bantustans (African Homelands under apartheid) and can’t be hoped to transform into a sovereign state that embodies Palestinian’s right of self-determination. To be sure, a genuinely sovereign state and the right of self-determination cannot be

\(^{56}\) In the 10 years since the Oslo peace process began, the Israeli government has expropriated at least 70,000 acres of Palestinian land, largely for Israeli settlement expansion and the construction of new settlements and settlement infrastructure. The settler population has doubled since 1993 to more than 220,000 people (excluding East Jerusalem) living in 150 settlements in the West Bank and 16 in Gaza (before Israel’s redeployment in Gaza) (Roy 2004: 31).
achieved apart from the territorial integrity of the OPT and the monopolization of coercion by this state: both conditions are not present.

The only aspect of the peace process that has been sustained is the process itself and the institutions it founded; a protracted peace process “in which original causes of the conflict persist and are exacerbated by new grievances sparked by the peace process” (Darby and MacGinty 2003: 3). To make it grimmer for the Palestinians the Gaza Strip has been under Hamas control since 2007 following Palestinian-Palestinian division and fight. The Palestinian national movement has become divided not only in a factionalized fashion that prevailed for decades, but also geographically fractured, which added more challenges to realizing a Palestinian state.

After more than six decades of the Palestinian Nakba of 1948 and four decades of Israeli occupation of the WB, GS and East Jerusalem the Palestinian national movement have failed in realizing any of its announced objectives apart from sustaining the Palestinian cause (question) alive and persistent on the political map of regional and international affairs. Without undermining this accomplishment Palestinian ends in national liberation and the establishment of democratic unitary state, in establishing an independent state on the OPT, in achieving Israeli recognition of their national rights, were all unfulfilled. The latter has been the most disillusioning following almost twenty years of negotiations with Israel. A two-state solution as engendered by the current Israeli-PLO agreements will remain dominated by Israel…not only will Israel’s domination persist through control over security, foreign relations, immigration, and the territories’ water resources, but the economic annexes to the Oslo agreements lock the Palestinians entity’s economic development firmly into Israel’s (Younis 2000: 4).
It is hard to see how a Palestinian government, with nominal jurisdiction and facing structural hindrances, could operate effectively to establish a viable institutional base for a sovereign state whether in terms of its ability to run a viable economy (Roy 2004:32)\(^\text{57}\) or provide security for its constituency or to tame Palestinians’ eagerness for self-determination.

The elusiveness, even disillusionment of the two-state solution not only justifies, but substantiates the examination of the conditions prevailing in Palestine/Israel to assess other likely developments including a one-state solution or particular formulas of power sharing and bi-nationalism or the continuation of the current state of affairs where Israel is exerting a “creeping apartheid” in the words of Yiftachel (see Sussman 2004, and Yiftachel 2005). With the conditions for a two-state outcome are dim and Israel’s colonial expansionist policies proceed apace, the status quo has become more critical and fraught malicious dynamics. Among the most serious exits for Israeli policy-makers is the *transfer* policy. Transfer (whether hard by means of force or soft by way of increasing pressure on the population as to make people leave) of Palestinians from the OPT to Jordan has a strong appeal for many Israeli political leaders, as discussed below. Although transfer would generate regional and international objection and create serious and long-term security threats, as Tilley (2005: 5-6) remarks, the history of the conflict and the difficult strategic choices Israel has suggest that transfer cannot be completely

\(^{57}\)The Palestinian economy as Roy asserts was devastated by the effects of Israel’s continued occupation and control over Palestinian land and resources. According to the World Bank, it will take some 20 years to return the Palestinian economy to where it was on the eve of the current Intifada, and According to UN figures, real GDP is presently below its 1986 level, declining by 24 percent in 2001 and more than 22 percent in 2002. Indeed, despite unprecedented levels of international financial assistance amounting to $315 per person per year, the World Bank calculates that the Palestinian economy has contracted by half (Roy 2004: p32).
dismissed as a possibility. Furthermore, Taking into consideration the creeping segregationist system of Israeli domination, it is not less probable that Israel impose its full sovereignty over the OPT and establishing Greater Israel with a system of overt discrimination. The chapters that follow focus on the conditions that may or may not lead to the emergence of a one democratic-civic state in the Mandatory Palestine. This entails examining centrifugal forces within the Palestinian-Israeli conflict that push in the direction of separation and those countervailing centripetal forces that may converge to create dynamics and conditions for the emergence of democratic one-state.

This chapter proceeds as follow: first it presents to the political debates on the question of one-state versus two-state solutions and then provides this research understanding of the one-state solution as a concept and as an emergent property of the conflict. The two sections that follow introduce the historical origins of the conflict with emphasis on Zionism and its correspondence with European colonialism and racism.

The term one-state

Literature on the one-state solution lacks clarity as to the type of integration considered when talking about a one-state solution; a bi-national state, a secular democratic-civic state, a bi-ethnic or power-sharing or otherwise (e.g. Abunimah 2006, Ibish 2009, Klein 2010). This study considers the secular democratic-civic state that Tony Judt, Uri Davis and Virginia Tilley defined in their analysis of the conflict. Judt argues that the Israeli-Jewish settlement movement and its influence and power in Israeli politics
bury the prospects of two-state solution. He makes an unequivocal preference for the democratic-civic state that is based on the dismantling of Jewish ethno-national structures of Israel. In this sense Judt conceives of Israel as colonial system of Jewish supremacy and presents the one-state as the alternative (quoted in Sussman 2004: 38).

By the same token, Uri Davis (2003:15) presents the one-state as the state of all its citizens. His normative take on the issue focuses on a vision of justice that is based on Kantian categorical imperative of equality of individuals and collective groups. This vision, he contends, cannot be achieved without a struggle that challenge political Zionism as a colonial power by “the native indigenous (non-Jewish) of Palestine.” Virginia Tilley (2005) argues for a civic-democratic one-state in which structures of politico-religious Jewish domination structures are challenged and replaced with universal democratic imperatives.

The following analysis draws on the conception of the democratic-civic one-state where individual rights is the ruling political form of governance (the one-man one-vote system) not group rights that is characteristic to bi-nationalism (the recognition of two distinct groups within one political entity). The democratic-civic state entails that systems and structures of domination are to be transformed into constitutional democracy that guarantees equal rights and obligations of all citizens with strong bill of rights and institutions that prevents majority tyranny.

 Adopting a clear concept of the ‘One-State solution’ is necessary in order to examine the conditions that make it worthy to pursue apart from political manipulations and speculative exercises. Although the idea of one-state has not been entertained at any
stage of the negotiations between Israel and the PLO, many political leaders especially on the Palestinian side utilize the idea as a reaction to the stagnation of the peace process. In this sense it looks more of a threat aimed at convincing Israel to strike a deal with the PLO (Ibish 2009: 105-109). For Israelis, however, this kind of pressure “does not carry a whole lot of credibility” as Michael Tarazi (a legal advisor of the PLO during the 1990s) remarks (Cited in Abunimah 2006:162). Nevertheless, these political maneuvers echo, at least partially, certain transformations of conflict following the political developments of the 1990s as mentioned above. Politicians on both sides of the conflict realize that the changes took place have transformed the stakes for any solution. The democratic solution (one-state) is examined here against these developments as an emergence.

The One-State solution: a choice or an emergence?

The discussion of a one-state solution has gathered some momentum in the last decade especially since the second Palestinian Intifada in 2000. However, groups and individuals who reject the two-state solution as a waning option and advocate the one-state agenda do not constitute a mainstream whether in Israeli or Palestinian politics or populations. The main force in this camp is concentrated in leftist groups in

58 It is indicative that the One-State idea has an appeal among the Palestinians, especially after the year 2000. In a survey conducted by the Near East Consulting (NEC) in February 2007 in the OPT and involved over 1200 individuals (The margin of error is +/- 3.4% with a 95% confidence level), principal 75% of Palestinians do not think that Israel has the right to exist, 70% support a one-state solution in historic Palestine where Muslims, Christians and Jews live together with equal rights and responsibilities. http://electronicintifada.net/content/survey-70-percent-palestinians-support-one-state-solution/6773
Surveys, however, remain less reliable in such a dynamic context. Other surveys indicate that a significant majority of both adversaries’ public opinions reject the one-state idea and endorses the Two-State solution; 74% of Palestinians and 78% of Israelis would be willing to accept a two-state solution, while 59% of
international arena and in Palestine/Israel especially among Palestinian Diaspora intellectuals, Palestinian thinkers inside Israel, and Leftist Jewish scholars and thinkers. The idea is not unprecedented within the Palestinian and Israeli/Jewish political thinking. The PLO endorsed a one-state vision in its National Charter of 1968: The Charter envisaged an Arab Palestinian state not a bi-national one (Ibish 2009: 19-20). While the PLO sought to redress Palestinian peoples loss of home and land it made a clear distinction between Judaism and Zionism perceiving the latter as the enemy, it adopted “a progressive, democratic, non-sectarian Palestine in which Christians, Muslims, and Jews will worship, live peacefully, and enjoy equal rights” (Younis 2000: 109).

However, this integrative program was abandoned in 1974 in favor of a new agenda that espoused Palestinian independence on the OPT. Within the Israeli-Jewish community, the bi-national state was envisioned as early as the 1906s. This idea can be traced to the ideas of a number of Jewish thinkers; the founders of the organization B’nai B’rith and the Jewish Joint Distribution Committee in Palestine Rabbi Judah Leib Magnes59, and in 1940s the ideas of theologian Martin Buber are the most prominent in lobbying for the one bi-national-state in Mandatory Palestine that could blend the interests of the two people. Their ideas, however, waned and did not attract any significant support. Current

Palestinians and 66% of Israelis find a single, bi-national state to be unacceptable. These figures turn to be more elusive as core issues of the Two-State arrangement involved in the survey. http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2009/apr/22/israel-palestinian-survey-two-state-solution.

59 Magnes wrote “we must once and for all give up the idea of “Jewish Palestine”, and “Jewish and Arabs…have each as much right there, no more and no less, than the other”. He also was discontent about the Jewish state that established a Jewish ruling class; a political primacy rather than political equality, which contains the seeds of resentment and conflict, as he asserts. Buber mistrusted ethnic-nationalism and spend most of his professional life invoking a bi-national state. Along with Magnes and others, Buber founded the organization Ichud (unity in Hebrew). In 1947 he wrote describing the program of the organization “as that of a bi-national state-that is, we aim at a social structure based on the reality of two peoples living together” (cited in Tilley 2005: 214-215)
debate on the issue is not entirely cut off of this early precedence. But it differs fundamentally in terms of the context within which it takes place as we mentioned. The failure of the peace process and particularly the less likely two-state solution is the main premise upon which most arguments for a One-State solution are based.

The two and the one-state solutions: correspondence?

Most advocates of the one-state solution predicate their arguments on the failure of achieving Palestinian people’s right of national self-determination in an independent state on the OPT. This failure, or more particularly the conditions that created it, seem to generate a situation that makes a One-State solution the only alternative. Opponents of the idea argue for the viability of the Two-State solution as the sole acceptable for all actors. The more leftist intellectuals reject the two-state solution on the grounds of castigating ethno-nationalism; they call for a democratic state and the dismantling of Israel as a Jewish state. They see Zionism as a “discriminatory ideology and Israel as an inequitable and pariah state” (Sussman 2004: 37).

For many commentators and scholars Israel will never allow the establishment of a sovereign Palestinian state West of the Jordan River. John J. Mearsheimer (2010), for instance, asserts that

Regrettably, the two-state solution is now a fantasy. Instead, those territories [the OPT] will be incorporated into a “Greater Israel,” which will be an apartheid state bearing a marked resemblance to white-ruled South Africa.”
Other thinkers indicate the almost inevitable development of the conflict toward integration in one-state. Palestinian intellectuals, especially those who live inside Israel and in the Diaspora such as Edward Said, Azmi Bishara, and Nadim Rouhana wrote in favor of a one state solution from the same perspective. Edward Said (Cited in: Aruri 2003: 220) argues

The whole idea of trying to produce two states is at an end. The Oslo peace process is really in tatters…The lives of Israelis and Palestinians are hopelessly intertwined. There is no way to separate them…in reality there is a common history. So we have to find a way to live together. It may take 50 years…. But it will take place as Said asserts because the future of Israel is to turn toward the Arab world and this turn cannot be realized without the Palestinians. Said goes on to embed his point within a political and empirical context; “Of course, on the West Bank, the settlers and Palestinians interact, through antipathy and hostility, but physically they’re in the same place”, which cannot be solved through separation especially with the demographic reality that prevails in Palestine as a whole: Palestinians will realize demographic parity with Israeli Jewish in Palestine in the coming two decades Said remarks, and Israel comparing to South African apartheid, will not be able to maintain apartheid regime. Said concludes: a bi-national state “is the one idea that will allow people to live with- and not exterminate- each other.” (Aruri 2003: 220)

The correspondence between the failure to establishing a Palestinian state in the OPT and the creation of a one bi-national state in all Palestine has been reinforced, unintentionally, by the repercussions of the peace process that created new realities and transformed the conflict in ways that make the one-state scheme more appealing. Nadim Rouhana (2003) argues that
The failure of the Oslo process to yield a viable Palestinian state could lead to the convergence of interests of all segments of the Palestinian people [those living in the OPT and in Israel, and in Diaspora] in calling for a unitary state in Palestine.

Palestinians as Rouhana stresses will not accept a Bantustan system of government in the West Bank, but the development of a mainstream political program that redefines the conflict from one over territory and sovereignty to a conflict over power sharing and equality …in the form of a binational or secular state— the same issue that the Palestinians in Israel are struggling for (Aruri 2003: 222).

A number of Israeli intellectuals and researcher have been grappling with new realities and structures of the conflict especially changes in the political-geography and dynamics resulted from the excesses of the peace process and the second Palestinian Intifada. Benvenisti (1990) argues for a re-definition of the conflict and contends that it has changed profoundly and “has shrunk to its original core, namely Israeli-Palestinian inter-communal strife” (Benevenisti 1990: 119). Originally, the conflict, as Benevenisti remarks, is one of a clash between settlers and indigenous people, which has been a zero-sum conflict. Therefore ‘means-ends’ approaches to settle this conflict are doomed to failure because of their linearity. The asymmetry between the two adversaries has deepened since the war of 1967 after which new political, institutional, socio-economic and administrative systems emerged to consolidate Israeli rule of all Palestine and rendered the demarcations between Israel proper and the OPT blurred and meaningless. For Benvenisti the question is not any more about binationalism, rather about the model to choose. He contends that the two-state solution can’t work because it “doesn’t reflect the depth of the conflict and doesn’t sit with the scale of the entanglement that exists in large parts of the country”. This reality, Benvenisti concludes, calls for a model that is
based on personal and collective equality within one regime throughout the country (Cited in Tilley 2005: 185). Following the steps of Benvenisti the prominent Israeli journalist Daniel Gavron announces: “The territory between the Mediterranean and the Jordan River must be shared and cannot be sensibly partitioned”. The solution for Gavron is Israeli-Palestinian coexistence in one nation (Cited in Abunimah 2006: 171-172). The idea of one nation inasmuch as it reflects an inclusive precept it is still ambiguous as to the institutional underpinnings it would engender or the base of legitimacy it represents. Inclusive and universal democratic principles entails a political system and state legitimacy whereby forms of domination and inequality being eradicated and dismantled. The founding principle of political life in this state is neither ethnicity nor religion; rather it is the one-man one-vote principle.

Whether the two-state agenda is making any significant breakthrough or is stagnant, and that a One-State solution requires an in-depth inquiry of the origins of the conflict, its underlying properties, and changes in its structures, manifestations, and actors. Such an inquiry not only pinpoints the causes that stand behind the stagnation of the two-state formula but also explain the impediments facing the One-State model. The conflict is primarily and essentially a territorial struggle; territoriality and the linkages it has with ethno-national identity and life viability implies that “land and its control lies at the heart of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict” (Roy, 2004: 32). Indeed, Israel’s control over the territory was further entrenched during the peace process and has benefited for the process to making occupation invisible: by suppressing the distinction between the occupied and the occupier, the powerful and the powerless the Oslo process created an
unusual situation whereby the abnormal (foreign military occupation) is being normalized. In comparison to South Africa, as Knox and Quirk (2000: 163) notice, the Palestinian Authority coexisted with the occupation whereas the ANC and mixed its position in favor of democratic transformation with a firm rejection to apartheid and Afrikaner racial ethno nationalism. ANC and its allies have turned most of the country into ungovernable zones and exerted peoples politics and rule, which undercut regime’s ability to sustain.

Without close treatment of the conditions that made the conflict deeply ingrained in territorial legetimation and the dynamics that may lead to the decomposition of this feature the attempt to understand the conflict remains partial. The task, thus, entails tracing down the conflict to its roots and how it developed the way it did. This chapter presents a thorough interpretation of the nature of the Zionist settler-colonial enterprise and how it shaped the conflict and its main properties and what were the consequences of this type of colonialism on the relationships between Israeli-Jewish society and the Palestinian people at different turns of the conflict? This approach emphasizes Zionist and Israel’s national-territorial identification as an ethnocratic-religious entity and the Palestinian reaction to it. Understanding these effects and conditions they created offers better grasp on the key to assessing the decline of Israel’s domination system that is based on ethnic-territorial exclusion. This decline is the precondition for the realization of either solution; two or one state as the arguments presented here contend. Tony Judt’s ideas stand as the most clear in rejecting the ethno-national grounds on which the state of Israel is premised and the two state solution that legitimate ethno-nationalism as the organizing principle of nation and state building (Quoted in Sussman, 2004: 38).
Therefore, the main task of this research is to deconstruct the structures of domination and their consequences and to examine the processes and dynamics those structures triggered on the level of the dominant and the subordinate actors to the conflict.

*The democratic-civic One-state as an emergence*

A one-state is a matter of emergence\(^60\) not an outcome of voluntarism or human agency. Nor it can be assessed in a linear manner where the one would connect current events with normative considerations without examining the deep structures of the conflict and there interaction with certain events and contexts. Emphasizing emergence, however, does not undermine the role of human agency as much as it is concerned with big the structural contexts within which human actions takes place and conditioned by. This approach departs from the most fervent advocates of the one-state model and their opponents alike. Hussein Ibish (2009) asserts that the idea of one-state is an illusion that lacks any significant support whatsoever and contends that “while Israel cannot and will not be compelled or persuaded to relinquish its control of 22 percent of the territory under its rule” it cannot, and will not be persuaded to give up its control over 100 percent of Palestine (Ibish 2009: 29). In contrast, Abunimah (2006) premises his advocacy of a one-state solution on a normative basis; the idea of reconciliation. He notices the presence of

---

\(^60\) The concept ‘emergence’ refers to social phenomenon as a “coming into being of qualitatively novel” (Bunge 2003 p1,10) political entity or structure that stems from within the interactions and dynamics of the conflict, has the capacity to capture the dynamic nature of the conflict and its underlying causal mechanisms that may or may not result in a specific outcome.
two communities in Palestine, both have the right to exist and none of which can dismiss or exclude the other. Partition under these conditions is failing now as it failed in the past, as he remarks. The only conceivable way to end the impasse between the parties to the conflict has to be premised on “absolute equality” and freedom ala South African model whereby the establishment of an inclusive democracy is the best basis for legitimacy and recognition.

Linearity and voluntarism prevalent in these accounts obscures the necessity of analyzing particular internal and external, structural and non-structural effects that may or may not allow the democratic solution to surface in the Palestinian-Israeli conflict the way they had accumulated and staged in the South African case. It implies that problematizing Israel’s system of apartheid, as a unique type of differentiation and domination is necessary. Political actors’ realization and will to espouse an integrative outcome of the conflict as the optimal and less costly than all other alternatives is not a mere function of human agency’s rational calculations; this was the case in South Africa and there is no reason why it should not be in the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. In this sense assessing Israel’s regime as a settler-colonial system that implements a particular type of apartheid is aimed at uncovering the prevailing dynamics of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict and the conditions it endures to examine the one-state emergence.

The suggestion that the failure of the separation agenda to the conflict and the need to redefine it in such a way to conform with a one-state trajectory reflects a mechanical and linear interpretation to the most crucial developments of the conflict. These developments have consolidated the structures of asymmetrical power relations
that Israel established and metamorphosed and led to the widening of the colonial buffer separating the Jewish society from the Palestinian society. Israel’s apartheid in this perspective is distinguished by the ultimate exclusion it imposes on the subordinate people. Without addressing and challenging the question of power and domination underlying such a system of domination neither outcome, two or one state can be realized.

The changes in the conflict in the last two decades that resulted primarily and largely from Israel’s domination and its territorial-national ideology do not necessarily lead to the transformation of the conflict into an inter-communal strife. Rather they indicate the deepening of domination that has taken new shapes under the auspices of the peace process and concealed new systems of domination that is breaking asunder Palestinian national, social, economic and political networks by segregation regimes that turned the OPT into separated Bantustans and noncontiguous enclaves. Israel’s policies since 1987 (the first Palestinian intifada) and especially after the initiation of the peace process and the eruption of the second intifada in 2001 have a consolidating effect of a system of apartheid that has been established since the creation of the state of Israel in 1948. Under these conditions a two-state solution is designed to preserve the Jewish purity of Israel while enabling it from controlling more territory within the OPT. By the same token a bi-national state within this context would perpetuate ethno-religious and ethno-territorial underpinning of Israel and the conflict. A one-state solution under these conditions will be at best a mere expansion of asymmetrical power relations and domination. At worst it would be a one-state dominated by Jewish nationalism and embodying Greater Israel; a state of affairs advocated and sought by Zionist movement mainstream leaders since the establishment of Israel as we show. Those forces support carrying out an ethnic-cleansing
of the Palestinians and call it ‘transfer’ or the establishment of overt apartheid (an explicit system of official differentiation and discrimination) to maintain Jewish hegemony on the Land of Israel.

Noam Arnon; an Israeli Jewish settlement leader sets it as the follow:

…if there is a contradiction between this [Jewish] essence and the character of the government, it is clear that the essence takes precedence, and that steps are taken to prevent damage or changes to this Jewish essence. Democracy cannot be exploited to destroy the Jewish State” (quoted in Sussman, 2004: 39).

Arnon’s ideas, as we show later, are not marginal in Israeli politics and Zionist founding ideological tenets. Efi Eitam; Chairman of the Israeli National Religious Party and a Minister in Sharon’s government in 2003 recently declared his vision for a one-state Jewish entity between the River Jordan and the Mediterranean. He introduces ethnic-cleansing in terms of transfer as he suggests that the Palestinians who wished to remain in the West Bank and Gaza Strip would be offered “enlightened residency,” as opposed to citizenship. Those unwilling to accept this status would have to relocate (quoted in Sussman, 2004: 39). These ideas lie in the heart of Israeli ethno-territorial regime of legitimation and upon them the state constructed its principles and policies to create a unique and covert type of apartheid in the Mandatory Palestine with differing levels of capacity in Israel’s proper and within the OPT. Challenging these foundations and social reality they are aimed at preserving is the locus of the processes that may lead to a particular eradication of Jewish ethno-religious system of differentiation and set the grounds for a democratic outcome of the conflict.
In this sense, the actualization of a Palestinian national identity and national self-determination has become a prerequisite condition for the creation of a civil-democratic one-state in Palestine. The reasoning is straightforward, without the fulfillment of Palestinian national aspirations that implies the abandonment of Zionist Jewish doctrine of Greater Israel the status quo and stagnation of the peace process will persist. Achieving Palestinian national self-determination implies the invalidation of the Jewish-Zionist doctrine of ethnic-Jewish supremacy and domination over the Great Land of Israel and over Palestinians. Challenging Israel’s own type of apartheid in Palestine and the abandonment of Zionist national-territorial ideology requires the convergence of Palestinians’ organized effort in the OPT, Israel and Diaspora to engage in a process of democratic-liberation struggle along with Israeli-Jewish democratic inclusive forces and international delegitimization of ethno-religious nationalism as an accepted form of nation and state building are the necessary and sufficient conditions for the realization of a One-State solutions and for ending Israel’s occupation of the OPT as the precondition for the democratic alternative to emerge. Without the decline or the breakdown of Israeli system of domination that is organized around the fundamental linkages between four elements: the Jewish identity as an ethno-national icon; the state as the ultimate sanctuary of this identity; the land (territory); and the ultimate economic, social, and political exclusion of Palestinians (within the OPT, in Israeli proper, and in the Diaspora) the emergence of a democratic-civic One-State remains unfounded.
European Colonialism and Zionist implantation

The promises Britain made to the Arabs, particularly to Sharif Hussein Bin-Ali of Mecca in 1915 as articulated in Hussein-McMahon Correspondence\textsuperscript{61} to recognize Arab independence in Asia and support Arab revolt against the Ottoman empire were not kept. As a matter of fact McMahon promises in the Name of the Kingdom were at odds with other simultaneously given promises and pledges: one with Britain’s colonial ally France as enshrined in the Sykes –Picot agreement\textsuperscript{62}, and the other to the Zionist movement made in November 1917 by British Foreign Secretary Arthur James Balfour to Walter Rothschild on behalf of the British government and to be transmitted to the Zionist Federation of Great Britain and Ireland. Whereas McMahon exceptions made on the Arab territorial boundaries was to keep the British-French division of the region between the two colonial powers intact, the Balfour declaration remained as unfettered a commitment that Britain kept aiming at the establishment of a Jewish “homeland” in Palestine. The degree to which the Balfour declaration was consistent or non-consistent with the McMahon pledges to Hussein Bin-Ali has been a matter of controversy. It is not in our

\textsuperscript{61} Hussein-McMahon Correspondence is a set of letter-exchange between the Sharif of Mecca Hussein Bin-Ali and Sir Henry McMahon; the British Higher Commissioner in Egypt between July 1915 to January 1916. Britain, needy of Arabs as ally against the Ottomans pledged to support Arab revolt and independence when the War (World War Two) ends. In his letter dated 24 October 1915 McMahon clarifies the territorial boundaries of the Arab independence and declares that “Great Britain is prepared to recognize and support the independence of the Arabs within the territories in the limits and boundaries proposed by the Sherif of Mecca”.

\textsuperscript{62} The Sykes-Picot agreement was signed in secret between the UK and France in May 1916 with the consent Russia; their ally at the time. The agreement defined British and French “spheres of influence” in countries of Western Asia (Iraq, Syria, Jordan, Palestine, and Lebanon) as the War comes to an end and the Ottoman Empire defeated as expected. The negotiations were led by British and French Foreign Ministers: Sir Mark Sykes and François Georges-Picot, respectively, and hence they dubbed Sykes-Picot. The agreement remained secret until the Russian communist revolution exposed it following its ascendance to power.
intention to examine the validity of rival interpretations of the declaration. The British government reiterated its pledge for Arab independence and unity when the Arab revolution forces were advancing northbound well into Jordanian territory. In 1918, Britain dispatched its Higher Commissioner in Egypt to Mecca to convey a letter by Sir Mark Sykes on behalf of the British government in which Britain once again stressed its recognition of Arab independence and Arab unity as a nation. British government, the letter firmly stated, was intent to maintain its commitment for the Zionist movement. The letter unequivocally states

Since the Jewish opinion of the world is in favor of a return (my emphasis) of Jews to Palestine and in as much as this opinion must remain a constant factor, and further as His Majesty's Government view with favor the realization of this aspiration (my emphasis), His Majesty's Government are determined that insofar as is compatible with the freedom of the existing population both economic and political, no obstacle should be put in the way of the realization of this ideal.

The letter neatly restates the provisions of the Balfour declaration of 1917. It represents the first and most instrumental international recognition of the Zionist colonial ambitions in Palestine. The letter added to the terminology the term “return” to depict Jewish immigration to Palestine, and the term “aspiration” to refer to the aim of establishing a Jewish homeland in Palestine. Both terms to be of the main pillars of Zionist political claims in Palestine and kindle the animosity between the Palestinian Arabs and the Zionist movement. The latter justified its endeavor in Palestine primarily by claiming that Jewish people has a divine right in the return to Palestine and that Jews

---

63 The Balfour declaration states that “His Majesty's government view with favor the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavors to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country” (Davis, 2003: 27).
have for a millennia aspired to reestablish their nationhood in the Promised Land. The implementation of the Balfour declaration had meant primarily allowing unlimited Jewish immigration into Palestine and thus seeding the seeds for the implantation of a settler community from tens of different nationalities.

The immediate and profound effect was that Jewish immigration that increased in the last quarter of the 19th century and was spontaneous and ideologically neutral, turned into a systemic, enormous, ideologically motivated, and organized by the Zionist movement. Immigration of this magnitude and sort was a watershed in the onset of the Palestinian-Zionist/Israeli conflict. The implantation of the Jewish in the land of Palestine alarmed the indigenous population and triggered their disillusionment with British intentions and their resentment in the face of Zionist creeping colonialism onto their land. Jewish settler colonialism would increase exponentially through the first three decades of the 19th century and the implantation of the Jews would take particular organizational features and establish its own buffered and isolated sphere of life. British colonial government, while restraining Palestinian institutional and economic viability, either supported or turned a blind eye to Zionist practices. In particular British allowance for Jewish immigration was significantly essential for the success of the Zionist movement to gain ground and strength; gathering more Jewish immigrants to Palestine was the precondition for the creation of a viable settler-colonial society. British policy of allowing the Zionist movement to establish its own administrative structures and to gain autonomy in running Jewish communities was significantly instrumental in Jewish settler community’s leverage over the indigenous population.
Crafting Zionist religious ethno-territoriality

Jewish immigration to Palestine up until the last two decades of 19th century; the pre-Zionist immigration fluctuated in numbers and point of departure. Jews immigrated to Palestine in an almost regular manner in small numbers from different European and Middle Eastern (Arab) regions. Jews immigrated to Palestine in the 17th and 18th centuries primarily for religious reasons, and then the persecution they suffered in Europe. Numbers of immigrants were in increase in the early and mid of 18th century (see Arie Morgensten 2006) for immigrants’ belief of the arrival of the Messiah in the Hebrew year 5600; 1840 on the English calendar. Declining life conditions and persecution and pogroms in Eastern and Southern Europe drove more Jewish immigration to Palestine, as well. Moreover, political and economic changes in the region attracted Jews from Southern Europe and some Arab countries; notably more Jews immigrated to Palestine during the expanding rule of Mohammad Ali in Egypt in 1832. Starting 1882, however the pattern and drivers of this immigration were fundamentally in a remarkable transition.

Rates of Jewish immigration to Palestine starting the last two decades of the 18th century were one of the highest, and the capital transfers that accompanied it was unprecedented in the world. Substantially, Jewish immigration had become an organized effort orchestrated by the ascending “political Zionism”64. The implantation of Jewish in

64 Uri Davis (2003:7) distinguishes between “spiritual Zionism” and “political Zionism”. The school of spiritual Zionism inside the movement opposed the project of “political Zionism”. As the latter committed to a normative and practical project for turning Palestine into a Jewish sovereign state, the former, led by Asher Ginsberg (Ahad-ha-Am) opposed the project. Following his visit to Palestine in 1891 published a critique of political Zionism titled “Truth from Eretz Israel” in which he defies the claim that Palestine was a barren land void of people. We draw on this distinction and wherever this study uses the terms: Zionism, Zionist movement, Zionists it refers to ‘Political Zionism’.
Palestine by means of organized and well-funded Zionist effort represented the convergence of interests between certain segments of Jewish capital in Europe with Jewish labor in the creation of self-sufficient and exclusive settlements in Palestine (Younis 2000: 55) with the consent and protection of the British colonial government that recognized Zionist institutions as legitimate. In fact the British Mandate Government following the enactment of Balfour Declaration recognized the Jewish Agency for the Land of Israel (Jewish Agency JA) “as the appropriate public body to advise the Mandate administration in such economic, social, and other matters as may affect the establishment of the Jewish national home in Palestine” (cited in Davis 2003:28).

Initially, capital and labor without military power enabled the Zionist movement to establish viable isolated communities (yishuvim and Kibbutzim) that benefited from capital to construct advanced industries, agricultural projects and residential settlements.

The Jewish settler society constructed its social, administrative and institutional, and economic structures in isolation from, and at odds with the indigenous Palestinian population and their livelihood. Isolation from, and exclusion of the Palestinians were the main two characteristics of Zionist colonization of Palestine and they, in effect, founded the principal bedrock for the constitution of the Jewish immigrants as a distinct religious-ethno-nationality bound to the space (territorial and socio-economic) it occupied. The pattern of total exclusion and isolationism that distinguished the Zionist endeavor from other types of colonialisms produced a wide buffer that was initially territorially based.
The degree of exclusion that Zionism implemented had been very unique and was consolidated in tandem with the increase of Jewish immigration. Thus after the arrival of the second through Fifth Jewish immigration waves between 1904-1928, exclusion was tightened and galvanized through and reached a climax with the establishment of the state of Israel. State phase of the Zionist enterprise came to officially and formally adopt this type of differentiation and exclusion; an apartheid of a distinct type, as further illustrated below. Immigrants of these waves, and most of subsequent waves, were ideologically motivated and driven by the Zionist motto that Palestine was “a land without a people” for “a people without a land” that negated the Palestinians altogether. Negation of the indigenous Palestinians, economically, politically, and physically culminated in the Zionist movement’s emphasis on conquering the land and the establishment of self-sufficient and well administered and well-defended Jewish entity. The viability of Jewish settlement communities was pivotal for the establishment of the state of Israel: they provided the infrastructure, institutional and economic bedrock, ideological coherency, and military power that contributed significantly to the ability of Israel to come into life and sustain.

Jewish settler-communities were economically, socially, and politically structured to meet the main objective of the Zionist movement, namely the “restoration of the Jewish people as an independent and self-sustaining community in its homeland; Palestine” (Cohen and Kliot 2011: 659). The ‘ingathered’ of Jewish and the implementation of the Jewish labor policy “Hebrew work” that aimed at the restoration of the immigrants as a nation distinct and separated from the indigenous Palestinians were
the primary pillars of Zionism in this era. ‘Restoration’ took the form of establishing the settler communities; Kibbutzim (communal villages) and Yishuvim (residential villages and towns) that have viability to receiving and absorbing more Jewish immigrants. The more Jewish immigrants arrived, the more these constructs the more settlements were consolidated and with that differentiation and separation between Jewish settlers and Palestinian increased.

Differentiation and exclusion implied a dual mechanism: dispossessing Palestinians from their land and prohibiting their employment in Jewish labor market. This policy founded the grounds of the notion of segregation and isolationism that make Zionism a system of apartheid on its own right. The absorption of vast numbers of Jewish immigrants especially after World War Two\textsuperscript{65} has given a crucial boost to this process by virtue of numbers right before the creation of the estate. Virtually, exclusion, land acquisition, and immigration were the main tools that Zionism –and later the state of Israel- has deployed in order to solve the main problem that faced the consolidation of the Jewish settler colonialism in Palestine: the presence of another people, the Palestinians (the Canaanites). Zionist motto of ‘a land without a people for a people without a land’ did not rest well with this fact, and the question becomes on the relationship between the Jewish settlers of the indigenous people. Ironically, Biblical wrath and fury is not directed to the peoples who enslaved or exiled the Jews, rather against the inhabitants of Palestine. Biblical reasoning of this is that the presence of an alien people in the land of Israel could threaten the political structure of the Chosen people and could possibly

\textsuperscript{65} By the end of the war, and at the eve of establishing Israel the Jewish community of Palestine consisted 302 farming communities, and 28 urban communities. Between 19949 and 1952 687,000 Jewish immigrants arrived to Israel (Cohen and Kliot 2011: 659).
undermine the cultural and religious character of Israel. Goyim (aliens) will contaminate the purity of the Jewish state and people. The answer to Goyim presence in the Promised Land is to enslave and abuse them, not to mix with them if not cleansing them altogether as Moses instructed the Israelites as they were about to enter Palestine. These perceptions, although not explicitly invoked by mainstream Zionists or Israeli officials in general can be observed in the practices of Zionism in the pre-state period and by the state of Israel since it was established.

Zionist exclusivist character prevented to a large extent any mechanisms of integration or significant cross-cutting interactions along the divide that was widening between the Jewish community and the Palestinian population. One of the main consequences of total exclusion was that the indigenous population was unable to affect or challenge Jewish preponderance from within the system they established; a feature that distinguishes Israel’s apartheid and represents the bedrock of the domination system it established in the whole of Palestine. Thus the structures of settler-colonial Zionism did not permeate the Palestinian society at any level and the colonial buffer that separated the settlers from the indigenous population was ultimate. In order to give cultural life and vibrant ethno-national dimension of the nascent settler-colonial Jewish community Zionist movement cemented the ethnic ties within through the use of Hebrew as the dominant and only language. Virtually, this mobilization tool has deepened the differentiation and distinctiveness of the two groups; Jews and Arabs. While a discourse of secular-nationalism amalgamated with religious precepts was deployed to ‘ingather’ the Jews in Palestine and convince them to immigrate, Hebrew was the main tool of
mobilization and unification within the immigrants. Hebrew, in addition to resurrecting many religious symbols and preserving them was the central core of the construction of the Jewish society as an ethno-linguistic group. Although the language spoken by the majority of immigrants and of the Palestinian Jews (whose homeland is Palestine prior to the arrival of immigrants) was the Yiddish, Zionists preferred Hebrew for its ancient connection to Abraham and the Bible and for the differentiation it consolidates.

Total exclusion, segregation, and hegemony; rather than exploitation were the pillars of a blueprint that was the hallmark of the Zionist enterprise in Palestine. Zionistist colonialism in Palestine encompassed features of European colonial practices intertwined with religious ethno-national attributes that make it a unique type of a buffered colonialism: colonial ethno-territorial force that aimed from the outset to negate rather than control and exploit the indigenous. Thus Zionism encapsulated, in the words of Yiftachel (2010: 226) the ethos of ‘collective survival-revival [and] an Orientalist colonial attitude typical to Europeans in settler societies [that] created a dual society, manifested in separate residential areas, education systems, cultural milieu, labor markets, and political organization, that established Zionist apartheid system before the creation of the state of Israel.

Zionism and the racial answer to the Jewish question in Europe

The creation of Jewish colonial presence in Palestine finds its justification in Zionist ideological tenets derived from Biblical myths66; particularly to the Old

---

66 Myth in this doesn’t mean an untrue context has the power of factual historical event. We subscribe to Akenson’s definition of it as a true set of views about historical events; “views of the past that take on
Testament and Talmudic narratives. However, early European initiatives and discussions on the implantation of European Jews in Palestine dates long before the founding of political Zionism in 1897, and at some point it intersects with Zionist’s efforts and pleas for the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine. Ideological zeal of Zionist Jews for the founding of a Jewish state in Palestine was also driven by materialistic; economic and political/strategic underpinnings within the broader European colonial ambitions in the region. Theodor Herzl; the founding father of Zionism himself was not an observant Jew; he was born to an assimilated western European family and had received no Jewish education. The underlying material aspects were not unique in the era of colonialism except for the fact that European colonial powers (French and Britain in particular) instead of establishing their own settler-colonial communities (as was the case in India, Algeria, and South Africa, for example) they espoused the implantation of a proxy that has sufficient justification and motivation. Thus, Zionism was preceded with European calls for Jewish colonization in Palestine to serve the interests of European powers; the private secretary of Napoleon III in 1860 promised that all Europe would support Jewish acquisition of Palestine (Ab-Lughod and Abu-Laban 1974: 22 to serve extraempirical meaning, by virtue of being closely related to the society’s views of its collective identity and it special, virtually divine, origin.” (Akenson 1992:138).

The Old Testament contains the only available record of the ancient state of Israel. It encompasses three main beliefs: (1) Jews are separate and exclusive people chosen by their God to fulfill a destiny, and therefore they are a covenant and elected people as opposed to other neglected peoples; (2) the covenant grant the chosen a definite and exclusive ownership of the land of Canaan (Palestine) for them and their descendants; (3) the reclamation of this land is a divine duty of all the Jews and the Jewish purity of the land is sacred. These beliefs and justifications are prevalence in Zionist leaders’ thinking secular and religious alike. Ben Gurion calls the Bible “the sacrosanct title-deed to Palestine” for the Jewish people “with a genealogy of 3500 years” (Ab-Lughod and Abu-Laban, 1974 p4), and therefore the redemption of the land of Israel and the return of the Jews to the land of the birth moladit is called aliah. The claim of divine mission and exclusivity farther entrenched by a strong convection that the Jewish people has some essential characteristics that no people possesses, which make the Jewish history incomparable in terms of its history and longing to the land of Israel, as Abba Eban; a modern and moderate Zionist, asserts. (Eban 1968).
European interests in the region. Thus religious ontology of Zionist foundations doesn’t
negate the existence of timely philosophy and material basis for Jewish settler-colonial
project in Palestine. One of the most prominent Zionist thinkers, Moses Hess endorsed
the colonial argument and the mutual interests that may materialize out of Zionist-
European colonial cooperation. Since European powers will need to establish colonies
along the new trade routes to the east after the work on the Suez Canal, Jews would serve,
as a colony, in establishing channels of communications and mediation with far Asia.
Herzl made the same argument:

If His majesty the [the Ottoman] Sultan was to give us Palestine, we could in
return undertake the complete management of the finances of Turkey. We
should there form a part of a wall of defense for Europe in Asia, an outpost of
civilization against barbarism. We should as a neutral state remains in contact
with all Europe, which would have to guarantee our existence” (Ab-Lughod

Herzl emphasized the mutual benefits that European (British, German, and French)
powers and a Jewish state would reap as a result of establishing and protecting a Jewish
colony in Palestine. Herzl spearheaded Zionist efforts to establish a broad Jewish
coalition supporting his ideas and Zionism succeeded in bringing to the action Jews from
different class affiliations including bourgeoisie, middle and working classes. In this
sense Zionism and the colonial ambitions it represented was a phenomenon embedded
within the broader current of European colonialism as well as European industrialization
and its discontents.

Zionism emerged as a set of ideas bound to the concrete social, economic, and
political conditions surrounded its founding in Europe. It represents a colonial movement
that claimed to have a solution to the Jewish question in Europe using European methods:
colonization. Capitalism and socio-economic changes accompanied it at some level precipitated racial tenets of nationalism and fascism. Zionism emerged in the era of European industrialization with all its malaise including the most two prominent strands of thought: enlightenment and racism. For the Jewish, this historical process was a double-edged sword: in the one hand it brought them emancipation and legal equality under the rule of law and democracy in some countries. On the other hand, the rise of racism and national chauvinism created anti-Jewish trends, which materialized in persecution, pogroms, and mass-murder of Jews. As a consequence, Jewish communities either opted to secular liberalism and democracy in their respective countries, or committed to secular racism as the base for ethno-national resurrection embodied in Zionism (Davis 2003: 9).

European racism was met by a response of the same kind by Zionism; the answer for Jewish negation in Europe was “not to destroy our lives in miserable indecision and spiritual sorrow” wrote Rabbi Joachim Prinz in 1934. Prinz further clarifies that the answer to persecution and anti-Jewish sentiments is the creation and sustaining of Jewish racism

The theory of assimilation has been destroyed. There is no longer any hiding place for us...We want to posit instead of assimilation something new: undertaking the yoke of joining the Jewish people and the Jewish race. Only a state based on the principles of the purity of the nation and the race can possibly endow dignity and honor on [and only] on those Jews who themselves subscribe to this principle” (Italics in origin) (quoted in Davis 2003:10).

Therefore, Zionist justifications of the colonization of Palestine and claiming exclusive right to the land were generic
they were the same arguments employed in the previous centuries by the Australian colonists concerning the aborigine…the Afrikaners concerning the Xhosa and Zulu…The same canonical justifications were used by all Europeans imperialists when explaining why it was all right for the colonists to bash the indigene” (Akenson 1992: 170).

Zionists arguments in this respect were real and typically colonialist regardless of their content of truth or logical coherence: Palestinian Arabs were not really a people; their emotional and historical ties with the land are weak; they are backward, not productive and they were not really dispossessed and by extension they have a lower level of rights than the Jewish; and that Zionist colonization of Palestine was good for the Arabs. In this sense Zionism sat very well with liberal notions of postindustrial Europe and therefore was able to convert the processes it launched in Palestine. Thus, as Said (1992: 87) argues

The Jews were not supplanting, destroying, breaking up, a native society. That society was itself the oddity that had broken the pattern of a sixty-year Jewish sovereignty over Palestine which had lapsed for two millennia. In Jewish hearts, however, Israel had always been there, and actuality difficult for the natives to perceive. Zionism therefore reclaimed, redeemed, repeated, replanted, and realized Palestine and the Jewish hegemony over it. Israel was a return to a previous state of affairs, even if the new facts bore a far greater resemblance to the methods and successes of nineteenth-century European colonialism than to some mysterious first-century forbearers

This line of argument has been the hallmark of the Labor wing in the Zionist movement and embodies the rationality of pioneered modernists and liberals who argue that their endeavor is messianic and aims at civilizing the uncivilized peoples (Nady, cited in Nic Craith 2002: 37). However, similar to other ethno-national colonial societies, Zionism created and consolidated a spiral of exclusionist and segregated system of domination. One of the major differences is that Zionism resorted to profound religious fundamentalist precepts to consolidate its colonial discourse and practices.
Religious ethno-national exclusionism and isolationism of the settler Jewish community in Palestine was a reflection of the circumstances that precipitated the emergence of political Zionism: European racist anti-Jewish sentiments argued that, given the fundamental incompatibility of non-Jews and Jews, Jews - as individuals and as a group - cannot be equal citizens and free in non-Jewish communities. These were the same premises upon which the Afrikaners in South Africa justified, at some point, the so-called “separate development” that would, so claimed at the time, serve the interests of both Black Africans and white Afrikaners. Isolationism of the settler-colonial Jewish community in Palestine entertained and practiced what European anti-Jewish racists called for: since incompatibility is evident by definition, the answer is separating the Jews from the Gentiles in Europe and in Palestine alike since

For political Zionism, Jewish society must also be segregated outside the body of the Gentile society, in this case in Palestine redefined and reified in Zionist ideology as the Land of Israel” (Nic Craith 2002: 11).

Zionism, thus was a cross-class movement that represented a classic colonial resolution to the Jewish question in Europe in direct and close coordination with the European powers of the time. However, it needed a more profound and articulate solution to the issue of mobilizing the Jews to rally behind the project and to create a moral and sufficient ideological justification that would provide the secular colonial nationalism with ethnic depth.

**Constituting Zionist Jewish ethno-territorial ideology**

The secular and class-based coalition that Zionism was predicated upon and the Orientalist colonial underpinnings of European origins were necessary but not sufficient
for the success of the Zionist colonialism in Palestine. Mobilizing Jewish support and immigration to Palestine especially when the vast majority of Jewish emigrating from Eastern Europe preferred Western Europe or Northern America as their destination required justifications beyond secular nationalism and vulgar colonial interests; the resurrection of Jewish national identity provided the answer. Primarily, Biblical myths constitute the main authority the Zionist movement invoke to support the claim of an exclusive Jewish right in Palestine. The central piece of the claim is that the Promised Land (Palestine) was actually occupied by other foreign peoples for hundreds of years, and that time has come for the Jewish people to redeem what is his. This right is cited as God’s ordainment given and sustained by the Covenant between him and the Chosen People (the Jewish people). Chaim Weizman, the founder of the institutional infrastructure of Zionism in Palestine, articulates the concept of redemption with its political implications as follows:

It seems as if God has covered the soil of Palestine with rocks and marshes and sand, so that its beauty can only be brought out by those who love it and will devote their lives too healing its wounds (Quoted in Said 1992: 85).

The divine exclusive right of the Jewish people in the Land of Palestine is strengthened by attaching to it a burden that the Jewish people have to carry; the fulfillment of God’s commandment to establish the just society in the Land of Israel. The covenant and the scripture works as a “conceptual grid” in which land, exodus, and blood sacrifice are the reflex points or the ultimate principles and great sensitivity touching them “energizes the entire grid and calls forth an immediate, focused, sometimes violent response” (Akenson 1992: 31) to threats that might undermine the sacred connections
between God, the Land, and the unity and purity of the Chosen. Territory and space in this sense is more than a Jewish property but also the burden of making it what God commanded. Intertwining this religious-ethnic claim with secular notions of colonial precepts and Jewish suffering in Europe, Zionism was able to present itself as a national liberation movement, even as anti-colonial. A claim that would not survive the question of practice: The question here is not whether political Zionism was a national liberation movement or a settler-colonial enterprise. Rather, “the critical question is what actions and /or omissions adherents of political Zionism justify in the name of Zionism” (Davis, 2003 p8). Emphasizing the practices of the Zionist movement and revealing social, political, economic and institutional reality it created in Palestine has the priority over an abstract discussion on whether it was a national liberation movement or not. Where ideology reveals the nature of the movement is ultimately in the realm of reality.

The most striking aspect of Zionist ideology is not only the religious belief it exhibits but rather the ethno-nationalistic territorial component it incorporates and justified by religious precepts. In effect, invoking the exclusive divine right of the ‘Jewish people’ in the land of Palestine implies controlling the land as one element in an inseparable triad: God, the People, and the Land. Zionism cannot be divorced from this profound devotion to the land in spite of its nationalistic and socialist character (Davis 1974 quoted in Cohen and Kliot 2011:664) and Zionist Jews, whether religious or secular share the belief that the Jewish people have a missionary task that makes its connection to the land very special and its spiritual unity as a nation a unique feature because of the Promised Land upon which the establishment of today’s Israel (“The Third Jewish
Commonwealth” as it is called by Zionists) is the continuation of the ancient Kingdom of Israel (Cohen and Kliot 2011: 662). The logical outcome of such articulations is the sought of Jewish purity in Jewish Land, which by definition implies exclusion and territorial control. Both are intertwined and constitute the politico-religious grid centered and focused on the essential connections between the land and ethno-nationality that distinguishes Zionist settler-colonialism.

Exclusion of the other non-Jewish and the imagined organic connections between the land and the people implies that notions of bi-nationalism and universal inclusive democracy entail the dissolution of the spiritual aspect of the nation and its unity. Realization or even discussion of bi-nationalism or inclusive democracy have a more stunning effect on Zionists than political considerations. From this perspective Israel embodies, in full terms, the “State of the Jews” Der Judenstaat envisioned by Herzl in his book that has the same title. This property is best illustrated by Zionist territorial legitimating regime and ideology as an expansionist colonial power driven by a type of apartheid without which realizing Jewish domination as a nation over the Land of Israel would not be possible. The expulsion of the native population is concomitant to these precepts; Jewish nationalism cannot be constructed with the presence of the non-Jewish.

As Herzl put it in his Diaries

We shall have to spirit the penniless population across the border by procuring employment for it in the transit countries, while denying it any employment in our own country. Both the process of expropriation and the removal of the poor must be carried discreetly and circumspectly (Quoted in Said 1992: 13).
Underlying Zionist territorial-nationalism is a legitimating system of meanings derived from ethno-religious connections to the ancient history of Palestine. Based on biblical scripts, Zionism has established the Jewish claim of the Land as the sole property of the Jewish people. It gave the name ‘Zion’ to Palestine although the Biblical name of Palestine is not Zion. Rather, it is Canaan or the Land of Israel. Zion is the name of sanctuary built by King Solomon in Jerusalem. Conflating Zion with Palestine, as Weissbord (2011: 192) remarks was to justify a choice that was not reasonable from a secular point of view. This can be noticed in Herzl’s initial proposal for the location of a Jewish state; Herzl in 1895 accepted any place for the establishment of Jewish entity and location was not relevant. Naming Palestine as the destination and location was reasonable only in its religious and ethno-national sense. The debate within the Zionist movement over the location settled down in favor of Palestine during the First Zionist Congress in 1897. The arguments deployed in favor of Palestine are highly indicative of the territorial ethno-national ideology of the movement. Phrases such as: “There is no Zionism without Zion”; “Even if we are shown the lushest countries, full of milk and honey, we will prefer the bare rocks of Palestine, because they are in Palestine”; and “Zion is the country we love, the land of our aspiration…there is only one country which has such an attraction for the entire people and that is Zion”. The conflation of religious beliefs, territorial aspirations, and nationalistic notions come together to create a unique type of ethnic colonialism.
The principal difference between Zionist settler-colonial adventure in Palestine and other colonial-settler regimes, such as the white in South Africa, is that Zionist movement claims “to be the restoration of a state that had temporarily been disrupted” (Abu-Lughod and Abu-Laban 1974: 3) by reconstituting the Jews from all over the world in a single ethno-nationality bound to the territory in the manner we discussed. Ethnicizing the conflict and endowing it with essential territorial-spatial dimension is unique for the Israeli regime in Palestine. Territorial absolute exclusion of the indigenous embedded another major distinction of Zionist colonialism; unlike other European colonial efforts Zionism did not seek the colonization of the indigenous and their dispossession and exploitation. Rather it sought their ultimate dispossession and ultimate exclusion which makes the consequences more disastrous for the Palestinians (Davis 2003: 27) Whereas other examples of similar regimes can be found in Serbia, Estonia, Sri Lanka and South Africa, these cases have not necessarily incorporated rigid territorial ideologies based on ethno-religious premises. As such, the specificity with which the movement identified its project with territorial boundaries is remarkable and has profound implications for the development of the state of Israel and the territorial legitimating regime it employ to justify the expansionist nature of its colonial policies and its domination system.
Essentializing territory and ethnic identities

Leaders of the Zionist movement justify Jewish immigration to Palestine by secular values such as justice, humanitarian principles, creating psychologically sane people, etc. Simultaneously, they invoked basic religious justifications to reinforce their secular discourse. In the words of Syrkin these secular values must be the guidelines of the Jewish state so that “the hope for a Messiah...may be converted into political fact” (Quoted in Weissbord 2011: 193). The arrival of the Messiah cannot be seen apart from a certain territory; Palestine and amongst a certain messianic people; the Jewish. The redemption and possession of the Land of Palestine becomes an imperative and an end sought for its own sake as an ultimate duty of the Chosen people. The reconstituting of the Jewish history and the resurrection of Jewish people cannot be achieved in any territory other than Palestine, which turned Jewish nationalism into a-historical phenomenon “providing a unified linear and repeatedly recited backdrop for contemporary practices of territorial expansion” (Yiftachel 2010: 224). In effect this has conferred a state of homogeneity on the Jewish history that exempted, even suppressed, any attempt to question it, or even to question Zionism as the bearer of this mission.

Zionism, in this sense is the embodiment of the reconstruction of ancient and continuous ties and connections between the Jewish people and their land. The ‘Jewish people’ although had never seen this land had dreamed of it for generations as Abba Eban contends (Eban 1968: 17). Perceiving the Land of Palestine as the exclusive property of the Jewish people is a matter of consensus within Israeli Jewish community and polity and world Jewry. Territorial claims are the less ambiguous aspect of Zionist ideology.
As Abu-Lughod and Abu-Laban (1974: 9) remark “while the question of people (Who is the Jew) may be open to…interpretations, and the problem of the indigenous population may be subject to some moral considerations, the right to the land is so basic that it is hardly contested: “Eretz Israe as defined in the Bible is not an ambiguity”. In Biblical terms territorial considerations are paramount and supreme to all other imperatives. Thus territory has been essentialised and given a-historical subjective meaning that pertains to the core of Jewish identity.

Perceiving territory in an essentialist manner confers a subjective sacred meaning to the spatial component of nation-building and turning it into an ethno-religious endeavor. The other non-Jew (an individual or a group) has no place within Jewish nationality understood and articulated in ethno-territorial terms. Establishing the correspondence between the land and the Jewish people, as Buber (1952) clarifies, is a consummation that could not be achieved by the people or the land on its own right but only by the faithful cooperation of the two together …land is not a dead passive object but a living active partner… [both needed each other] to realize the fullness of life.

The unique connection to the land is further essentialised by the belief that the Jewish people as a whole share transcendental spiritual attribute by virtue of this unique connection to the land and God’s grace which makes territory and land the equivalent of ethnicity, nationality, religion, and the state. For some Jewish scholars (e.g. Shilhav 1985:111-124) the missionary precept of ethno-religious Jewish nationalism hinders the morality of this mission by worshipping territory and turning it into an end and confers an essentialist meaning to controlling territory and alienating it from the indigenous. The sanctity and essentialist precepts of territory and spatial sphere turned the land into an
indivisible subject and extra-territorialized the spatial domain of the conflict and the connotations of the nation.

*Extra-territorializing the geography*

As an ultimate subject, the redemption of the land of Palestine from the foreigners and establishing Jewish settlements and Jewish sovereignty on it becomes an act of piety, righteousness and religious must. Whether within the Israeli proper or in the OPT, Jewish settlement building is considered a higher value and described as a pioneering practice; “The land of Israel was, with its borders, defined for us by Divine Providence. Though shalt be, say the Almighty, and there is no power on earth can alter that which was created by him” as Rabbi Nissim (chief Rabbi of Israel in 1968) puts it (Shilhav 1985: 111). Legal and political implications of this belief can be found in early legislations enacted after the establishment of the state of Israel. Since the land of Palestine is the property of Yahweh (God) it shall not be sold to non-Jews, which represents the mandate of the Jewish National Fund (JNF)⁶⁸. The extraterritorial value Zionism conferred on the land and especially the OPT can be best captured by noticing the nature and scope of Israeli settlement grid. Ironically, the portion of Palestine allotted for the establishment of Israel in UN resolution 181(II) of 1947 includes low-lands that do not have the same

---

⁶⁸ The JNF was one of the first institutions the Zionist movement established for the aim of redeeming Jewish land in Palestine. Herman Schapira proposed the establishment of this organization to the First Zionist Congress in 1897. The funds allocated to the JNF were to be spent on land purchase and development. Although land acquired by the JNF is to be the Jewish people’s ownership, land should not be sold to the Jewish settlers; rather to be leased for specific period of time question of terms and renewal. The JNF became active shortly, and in 1905 it made its first purchases, and by 1907 it managed to purchases a total of 12,400 dunums. In 1936 the JNF possessed up to 370,000 dunums. In 1948 the JNF became the largest landowner in Palestine holding the title of 53.8 per cent of the Jewish-owned land.
religious relevance to the Bible comparing to the highlands of the West Bank and East Jerusalem. “The Jewish realms of antiquity were located primarily in these highlands, and the West Bank settlements are promoted to potential Jewish immigrants on grounds of “redeeming” or “returning to” the long-lost Jewish homeland” (Tilley 2005: 34).

Therefore the importance given to settlement in the WB by the Zionist movement has been entrenched not only by settler movements such as *Gush Emunim* (The Block or League of the Faithful). Conferring a subjective indivisible and extraterritorial meaning to the space has yielded not only Jewish fundamentalist movements like Gush Emunim; the movement encompassed religious-national extremism of the National Religious Party (NRP) combined with military hardliners to form a messianic front to expand settlement construction and oppose any attempt to withdraw from any part of the occupied Arab territories of 1967 (Ishay 2011: 72, 78). It also underlies systemic state policies and military measures that aim at transforming property rights of the land, confiscating it, and ultimately Judizing the entirety of the spatial sphere of the land by a variety of methods as we discuss in the Third section of this chapter. Moreover, Zionist tenets and Israel’s laws have extraterritorialized the meaning of the nation/people to include world Jewry regardless of their nationality. For Jewish people all over the world the territory of Palestine is their ethno-national home, which leaves no right whatsoever for the indigenous Palestinians in the land. Exclusion in this sense transcends the typical implications of apartheid as the world knows it in the South African case; it negates the
Palestinians out of territory and out of history all together. This can be seen through the patterns of territorial control and expansion in the pre-state phase of Zionist colonialism.

**Territorial-national nexus in the pre-state colonialism**

Land possession by the Zionist movement in pre-state phase using the intensive capital flows from European Jewish investors and donors took advantage and exacerbated a process that had been generated by Ottoman regulations especially high taxes imposed on land, which rapidly turned more and more Palestinians into landless masses. British colonial effective methods of tax extraction contributed significantly to this process. Dispossessed as they turned to be, Palestinians were excluded from the labor market in public sector as a result of the “civilized labor” policy of the British Mandate that paid higher wages for Jewish employees (Younis 2000: 64). In the private sector, those peasants migrated to cities where the Palestinian industrial sector was small and restricted whereas the Jewish sector was advanced and heavily supported with capital. The latter was exclusively opened to Jewish labor as an implementation Zionist policy of “Hebrew labor only” and the creation of an exclusively Jewish entity. Under these circumstances the Zionist movement was in a position to consolidate the settler community that sustained by its own means and gained a life of its own capabilities especially the

---

69 The combination of British land laws and taxation, Zionist land purchases, and the Ottoman Land Code of 1858 (the code aimed at raising the revenue to serve the increased debt of the empire) Palestinian peasants (three-fourths of the Palestinian society in the period) rapidly and steadily lost their land holdings. They lost access to communal land (musha’) and huge portions of land turned into privately owned to wealthy individuals who afforded taxation. Zionists could pay and henceforth possesses large tracts of land. These dynamics resulted in dramatic increase of landless Palestinians in the 1930 where 30.7 per cent of rural families lost their access to land, and more than an additional one-third of peasants owned less than the minimum required for subsistence. The average size of Palestinian holdings decreased steadily from 75 dunums in 1930 to 45.3 dunums in 1936 (Yunis 2005: 63-4).
exclusive control of land. The core Zionist agency that implemented and sponsored land control and economic development of the Jewish settler community in this era was the Jewish National Fund (JNF).

The JNF was established to carry on land purchases, development, and settlement expansion. Laws by which the JNF operates assert that the land is “the inalienable property of the whole Jewish people. Arabs may not buy or rent it. The importance of JNF’s role was crucial in determining the bounding linkages of different aspects of the Zionist enterprise in Palestine: Land purchases it made and agricultural development it funded contributed significantly to linking “national policy, security, and strategy… with the settlement objectives, all being welded together into a united, systematic, purposeful, and far-seeing policy” (Younis 2000: 64). Asserting the Land as a sacred asset of the Jewish people was further stressed by political accounts of Zionist leadership. To be sure, Ben Gurion declared in 1937 that “no Zionist can forgo the smallest portion of the land of Israel” (Younis 2000: 11), clearly referring to the Mandatory Palestine since at the time the boundaries, let alone the establishment of Israel was not yet a political reality.

Nonetheless, the concept of the Greater Israel was debated within the Zionist movement following Herzl’s definition in which he refers to the Biblical definition; “Our slogan shall be: The Palestine of David and Solomon” (Younis 2000: 13). Therefore, Zionism in the pre-state phase was clearly a self-conscious colonizing force and its creeping land control reflected this attribute through settler communities it established. As Akenson (1992: 166) notices, “…the Zionists of the Yishuv were indeed settlers and they engaged in a collective act of colonization” that was driven by the plans and
strategies put forward by the Zionist movement institutes. The 16th congress of the World Zionist Organization’s resolution of 1929 states under the Article titled “Colonization Policy” that

The congress declares that it must for all time be the fixed policy of the Jewish Agency [established in the same congress] to use every effort to ensure the development and expansion of the Jewish agricultural colonization in Palestine to the furthest possible limit in accordance with the principles laid down by the Congress for cooperation in the Jewish Agency” (Akenson 1992: 166).

For Labor Zionist concealing this feature was paramount. However, for Revisionist Right Zionists such as Vladimir Jabotinsky colonization was explicitly sought. Jabotinsky wrote: “Colonisation can have only one goal. For the Palestinian Arabs this goal is inadmissible. This is the nature of things. To change that nature is impossible.” (Akenson 1992: 166)

Territorial acquisition and control by the Zionists have imbued the conflict from the outset with ethno-national enmity and mutual exclusivist attribute. For both adversaries the spatial dimension of the conflict has been turned into the kernel of national identity, socio-economic viability, cultural continuity, and political rights. Palestinian nationalists confronted Jewish immigration to their country not only as ethnic menace but rather as a national identity challenge deployed by taking over the land and the dispossession of the Palestinians. Extraterritorialization of the spatial realm of the conflict not only turns territory into a subjective and indivisible value but has also fixated the conflict as an ethno-territorial one and makes political-geography of the conflict the defining element of the struggle. In this sense space becomes the ultimate embodiment of national identity, culture, history, collective memory, religious beliefs and future
(Yiftachel, 2010: 216); all of which were institutionalized and internalized in Israel’s social milieu, polity, and ethnic-national identity through state system and its legal structure. Therefore Israel foundation and formation, and its “regimes of territorial legitimation” are pivotal for understanding the development of the conflict.
Chapter VII

Israel’s anachronism

Introduction

This chapter highlights the institutional attributes of Israel and the fundamental characteristics of its system of exclusion, differentiation, and sublimation predicated on ethno-national tenets. The main argument presented here is that Israel is not a nation-state in the normal sense of the term; rather it was established and remained an ethno-territorial construct. The chapter starts with showing the ethno-territorial base of Israel and the foundation of its “regimes of territorial legitimation” and then moves to discuss the characteristics of the state as an ethnocracy. Finally, the chapter discusses the peculiar aspects of Israeli settler-colonial system as a type of apartheid. The analysis focuses on the ideological, institutional, and economic underpinnings of Israel’s regime in Palestine as a single geographical and political unit; a factual aspect created by Israel’s virtual domination over the whole region of the Mandatory Palestine. Thus “regimes of territorial legitimation” are de-constructed into their practices, institutions, laws, and procedures to unveil their nature as a system of differentiation and structural discrimination. The foundation of the state of Israel has structured the main character of
the conflict as ethno-territorial in which the political-geography plays the most crucial role in determining the trajectory the conflict has taken. As discussed in chapter II, there are three factors that shape the territorial legitimation system of a state: the political-territorial status of states at the time of entry into the modern state system and prevailing ideas about the cultural-historical character of state territory” on the one hand, and the challenging group’s capabilities and chance to control the territory; and groups believe in the legitimacy of its cause.

Israel’s “regimes of territorial legitimation”

Chapter VI has shown how the Zionist movement succeeded in creating the primary administrative, institutional, and economic bases for achieving statehood prior to 1947. By 1948, and following UN General Assembly Resolution 181(II) Israel’s viability was out of question. The Arab state, on the other hand lacked the necessary infrastructures of all kind: The long and draining confrontation with the British government and the Zionist movement; the dispossession and the expulsion of more than half of the population; and British policy in hindering the establishment of self-sustaining Palestinian economy and defense in the 1920-30s rendered the Palestinian society fractured and lacks all means of livelihood, let alone the ability to head-off the well-armed and organized Zionist forces. Labor Zionism within the movement was more flexible to accept the partition resolution. Labor’s practical stance attempted to reconcile colonial practice with the mainstream tenets of European enlightenment concealed and
obfuscated the nature of the Zionist enterprise. Thus, Labor policy succeeded in embedding Zionism within the ranks of modern secular racist and imperial expansionist European stream (Davis, 2003: 19) by using intensive propaganda to generate popular sympathy and diplomatic support to the newly established state. Zionism and the state of Israel were presented as part of the enlightened European endeavor to bring civilization and prosperity for otherwise backward and primordial population. This policy also helped Israel to justify and maintain its expansionism following the war of 1948 (the War of Independence in Zionist parlance).

The military victory Israel accomplished resulted in the expansion of Israel’s territorial control to encompass 78 per cent of the mandatory Palestine (adding 22 per cent to the 57 per cent allotted for the Jewish state in the UN resolution 181 of 1947). International legitimation of the state of Israel as enshrined in the partition resolution has three profound implications in regard to the main character of Israel as an ethno-national territorial entity: first, it endorsed religious ethno-nationalism as a legitimate principle for the organization of a political system of the state. In effect the resolution reinforced the ethno-national aspects of the conflict and fixated adversaries’ identities upon their ethno-national affiliation. Second, in recognizing Israel as a Jewish state the resolution legalized ethno-territoriality as the defining element of sovereignty and reinforced the extraterritorial aspects of the state in terms of its boundaries and the people (nation) it represents. A Jewish state in this sense has people (Jews) on its proper and beyond. In essence the international community has legitimated a colonial settler adventure in the era
of decolonization and accepted ethnic-control over space as a legitimate means to create a modern state. Third, it endowed international effects with a crucial role in the development of the conflict. The Palestinian-Israeli conflict is one of the most highly internationalized conflicts of all times, and international involvement in the conflict at many turning points proved to be decisive (we return to this point in the last chapter of this part).

For Israel, this unprecedented legitimating was taken as recognition of all that Zionism stood for. Israel in this sense was not a pre-existing independent unit except in the claimed ancient Biblical history, nor did it emerge as a fragment of a waning empire or colonies. Rather it was initiated by external powers. The recognition of Israel under the circumstances abovementioned granted the new entity with the consent of the international community as to its founding principles as a Jewish entity. In effect, this encouraged Zionist forces to carry on a series of massacres against Palestinians and ethnic cleansing of hundreds of thousands of them in order to guarantee Jewish majority and controlling the space of the region allocated by the will of international community. The “purification of this space became a prime goal; buttressed by strong feelings of historical mission and justice (Yiftachel 2010:227) that characterizes Zionist ideology. The first two factors that determine territorial-national legitimating regime were established and reinforced as early as 1948. The challenging national group; the Palestinian national movement, as we discuss below, was not in any position that enables it to challenge the Zionist movement.
Primarily and most significantly, Israel was created as a religious ethno-national entity. International endorsement of the establishment of a Jewish state was basically an endorsement of Jewish nationhood with all its implications and excesses in regard to the indigenous population, land, and nation building. Nation Building espoused by the Zionist movement and institutionalized in the shape of a Jewish state represents an anomaly, to say the least, to nation-state underpinnings where the state does not aspire to “merge nation and state; rather and to the contrary it aimed at essentialise and segregate group identities” (Yiftachel 2010: 215).

Therefore international community in principle endorsed a colonial apartheid state system in the ear of de-legitimizing racism, inequality, and ethno-national exclusivist tenets as principles of political organization, nation and state building, and governance. Judt’s depiction (above mentioned) of the state of Israel as an anachronism sits very well with the counter-historical manner in which Israel was created. The modernity of the Jewish community in pre-state and after the establishment of Israel coexisted with Biblical beliefs in justifying Jewish settler-colonialism in Palestine and the establishment of the state as the sanctuary of a religious ethno-national configuration of nationhood. All Zionists regardless of their philosophical inclinations share the belief that Israel is the embodiment of Jewish nationhood not Israeli nationality.

While the extreme version of Zionism calls for the restoration and the re-establishment of the Great Israel, the more liberal recognizes that the indigenous people has some rights but at the same time holds that the Jewish people has an exclusive historical right in Palestine. Arie Eliave; a prominent liberal Zionist remarks that the
Arabs also have rights and this doesn’t negate or detract the full historical rights of the Jews to the “undivided land of Israel- that is, the land of the Twelve Tribes” (quoted in Abu-Lughod and Abu-Laban, 1974: 8). Ben Gurion is more firm when it comes to the right of the possession of the “land of Israel”. He presents a distinction between human rights in general and the specific right of the Zionists in claiming Palestine exclusively. Ben Gurion in this respect puts the divine right of “Return of the Jewry Dispersed” above and in a supreme status vis-à-vis human rights, and the Bible with its supranational concepts over human thinking and modern concepts of nationality.

The state of Israel as the supreme protector of Jewish nationhood within the undivided land of Israel, the ancient and the contemporary, becomes ahistorical phenomenon in itself and conforms to the ahistorical and essential conceptualization of the land and the people, as mentioned earlier. Israel in this sense represent the embodiment of “Jewish statehood and seen as essential or even sacred Jewish-nationalist mission” (Tilley 2005: 9). Thus nation-building in Israel, from the early stages, was coherent, well envisioned and followed a premeditated blueprint predicated on exclusion, territorial control, and the sanctity of Jewish ethno-nationalism; Israel was established and remained an “ethnocratic” entity as Yiftachel depicts it.

**Israel as an “ethnocracy”**

Yiftachel (2005: 126) captures the essence of the state of Israel as a religious-ethnic group rather than a nation-state. The concept ethnocracy
account[s] for regimes and societal processes found in contested territories in which a dominant ethnic nation appropriates the state apparatus to further its expansionist aspirations while keeping some features of formal democracy.

The inherited oppression and exclusion directed to the subordinate group; the indigenous essentialize group identities and polarize territorial-spatial and political systems of differentiation that is antithetical to universal democracy. The state in this sense is perceived as the precondition for the Jewish people to survive and flourish, not as a political and institutional expression of inclusive nation-building. In an ethnocratic regime the state is the condition for the security of the Jewish people and its ability to collectively express the unique social, cultural, and spiritual qualities of Jewish experience. The loss of the state implies the loss and dissolution of Jewish national life and heritage; defending the state becomes the equivalent of defending the survival of the Jewish people that exceeds individual survival. “Statolatry” or the “worship of the state”, in a Gramscian sense (see Ishay 2011: 70-2) essentialized the state and gave it a supreme status over the civil society since it embodies the conflation of religious, ethnic-nationalism, and territory. The unity of the Jewish nation on the Land of Israel ‘Eretz Israel’

became bound to well-defined, even pre-defined territory and the state of the Jews.

Being the state of the Jewish people Israel has had, and still has, to face the question of universal democracy and the incompatibility of Israel’s “ethnocracy” and the

---

70 The term Eretz Israel denotes the term Greater Israel in Hebrew. English translation of Zionist documents and Israel’s discourse uses the term Israel, which gives an impression that the term refers to the state of Israel. This duplication of official Israeli narrative plays an important role in the deception and concealment of Zionist long term objectives of establishing Jewish sovereignty on the whole of the Mandate Palestine. Thus the official English name of the Jewish Agency is the Jewish Agency for the Land of Israel, whereas the Hebrew name refers to Israel as Eretz Israel; Greater Israel referring to the Biblical boundaries of ancient Israel.
democratic-civic state system. This question underlies the bitter debates inside Israel on the one-state solution. The democratic civil One-State implies, by definition, the dissolution of the Jewish character of the state and uplifting the prerogatives of inclusive and equal citizenship and the dismantling of ethno-national dominations system of Jewish supremacy. Since the establishment of Israel in 1948 Zionism could claim Israel has been a democratic state and simultaneously Jewish. In the words of Chaim Weizmann, the first President of the state of the state of Israel, Israel would “be as Jewish as America is America or England is English” (quoted in Davis, 2003: 19). Ironically the expulsion of the Palestinian people and the absorption of hundreds of thousands of Jews in their place enabled Israel to establish a Jewish majority, which facilitated the claim of modern democracy. Nonetheless, the claim has been accepted and embraced in Western democracies even though Israel’s is a democracy only for the Jews.

Israel, according to its own laws is not a nation state in the regular sense of the term. Although technically all Israeli citizens (ezrahim in Hebrew) have equal rights such as the right to vote, those citizens do not comprise the nationals of Israel. Israel is not the state of all its citizens. Rather it is the state of the Jewish nation and non-Jews can be citizens of the state but not nationals which make them virtually residents not citizens. Therefore there is no such a thing in Israeli law as an ‘Israeli nationality. Juridical status in the state is given exclusively to the Jewish with a great set of civil rights and privileges attached to this status and not applicable to non-Jews.

Thus Israel can easily make the claim that it nurtures a universal democratic regime while preserving unequal status for all other non-Jewish communities who have
Israeli citizenship. In effect this discrimination deprives these communities from a great array of privileges in building/construction and housing; public sector employment; cultural and educational services; municipal development and governmental subsidies; and above all property, in particular land possession rights. The state as ethnocratic regime serves the interests of the Jewish people as individuals and groups and Jewish national interests in general, not Israeli public interests. Differentiation and discrimination against non-Jews in this context has been structured within state system especially in determining the belonging of the spatial space and territorial considerations.

The primary element of recognition in Israel’s state system is the Jewishness of the individual and the group. No matter how religious or observant or secular an Israeli Jew or a group of Jews are the Jewish nationalist sentiment prevails over other identifications. As Rabbi Abraham Isaac Kook suggests

The spirit of Israel is so closely linked to the spirit of God that the Jewish nationalist, no matter how secularist his intention may be, is, despite himself, imbued with the divine spirit even against his own will (quoted in Tilley 2005: 56).

Ethno-religious foundations of Zionism are embedded within the founding principles of Israel in ways that makes it anathema to modern liberal democracy. Chaim Weizmann’s above cited statement reflects Labor Zionist deceptive discourse and attempts to escape the reality that above this Jewish democracy (ethnocracy) and shadows it there exists an inclusive ethno-religious definition of the state and the nation where either Judaism could escape the logic of colonialism or colonial underpinnings of Israel could escape or do without religious precepts. Religion, territorial essentialism, and ethno-nationality are correspondent and inextricably linked in the state system of Israel. The separation of
religion and religious institutions (whether tangible or intangible) on the one hand and the state on the other that distinguished modern secular democracies is absent in Israel’s ethnocracy.

The state and religion in Israel’s regime cannot be separated: while religious precepts and believes provide for the ancient history of the Jewish people that has been a core element in Zionist claims in Palestine and hence a source of legitimacy and justification, secularism and modern norms of nationalism provide for the continuity and contemporary underpinnings for a vibrant state system. Last chapter has shown how Israeli-Jewish community and polity as the super-ordinate power have established their preponderance from the belief in the covenant and the scripture (the chosen people in their Promised Land) as the foundation of their set of values and practices. Religious beliefs have been positioned in the heart of a “conceptual grid” in which land, exodus, and blood sacrifice are the reflex points or the ultimate principles and great sensitivity. Touching any element of the grid “energizes the entire grid and calls forth an immediate, focused, sometimes violent response” (Akenson 1992: 31) for it threatens the collapse of the whole system. Therefore religion and religiosity in this context transcend the regular meanings and implications of state-religion relationships; both become conflated in a single stream of legitimacy and coherency that bound the whole structure of the entity.

Lacking a modern history of the ‘Jewish people’ except for the Diaspora history, Zionist movement led by Ben Gurion before and after the establishment of the state adopted the ethnic-religious grid in order to establish the necessary territorial-national
nexus of the state. Ancient history of Israel provided by the Bible is indispensable for the coherency of Zionist claims and Israel’s policies to sustain. Without founding connections between religious, ancient history of the Israelites, and modern secular nationalist discourse justifying the settler-colonial adventure in Palestine and the creation of Israel on secular ground would have been precarious. Thus “Israelis were defined as the people who lived in the state of Israel, and the justification for claiming rights to this territory was primarily historical” (Weissbord 2011: 197). The old history is emphasized, and the Diaspora history is ignored. The former represents the period when the Jews lived independently in their land as a nation. In order to reveal these ancient religious history archaeological explorations has been emphasized by Ben Gurion and all his successors as a substitute for the recent history of the Jews. In Ben Gurion words recent history of the Jews matters “but in the state of Israel we aspire to some other Israeli wisdom” (Weissbord 2011: 197).

Although self-defined as a “Jewish state” Israel is not quite a religious state; it doesn’t introduce the teachings of Judaism as the source of the basic laws of the state or social life. Jewish identity is not simply a religious affiliation but encompasses notions of lineage, culture, and nationhood (the ancient history of the Jewish people). As Cohen and Kliot (2011: 659) notice: “In Israel it is difficult to draw the boundary between the ancient and the modern, between purely religious expressions and the secular goals of modern nationalism”. Indeed Religiosity and secularism are bound together in the ethno-religious basis of Jewish nationalism. Zionists seculars’ adoption of religious-based discourse and imperatives doesn’t stem necessarily from religious fervor. Rather it is
derived from the role Judaism (religion) played in shaping and materializing Zionist/Jewish national identity. Religion in this sense provides a decisive source of legitimacy and justification of the Zionist colonial enterprise.

Religious beliefs and justifications were at the core of the ideology that founded the normative aspect of settler colonial nationalism of the Zionist project; a project whose main pioneering force was not the Orthodox Jews or even nationalist-religious groups; rather it was a secular nationalist force that was affected by European ideas of socialism, nationalism, enlightenment and colonialism. Conflation of religion and nationalism remained effective and substantial in the formation and legal underpinnings of the state of Israel. Although Israel is self-defined as a secular democratic entity “religion has continued to play a significant role in [its] jurisprudence”… [and it] retained a peculiar mixture of civic and religious law” (Weissbord, 2011:195). Furthermore, the state and religion are not quite separated; Jewish religious institutions in Israel are legally recognized and financed by the state, there is no civil marriage and no civil burial of the dead for example.

The intertwined system of recognition in state system that brings religion (the history of territorial legitimation) and Jewish nationalism (the modern continuity of ethno-territoriality) manifests the structure of politico-religious foundation of citizenship. This system defines who the Jew is, and therefore the rights and privileges pertaining to Jews only. There is wide range of privileges and rights that are given exclusively to the Jews which makes determining ‘who the Jew is’ a prime issue in Israel. The Law of Return of 1952 defines the Jew as a person “who was born of a Jewish mother or has
become converted to Judaism and who is not a member of another religion”. Waves of Jewish immigration had included numbers of people whose Jewish affiliation and lineage was problematic, which stirred fierce debates within the state and Jewish community on the issue. In order to accommodate more Jewish into the state, Israel enacted the Amendment 5714 granted the right of return to the Jews who do not meet the criteria mentioned in the Law of Return but the Amendment did not recognize those as Jewish in terms of their ethno-national affiliation. They can gain the status of citizens but not nationals and the ministry of Interior doesn’t register them as Jews. They, according to the law, can’t marry from Jewish persons, and can’t be buried in Jewish graveyards.

The debates and laws on the issue of Jewishness indicate the extent to which Israel and Zionism are obsessed with ethno-religious purity. It might be said without losing track that this obsession explains why Zionists have not attempted any missionary efforts to convert non-Jews to Judaism. In a deeper level it indicates that Israel is more of a Jewish tribe with traits of ethno-religious chauvinism. Corresponding secularist nationalism and religious ethnicity in Israel might be explained as an act of political expediency; the need for coalitions to make any government viable since no single party could achieve majority in the parliament compelled big parties to give concessions to religious and nationalist-religious groups. The demands of those groups and their political parties were by and large in the realm of religious affairs not in economy or foreign policy issues.

This is true as an explanation of coalition policies but not sufficient to explain the intensified and constant use of religious discourse, religious definition of Jewish ethnicity,
and emphasizing Israel as a Jewish state. As mentioned earlier the basic law of Israel denies nationality to non-Jews, and therefore preserves the religious base for citizenship. Disputes on issues of citizenship are settled by religious courts that possess the sole legal right to determine who is a Jew and who is not and henceforth who may and who may not enjoy the bill of rights that is attached exclusively to Jewish. In this sense Israel’s political system and its internal dynamics not only created the correspondence between religion and ethnic-nationality and the state but also buttressed the power that religious precepts and their political manifestations gained in Israel.

The conflation of religion and the state, and the rise of religiously-driven political parties in Israel since the mid-1970s can be also plausibly explained by the socio-economic changes in Israeli society and their political repercussions on the one hand, and the changes in the nature of the conflict on the other. Both resulted from the very structures of Israel’s domination and justification system. Explaining the rise of fundamentalism in the Palestinian-Israeli context Ishay (2011: 70) draws upon Antonio Gramsci’s analysis of the relationship between capitalism, fragmented civil societies, and the rise of fascism; a phenomenon that Gramsci called “statolatry” or the worship of the state. It is striking that religious and national religious parties in Israel have been in the rise since the victory of the Likud Party in 1977 that, among other consequences led to the emergence of the fundamentalist settler movement “Gush Emunim”. This trend that has been consistent in the 1980-90s and had witnessed a dramatic increase in the elections of 2006 and 2009 whereby right-wing extremist parties (Shas, the National Union, United Torah, and Yisrael Beiteinu) gained significant victories.
Ishay (2011) argues that globalization and the shift of Israel’s economy from a state-led to privatization system has exacerbated tensions within the Israeli society and between Israelis and Palestinians, and “forged the conditions underlying increasing religious and nationalist radicalism” that undercut peace efforts. Social repercussions of liberalization of the economy in 1970-80s especially the concentration of wealth and social disparities, recession, and the fragmentation of the civil society, coupled with the intensification of the conflict created a political and ideological void. Religious parties moved to fill this void and provide for an alternative policy and socio-political affiliation. Within a factionalized polity and a fragmented civil society, and the absence of a “Caesarits” solution - an entity or a charisma that can reign over conflicting political forces- dark anti-democratic forces will prevail.

This analysis of religious and secular fundamentalism in Israel provides a very useful tool to look beneath Israel’s society’s rift to the extreme right. This rift has led to the ascendance of the most extreme political forces in the history of Israel’s political system. Whether Israeli domestic political shifts or the rise of radical national-Islamic movements in Palestinian are best captured by accounting to the effects of asymmetrical power relations, and the domination system Israel established and to a large extent determines the dynamics of political processes in both societies. The fascist-like feature, into which Israel’s politics are drifted, however, cannot be fully understood apart from the conflict. As Ishay (2011: 72) remarks, the effects of “conflict over the occupation of Palestinian land after 1976 is central to any account for rising religious and secular extremism on both sides”.
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Israel’s policies contributed significantly to the rise of a fascist-like politics in Israeli polity and the rise of religious extremism within the Palestinian national movement. This can be captured by revealing Israel’s expansionist policy and its legal, ideological, and political justifications that we now turn to discuss. It also sprung from Israel’s systems and methods of domination practiced against the Palestinian people within the whole region of the Mandatory Palestine as we present in the next chapter. For now we turn to present the two phases of Israel’s territorial expansion and their underpinnings in order to show how the properties of the state in Israel, abovementioned led to its colonial practices and the rise of a unique form of apartheid as a state system before the occupation of the West Bank, Gaza Strip and East Jerusalem in 1967. The following section shows how this apartheid system had been structured and consolidated in the institutional configuration of the state of Israel and its legislative apparatuses.

**Israel’s apartheid**

The state of Israel took all measures and enacted laws that would make changing the ‘nature’ of Jewish colonization and domination impossible. In this phase, territorial and spatial expansionism had been established as a strategy that has been initiated the next day after the founding of the state of Israel and has been developed through 1980s when the Palestinian first Intifada irrupted. The focus here is on the consolidating of Israel’s state system as a distinct form of covert apartheid. The overlap between this phase and the one that followed 1976 in the OPT uncovers the continuity of state policy
of territorial expansion and ethnic-national discrimination and domination. The ability of Israel’s system to adapt to events and changes in its environment without losing its main features is the most striking.

As discussed above, Zionism’s supreme goal in Palestine was the establishment and consolidation, through the Jewish colonization of the country of Palestine, of a sovereign state, a Jewish state, that attempts to guarantee in law and in practice a demographic majority of the Jewish tribes in the territories under its control” (Davis 2003: 19).

This prime objective was tailored in a more principled and policy-bound agenda that was set by the Zionist Congress of 1951. The Congress adopted the “Jerusalem Program” to replace the “Basle Program”. “Jerusalem Program” of 1951 stated that: the task of Zionism is to consolidate the state of Israel and to ingather the exiles, and the unity of the Jewish people. In order to achieve these ends the movement has to: encourage Jewish immigration to Palestine and integrate them in agricultural settlements. Land acquisition as the property of the people (Jewish people) is a crucial part of the program. Land acquisition and control by the pioneers (Halutzim) is pivotal. The program goes further to assert the “fostering of Jewish consciousness by propagating Zionist idea and strengthening Zionist movement” (Tilley 2005: 170).

As such territory acquisition and control, unity of the Jewish community apart from the indigenous population, and exclusion were the imperatives of the state of Israel since to it the implementation of the program was assigned. Israel exclusivity in terms of the defining elements of its identity is upheld by a cluster of laws that define Israel as such. The newly founded state had committed its first expansionist steps in the same year
of its creation: the takeover of another 22 per cent of the land of the Mandated Palestine. Moreover, within an overnight the Palestinian population in these areas was reduced from 50 per cent to 20 per cent of the population of the newly established state within its borders as defined by Resolution 181 (II).

The expulsion of 750,000 Palestinians by means of force was coupled and followed by two policies: First, Israel in defiance to UN resolution 194 (III) of 1948\textsuperscript{71} denied Palestinian refugees their right to return to their homes and property. In order to assure that the expulsion of these refugees is permanent, Israel demolished entire Palestinian villages; the number of which differs but approximated between 400-500 villages in the most conservative estimates. Second: in its effort to legalize expulsion and territorial control over the property of the refugees and the ‘internally displaced’ Palestinians, Israeli government enacted the “Absentees Property Law” of 1950. According to the law all Palestinians outside of the green line (the 1949 armistice line) were denied their property rights as ‘absentees’ who were not present on their property at the time of first Israeli census. They were also alienated from Israel’s legal system by denying the citizenship. The law enabled Israel to out hand on 70 per cent of the territory west of the armistice line; all of which was the property of ‘absentees’ (Fisk, cited in Davis 2003: 33). Achieving a unified Jewish majority on the maximum territorial area had been thus guaranteed by means of expulsion or transfer in Zionist discourse (Masalha

\textsuperscript{71} United Nation General Assembly Resolution 194 (III) states that “the refugees wishing to return to their homes and live at peace with their neighbors should be permitted to do so at the earliest practical date, and that compensation should be for the property of those choosing not to return and for loss of or damage of property which, under principles of international law or in equity, should be made good by the Governments or authorities responsible” \url{http://www.un.org/Depts/dhl/resguide/r3.htm}. 
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1992: 199). The expulsion of Palestinians, in today’s term ethnic cleansing, would not have been a successful without Zionist forces’ terror and massacres against Palestinians in 1947-8; Deir Yasin, Tantura, and Al-Dawayma being the most shocking and best documented. Cleansing the indigenous population and taking over their property, especially territories, was seen as a pre-condition for the achievement of Zionist goals. As Israel Eldad (a former military leader of the LEHI; Fighters for the Freedom of Israel) revealed in 1967 that “Had it not been Deir Yasin- a half million Arabs would be living in the state of Israel [in 1948]. The state of Israel would not have existed…this country will either be Eretz Israel with an absolute Jewish majority and a small Arab minority or Eretz Ishmael, and Jewish emigration will begin again if we do not expel the Arabs one way or another (Quoted in Davis 2003: 23).

Thus, by the end of 1948 Israel had guaranteed a Jewish majority within its expanded territorial boundaries; the grounds were well prepared for the consolidation of Jewish sovereignty and domination. In doing so, Israel was crowning the efforts of Zionist organizations (World Zionist Organization WZO, the Jewish National Fund JNF, and the Jewish Agency for the Land of Israel JA) that set the institutional bedrock of the state in 50 years of Jewish settlement in Palestine. The consolidation of Israel and Zionist

72 The three massacres took place between April and November 1948. Witnesses from the Israeli armed formations Zionist National Military Organization (Irgun Tzvai Leumi; IZL or Irgun in Hebrew, and Fighters for the Freedom of Israel (Lohamii Herut Israel; LEHI in Hebrew) who attacked the village of Deir Yasin, and the International Organization of the Red Cross Delegate in the area leave no space for doubt that the massacre in which nearly 250 (out of 750 the total population ) Palestinian were slaughtered including children and women was planned and cold-bloodedly carried out. For the documentation of the Tantura massacre, Theodor Katz; an Israeli scholar revealed in his research for the M.A degree at Haifa University the events in Tantura. He describes the killing as an orchestrated slain of more than 200 Palestinians. AL-Dawayma massacre was revealed in the Official Hebrew daily of the Histadrut (General Federation of Workers) ((see Davis 2003: 21-5). Although the number of such atrocities and their detailed documentation vary it is evident that an act of ethnic cleansing took place.
idea (as put forth by “Jerusalem Program” found their materialization in early laws Israel enacted: the Law of Return of 1950 that grants any Jew the right to Jewish immigrants to Israel. Upon arrival Jews immigrants under this Law are granted citizenship according to the Citizenship Law of 1952. The Population Registry Law of 1965 provides those new citizens the status of ‘Jewish nationality’, not Israeli nationality henceforth depriving the non-Jews remaining within the Jewish state from a wide range of privileges and rights that Jewish exclusively enjoy.\textsuperscript{73}

Laws enacted before the establishment of the state of Israel also were sustained and further entrenched the linkages between ‘Jewish nationality’ and territorial boundaries as Jewish homeland. As a matter of fact Zionist organizations that were ‘voluntary’ before 1948 have become incorporated in Israel’s state system; state laws and these organizations’ objectives became legal, compulsory and judicial. The World Zionist Organization-Jewish Agency Law of 1952 authorizes Jewish Agency to administer most of the state’s land, property, and other resources. According to the law the WZO and the Jewish Agency for Israel (JA) are recognized as a sort of supra-state bodies primarily to carry all practices and mobilize necessary resources for the purpose of “ingathering the Jewish people in its historic homeland, Eretz Israel. In effect, all Zionist institutions in close coordination with state agencies and institutions were fundamentally instrumental in obscuring the nature of Israel as a colonial system involved in formal apartheid. The

\textsuperscript{73} In addition to these laws Israel enacted the establishment of the Keren Kayemeth (Jewish National Fund) Law of 1953. The Keren Kayemeth had been the main institution that executes land acquisition, water extraction, and other land-connected development projects; none of which for the benefit of non-Jews whether in Israel or in the OPT. Keren Kayemeth and other institutions relied on complementary laws pertaining to land and agriculture; all of which consolidated Jews-only possession and development: the Basic Law of 1960, and Israel Lands Law of the same year and the Agricultural Settlement Law of 1967.
fact that Palestinian citizens of the state of Israel have certain political and civil rights: to
vote in local and general elections, to be elected and serve as members of the Israeli
parliament, and they have an equal standing before Israeli courts, doesn’t nullify the fact
that differentiation and discrimination is a state policy.

The rights abovementioned have been used to manipulate and misrepresent reality;
Palestinians are deprived of all rights pertaining to inherit property; to access material
resources of the state (particularly land and water), and to access social welfare system of
the state, to have equal or equitable allocation of resources for educational and local
authorities, and to gain equal access to public sector employment. Clearly, these state
policies fit in UN definition of apartheid abovementioned. They also represent policies of
racial discrimination; racial discrimination in this sense refers to the UN definition that is
incorporated in UN Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination
2016 (XX) of 1965\textsuperscript{74}. The Convention states that

> any distinction, exclusion, restriction or preference based on race, color, descent,
or national or ethnic origin which has the purpose or effect of nullifying or
imparing the recognition, enjoyment or exercise, on an equal footing, of human
rights, and fundamental freedoms in the political, economic, social, cultural, or
any other field of public life.

In this sense Israel has three classes of citizenship: class A for those classified as “Jews”
who are allocated access to all state resources; class B for citizens designated as non-Jews
(Arabs) who are denied access to significant state resources. There exists class B of
Palestinians classified until today as ‘absentees’ (25 per cent of the Palestinian citizens of

\textsuperscript{74} To look at the full wording of the resolution visit UN official website at:
http://www2.ohchr.org/english/law/cerd.htm
Israel) who live inside Israel and yet unrecognized as citizens and denied all their right (except voting) although they are taxpayers.

**Conclusion**

UN Resolution 2016 of 1965 clearly defines apartheid as a generic concept that refers to any a policy framework that is based on racial and/or ethnic exclusivity and differentiation. Differentiation and discrimination regardless of the basis upon which they are justified is an act of racism and apartheid. The United Nations Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid (or the Apartheid Convention) although was established to deal with the South African apartheid is applied generically regardless of country specific context (Bakan and Abu-Laban 2011: 337). Therefore apartheid is a state system of domination and discrimination where racism is being regulated and formalized in laws and legislations.

Although the one may find forms of racism and discrimination in democracies all over the world, the victims of these forms are protected by the constitutions and laws of these democracies. This is not the case with Israel’s apartheid since it was established. Israel admitted the UN on the basis of a clear commitment to the obligations of the UN Charter. However, Israel violated systematically and consistently the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948 to which Israel is a signatory state. The laws and regulations abovementioned that Israel enacted are antithetical to these commitments. In fact the admission of Israel in the UN was premised upon it to be international law-abiding state; the failure to show obedience to international law would have seriously put the recognition of Israel in jeopardy (Mazzawi 1997: 129).
Partition Resolution of the UN of 1947 is still valid and has not been undone by the UN General Assembly. The first and most obdurate violation, without which Jews would not have become a majority in Israel, is the massive ethnic cleansing of the indigenous Palestinians in 1947-8.

The discriminatory foundation of Israel’s national‐territorial nexus is founded in the religious ethno‐territoriality of Zionism and the exclusivist foundation of Israeli ‘regimes of territorial legitimation’. These are articulated and manifested in the juridical system that discriminates against “non‐Jews” as a category. This category is denied access to state resources especially the land, and another set of rights and privileges that Jews enjoy. It is for these formal, state‐based properties of Israel - in addition to Israel’s occupation of and policies in the OPT, that the UN General Assembly issued the resolution 3379 (XXX) of 1975 that equates Zionism with racism, apartheid, colonialism and neo‐colonialism. Although the resolution was nullified in 1991 its efficacy as pertained to the nature of Israel’s apartheid is still valid if we notice that the nullification was part of a political process not a legal scrutiny of actual Israeli policies.

Israel’s strong affiliation to ethno‐territorial identification represents the bedrock of its domination and differentiation system that is aimed at depriving non‐Jews from property rights of the land. Thus, the state in Israel controls 93% of the land within the Israeli proper that is designated for cultivation, development, and settlement by, of and for, Jews only. The peculiarity of Israel’s apartheid is that in the realm of territorial legitimation and state legislation (the core of the Israeli‐Palestinian conflict) it is more radical than apartheid legislation in the Republic of South Africa. This peculiarity refers
to Zionist territorial ideological underpinnings that embody the constitution of the state of Israel and aim at advancing the interests of the Jewish community.

The fact that a significant array of apartheid policies is being implemented by Zionist institutions has enabled Israel to conceal apartheid implications of its system of differentiation. As strategic colonial-settlement expansion, land acquisition and development were vested and hidden in Zionist Organization laws that are committed to their own discriminatory constitutions, the state per se distanced itself from the accusation of apartheid by not incorporating any terms of “Jewish only” or distinctions between Jews and non-Jews in Israel’s laws. However, these Zionist institutions act in the capacity of state-affiliated entities and they represent a third party that has state mandate and jurisdiction to act on its behalf. Moreover, racist aspects of Israel’s apartheid are overt and structured in the body of laws, regulations and legislation of the state, as shown above. This body of laws and legislation stems primarily from Zionist colonial tenets derived from politico-religious precepts especially in regard to the land. This was clearly stated by Zerah Wahrhaftig (Minister of Religious Affairs and Chairman of the Knesset, Israel’s Parliament Constitution, Law and Justice Committee) as he presented the Basic Law to the Knesset in 1961:

…to give legal grab to a principle that is fundamentally religious, namely ‘the land shall not be sold forever, for the land is mine’…the law gives legal grab to this rule and principle in our Torah…the holiness of the Land of Israel belongs to me” (cited in Davis 2003: 24).

Territory in particular not only essentialized and extraterritorialized as an object of religious belief, but also as a subject of identification and discrimination. Israel’s sovereignty over the land as a Jewish sovereignty has been uplifted by the legal mode of
thinking and behavior assigned to apartheid and colonization. Amongst which the most prominent were the laws and regulations of land possession and acquisition. Politico-religious nature of Israel’s legal structure reflects the dualism of sacred-profane stance that pervades every detail of life. Israeli military rule of the OPT took a very similar course in which legalism of occupation and land control constituted its own legitimacy. The next chapter examines the properties of Israel’s national-territorial nexus beyond the boundaries of its own proper namely, in the OPT since 1967.
Chapter VIII

Post-1967: expanding the territorial-national nexus

Introduction

Israel’s occupation of the West Bank, Gaza Strip and East Jerusalem in 1967 can be assessed as a new phase of the regimes of territorial legitimation” of Zionism and the state of Israel. Zionist-Jewish colonization of the OPT took a strikingly similar pattern of early Zionist settlement colonialism in Palestine: implanting Jewish settlers on the Palestinians’ land and simultaneously separating the newcomers from the indigenes population that has been alienated from the land. Dispossession and exclusion of Palestinians were sustained as the main two pillars of Israel’s colonialism.

In post 1967 Israel’s occupation has renewed the ethno-national threat of Zionism to Palestinian national aspirations and identity and buttressed the territorial-spatial aspect of the conflict. The memories of 1948 and current day repercussions of Israel’s occupation have deepened the animosity between the two parties as ethno-national groups. Moreover, military occupation accompanied with settler-colonial control of the land reintroduced Israel as a colonial territorial power; territory and space prevail in a more profound level that reinforced segregation and fixated distinctions between possessor and dispossessed, colonizer and colonized, and occupier and the occupied.
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The chapter is organized to capture the expansion and consolidation of Israel’s ethno-territorial “regimes of legitimation” through the OPT to encompass the entirety of Palestine. The second section examines the main features of Israel’s settler-colonialism in the OPT as a grid that is aimed at controlling the Palestinian territory and space. The following part of the chapter discusses the transformation of Israel’s national-territorial nexus to encompass the Palestinian occupied territories and the last section illustrates Israel’s domination system in the region that is derived from the imperatives of the “regimes of territorial legitimation”. Ultimately this chapter shows how Israel’s occupation of the OPT has established the structures (territorial, legal, political) of a tripartite dualism of domination and subordination:

- A dualism of domination on both sides of the green line. While Israel subordinates its Palestinian citizens through racial discrimination in a form of apartheid, as discussed in the previous chapter it implements grand apartheid in the OPT. Disregarding Palestinians in Israel as an ethno-national minority, and oppressing Palestinians in the OPT and depriving them from their land and rights;

- the differentiation Israel established between Israeli Jewish settlers in the OPT and the Palestinian population. At this level Israel has created a system of segregation that extends Jewish privileges and stretches Israel’s national territoriality; and

- Israel has founded dual systems of coercion and separation within the Palestinian society in the OPT. This layer separates Palestinians from each other in the OPT turning the WB into Bantustans and enclaved areas.
Expanding the “Regimes of territorial legitimation”

Israel’s occupation of the OPT in 1967 provided Zionism with a unique opportunity to turn the extraterritorial value of the Land of Palestine as a whole into a political, institutional, and demographic reality. In 1968 Zionist movement reasserted its original objective of establishing Jewish sovereignty over the Land of Israel, Eretz Israel and gave it a new ideological and political impulse. Territoriality is now being intertwined with notions of unity, survival, and Jewish sovereignty over the Land of Israel. Jewish sovereignty in this sense refers to the processes through which Zionist organizations and state institutions systematically Judize the geographical and spatial domains of Palestinian territories. The “Jerusalem Program” articulated by the Twenty-Seventh World Zionist Congress in 1968 stressed the new credo: survival-as-nationality although Israel gained military and strategic advantages vis-à-vis its Palestinian and Arab adversaries. The credo not only re-assured the correspondence of Jewish nationhood and territorial ethno-religious ideology but also reconstructed the connections between the sustainability of the Jewish people and its survival on the one hand, and the control over the newly occupied territories on the other. Thus the “Jerusalem Program” stressed Jewish people unity “beyond geographical and cultural barriers”; and that the “survival of the Jewish people is a supreme and absolute Jewish and universal value”. It further asserted “the unity of the Jewish people and the centrality of Israel in Jewish Life; the ingathering of the Jewish people in its historic homeland, Eretz Israel” (Tilley 2005: 170). Israel’s and Jewish people’s survival and unity have been organically linked to the OPT as the heart of Eretz Israel and essentially linked to the existence and sovereignty of the
state of Israel. In effect Israel would start to practice its sovereign powers and domination over all the Mandatory Palestine not as a belligerent occupation force but as a Jewish Sovereign. Short from imposing formal sovereignty on the OPT Israel practices the legal, judicial, and institutional powers of a de facto sovereign.

Founding Jewish sovereignty by land control and spatial expansion has changed the demographic, topographic, physical, and legal status of the OPT. Most importantly it draws a new deeply entrenched level of ethno-national differentiation that would cut off any possibility of integration or accommodation. Thus, apart from annexing the OPT Israel’s territorial and spatial practices fixated the conflict on its ethno-national foundation. Israel aimed at implementing a two-fold process: controlling the widest geographical terrain on the one hand, and circumscribing Palestinian spatial sphere in the minimal territorial periphery on the other. Formal annexation of the OPT or accommodation would have altered the demographic balance in favor of the Palestinians in the entirety of Palestine. It also would consolidate Palestinian collective sense of nationhood and would give rise to their demand for a majority rule and henceforth change the very character of the state of Israel as the state of the Jews. Changing the foundation of Israel as a Jewish entity is perceived by many Zionist as a dread and dark, and may result in Jewish suffering if not expulsion (Tilley 2005: 10). The least evil for Zionism if Israel annexed the OPT is the emergence of a bi-national or bi-ethnic state where Jewish maintain and sustain domination over the Palestinians by means of discriminatory laws and measures. However, overt discrimination would expose Israel as a racial state; a case that is very hard to defend morally. Therefore, for many Zionists if a choice has to be
made it would be a two-state solution that would maintain Israel as a Jewish and
democratic having not to include Palestinians within Israeli territory. However, the very
policies Zionist organizations and Israel implemented in the OPT have made the two-
state solution less likely if not impossible.

For many hard-core Zionist leaders (those dedicated to the concept of Greater
Israel) the question of Jewish nationhood and Jewish sovereignty cannot be sustained
within the west part of ‘Eretz Israel’ (referring to the Mandate Palestine whereas the East
part is Jordan. See map 3) apart from taking permanent control over the territory with the
less possible Palestinian population living in them. For example, Joseph Weitz; one of the
leading architects of Israel’s settlement grid in the OPT, and Deputy Chairman of the
Board of Directors of the JNF from 1951-1973 contends that

…colonizing the liberated territories” [West Bank, Gaza Strip and East
Jerusalem] must necessarily answer three problems that Israel face following
the 1967 war. These problems or challenges are: regional security,
demographic security, and the settlement of the refugees [Palestinian
refugees].

Weitz’s solution for the demographic and refugee issues is the deportation or transfer of
Palestinians; “it is easier to carry our [Israel’s] surveillance over the activities of a
neighbor than over those of a tenant”, he asserts. This is true; he goes on, also for

the need to sustain the character of the state which henceforth be Jewish, and
obviously in the near future, by the majority of its inhabitants, with a non-
Jewish minority limited to 15 per cent…there is no place in the country for
both peoples together. The only solution is Eretz Israel, at least the west part
of Eretz Israel, without Arabs…and there is no other way but to transfer the
Arabs from here to the neighboring countries, transfer all of them, not one village or tribe should remain (Italics in origin, quoted in Davis 2003: 20).

Transfer, although has not been dismissed altogether by Israeli governments especially the Labor Party, did not prevail as the official policy of the state of Israel. Instead a middle ground policy had been enacted. The “Jerusalem Program” (abovementioned) set the principal foundation for the policies in the OPT. It firmly states that

This nation [the Jewish] is worthy and obligated to exist forever…the recognition that the Jewish people must achieve national sovereignty in its historic homeland” implies that it is the duty of every Zionist to “strengthen the state of Israel through personal aliya [immigration] to Israel”; and the recognition of the centrality of the state of Israel in the life of the “Jewish people” as the only living expression of Zionist values and the “focus of worldwide Jewish identification” (Cited in Tilley 2005: 170).

Extending the main tenets of colonial Zionist principles to the OPT is to be achieved by means of land Judization and the Israelization of the OPT as part and parcel of the historical definition of the state. Judization of the territory of 1967, the heartland of the Bible would materialize the long-awaited opportunity to manifest the primordial spiritual and cultural ties to the entirety of the Promised-Land. Consolidating Jewish control over the OPT has been seen as an actualization of the Jewish ethno-national identity through re-establishing Jewish lineage that goes back to Abraham within the entirety of Palestine. Orchestrated efforts to Judaize Palestine, with an intense focus on the OPT represents a phase of colonial expansionism that consists of two interrelated strategies: the continuation and assertion of Jewish-only immigration to Palestine, and the
establishment of Israeli Jewish-only settlements on Palestinian land acquired by massive land confiscation and expropriation.

The new strategy of Judizing the OPT went uninterrupted in any significant way to an extent where the “green line” (the 1948 armistice line) was de facto abolished and the Zionist strategy to establish Jewish sovereignty over the whole region of Palestine has made significant success in terms of settlement construction\(^75\). Blurring the distinctions between the OPT and Israel’s proper allowed the Palestinians within the whole Palestine to sustain their ties and connections as and to cement their collective consciousness as an ethno-national people subordinated by a colonial power. In addition to the concomitant economic depletion of the Palestinian economy and the exploitation of the Palestinian work-force from the OPT in the Israeli market (Hebrew employment has been outdated as the state now guarantees subordination by other means rather than Jewish-only labor), Israel’s territorial expansion and its oppression culminated in the first Palestinian intifada (uprising of 1987).

The *intifada* represented the apex of Palestinian nationalism within the OPT and Israel. In this sense it sent a powerful alarm to Israeli authorities on the decline of the

\(^{75}\) Since 1967, Israel has built 120 settlements in the West Bank, and 12 settlements in East Jerusalem. The Interior Ministry calls them “communities,” though some settlements’ land boundaries are not contiguous. In addition to the settlements, Israelis have built 100 so-called “outposts” that don’t have the status of settlements in the Interior Ministry’s eyes but do enjoy the same protection from the Israeli military, the same funding from Israeli nationals and the same special treatment from Israeli authorities, such as roads, utilities and schools for the exclusive use of settlers. The Jewish rate of population growth in the settlements, at 5.8%, is far higher than in Israel proper (1.8%), leading to a rapid rise in settler the population. In 2009, some 300,000 Israelis lived in the West Bank, not including East Jerusalem. At the end of 2006, the total Jewish population of the settlements in the West Bank, according to Israel’s Central Bureau of Statistics, had stood at 261,879. An additional 182,460 lived in East Jerusalem.
sense of normalcy Israeli authorities sought to found and consolidate in the OPT. Most importantly, the intifada redrew the ‘green line’ as the political geography of the conflict, which rendered questionable the sustainability of the settlement enterprise in the OPT and the durability of open-borders policy. In the early 1990s (the last two years of the intifada) Israel started to change strategy towards segregation and more coercion to circumscribe the rise of Palestinian nationality and consolidate settlement grid in the OPT. With the initiation of the peace process and the changes in the regional and international environments following the Gulf-War of 1990, Israel faced another element of pressure on its colonial practices in the occupied territories. Israel’s territorially-oriented strategy is now facing the challenge of time to accelerate its expansionist policies while the peace process has been on track and the Palestinian state is in the wait. Initially, the new phase has started in a territorial massive offensive combined with extreme harsh oppression that aimed at the consolidation of “major territorial and political gains. These included aggressive policies such as a wave of new “outpost” settlement, accelerated expansion of existing settlements, increased “anti-terror” offensives, and the separation wall” (Yiftachel 2005: 126) and at the same time show the willingness to relinquish minor parts of the land.

Under certain circumstances such as those prevailed in Palestine in early 1990s ethnic-territorial regimes may take limited contraction steps in response to particular internal and external pressures but that can only be understood within the context in which it took place. Thus Israeli redeployment in the OPT in 2005 (handing control over major Palestinian cities to the PA) although a precedence in partial disengagement from
parts of the ‘Land Of Israel’ was not a step towards decolonization. The redeployment of 2005 was accompanied with massive settlement expansion and land confiscation and expropriation. Actually it allowed Israel to implement the twofold strategy abovementioned: more land with less Palestinians under the cover of the peace process.

This marginal contraction eased Israel’s burden to manage its occupation by sparing itself the management of Palestinian population who became confined in fractured Bantustans nominally controlled and served by the Palestinian Authority (PA). Following the construction of the separation wall a new Israeli consensus has ensued; Israeli will take over all regions of the OPT west of the wall until the peace talks with the PLO take off again. This entails, from Israel’s perspective Palestinian fulfillment of a series of commitments and obligations especially in security issues. The last few years can be marked as a period of conflict management for Israel rather than conflict resolution as Sussman (2005) notices.

Reconstituting Zionist settler-colonial expansionism

This section aims at capturing the essence of Israel’s occupation of the OPT as a colonial project that seeks the annexation of significant parts of these territories apart from its population. Thus, it does not seek to present detailed informative data on Israeli
Jewish settlements after 1967\textsuperscript{76}. Rather we seek to uncover the driving force, patterns, main goals, and consequences of the settlement grid in the OPT.

Israel’s occupation of 1967 represents another dramatic transformation of the territorial aspect of the conflict; it changed profoundly the political-geography of the conflict and with it actors’ strategies. The conflict is now focused on a narrower definition of ethno-national territorial boundaries instead of a struggle on democratic liberation. In this sense Israel’s occupation of the OPT resurrected and buttressed the ethno-national segregationist character of the conflict that it created in 1948. Israel’s presence in the OPT and particularly its settler colonization of the West Bank, Gaza Strip and East Jerusalem have extended Jewish ethnocratic rule to the whole area of Mandated Palestine. Jewish settlement enterprise is

now placed in the midst of Palestinian population centers. Ancient Jewish time was thrusted again into contemporary political moves, by settling at biblical sites, thereby shaping anew the nature of Zionist and Palestinian geographies and identities" (Yiftachel 2010: 231).

\textsuperscript{76} There are currently 121 Israeli colonies, often referred to as "settlements" inhabited by a population of some 462,000 Israeli settlers. 191,000 Israelis are living in settlements around Jerusalem and a further 271,400 are further spread throughout the West Bank. The settler population has grown consistently between 4-6\% per year over the last two decades, a much higher rate of growth than Israeli society as a whole (1.5%). http://www.palestinianmonitor.org/spip/spip.php?article7 . It is not in the scope of this research to present any accounts for the types of Israeli Jewish settlements in the OPT. However, it is worthy to notice that different types reflected the preferences of certain settlers’ demands and government support. Particular political parties in the government supported different types of settlement and the same party or settler political movement may sponsor more than one type. Types of settlements are: Kibbutzim (communal villages); Moshavim (cooperative villages); collective Moshavim (a combination of Kibutz and Moshav); Moshavot (private landholder villages); and Yishuvim Kehilatyim (community settlements). The last category was especially supported by the Likud party and the nationalist religious parties, and it turned the predominant type in the OPT (see Cohen and Kliot: 2011 p669)
The occupation has deepened the ethno-national underpinnings of the conflict and exacerbated the exclusivist natures of Israel’s domination. Thrusting ancient time in contemporary political struggle required the construction of Jewish material existence in the newly controlled territories; without which Israel’s control of them would have remained precarious and subject to the dynamics of the decline of traditional military occupations and foreign domination. Virtually, Israel’s military domination and Jewish-settler colonization of the OPT as a single system is best captured as a form of state grand apartheid.

Israeli Jewish settlements in the OPT coupled with other Israeli draconian measures are antithetical to Palestinian viability as a socially and politically integrated entity, a viable economic structure, a territorially and geographically contagious space, and ultimately hinders the creation of a sovereign Palestinian state on the OPT. As such it embodies and galvanizes the strategies and goals set by the “Jerusalem Program” and state policy that is derived from these goals. Israel presence in the OPT has been sustained through policies of petty apartheid.

As Akenson (1992: 209) defines petty apartheid as the negative or administrative practices through which Israel exerted its power on the level of Palestinians as individuals and as a group of population (disciplinary and bi-power) and it consists of all rules, laws, procedures that regulate social, political and economic life of two ethno-national groups segregated in a dual system of domination. Although total exclusion that characterized Zionism in per 1967 phase has been slightly changed to encompass the element of exploitation of the Palestinian workers from the OPT, those workers were not
integrated in the Israeli economic system since they were fully immigrant labor (they commute on a daily basis to their working places and back to their homes in the OPT). Under these circumstances Palestinian workers couldn’t establish any basis for exerting any significant political leverage on Israel’s politics, as Younis (2005) eloquently illustrates. This quasi-inclusion resulted in a complex alienation of a significant segment of the Palestinian society; the workers. Workers have become not only deprived of political voice as part of the subordinate group, they were also deprived from their rights in the marketplace as an unrecognized immigrant workforce.

Petty apartheid in this context enabled Israel from handling a cost-effective occupation and to render the population amenable to its rules. In congruent with petty apartheid Israel has established a system of grand apartheid; territorial arrangement of segregation and social gerrymandering that targets the subordinate group with restrictions and prohibitions pertaining to the land and other aspects of national identity expressions and aspirations.

*Colonial Settlement as a state policy*

The Zionist assertion that ‘the land’ of Palestine belongs to the Jews only has established “an exclusive ethno-national culture [that was] coded, institutionalized, and militarized by the new state [Israel] in order to quickly ‘idegenise’ immigrant Jews, and conceal, trivialize, or marginalize the land’s Palestinian past” (Yiftachel 2010: 228). Alienating the Palestinian from the land by colonizing it has been carried with religious ethno-national zeal that aimed at the negation of the Palestinians and replacing them with new pioneer Jews. Settler-colonization of Palestine, now in the OPT, glorifies the frontier
Jew; a ‘new Jew’, a settler fighter who negates the other Palestinian and the other Diaspora Jew. Jewish settlement in Palestine is a prominent Zionist ethos through which a new Zionist Jew is created; without “knowing, walking, settling, loving and staking a claim to the land” (Yiftachel 2010: 228) Jewish ethno-nationalism remains incomplete.

Notwithstanding these attitudes settlement construction in the OPT was not an outcome of religious zeal only or the result of right wing maximalist political forces actions. Although those forces spearheaded the settlement project at different junctures and succeeded to establish strong political blocks (in and outside the parliament), the complicity of the state and governments in settlement building and expansion cannot be obscured. Actually, “the entire settlement grid has been designed and subsidized by the state, in coordination with the settlement movement” (Tilley 2005: 35) and relevant Zionist organizations especially the Jewish Agency, the Jewish National Fund, and the World Zionist Organization. Without an exception Israeli Prime Ministers facilitated and endorsed the policy. Linking settlement policies exclusively to the Israeli right wing politicians or the pressure of Zionist religious and national-religious parties is a common misrepresentation of the actual record of settlement expansion. Settlement building and expansion started under the rule of the Labor Party right after 1967 war and reached unprecedented levels under the Labor government in the 1990s. During periods of ‘national unity’ governments (1984 and in the 1990s) settlement construction continued apace, as well as under governments led by the Likud in 1977 and late 1990s through the 2000s (as we show below). Thus regardless of governments’ partisan build up colonizing the OPT has been an immutable policy.
State systematic involvement in settlement building and particularly the promotions Israeli governments offer Jewish families and individuals encouraged more and more Israeli Jewish citizens to move and live in the OPT\textsuperscript{77}. Furthermore, Israeli classified the OPT as “Class A National Priority” development zones in 1972, which means that settlements are entitled for the same treatment other cities and towns in Israel receive from the government in terms of tax exemptions and investment incentives. These policies made some settlements hubs for economic, technological, and agricultural development projects\textsuperscript{78}. Let alone that settlements are a significant source of benefits and profits for individuals, entrepreneurs, and companies who enjoy a wide range of incentives and preferable terms for housing, investment, and other activities settlements construction reflects the “deeper ties [that] concretize the state’s commitment to [settlement] grid” and state’s identification with this enterprise as a defining aspect of its

\textsuperscript{77}Israeli Ministry of Construction and Housing provides generous loans for the purchase of apartments, part of which is converted to a grant; the Israeli Lands Administration offers significant price reductions in leasing land; the ministry of Education extends incentives for teachers, exemption from tuitions and fees in kindergartens, and free transportation to schools; the ministry of Industry and Trade provides grants for investors, infrastructure for industrial zones, etc; the Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs gives incentives for social workers; and the ministry of Finance offers reductions in income tax for individuals and companies (B’Tselem, Land grab: Israel’s Settlement Policy in the West Bank; Comprehensive Report, Jerusalem, May 2005). Vast amounts of governmental and non-governmental funds were allocated to establish and galvanize the settlements: the WZO estimated the costs of the ‘Major Plan for the West Bank’ of 1978-83 at IL (Israeli Lira) 32 billion for new settlements, and an additional IL 22 billion to ‘thicken’ existing settlements. This pattern remained steady through the years and in 2001 total spending on settlements by eight Israeli ministers was US$ 553.6 million, military spending and transportation are not included (Strasler2002).

\textsuperscript{78}In 1984 the WZO distributed an ad that hailed ‘Judea and Samaria (the WB) as Israel’s new high-tech industrial zone. It describes the WB as the scientific and technological anchor of the entire nation. The Ministry of Science, as the ad confirms, was determined to establish a science-based park in the settlement of Ariel in the heart of the WB, and a nuclear medicine facility in Ma’ale Efraim (Tilley 2005: 43).
foundation. Indeed “the policy to settle all of Eretz Israel not only runs deeply through the fabric of Israeli politics but is embedded in the state’s very design” (Tilley 2005: 46).

As a matter of ‘national consensus’ among the Zionist Jews settlements in the occupied territories have become in the heart of an orchestrated effort to nurture the Jewishness of the Jewish state as the Jerusalem Program abovementioned states. The mission of the settlement operation in the OPT is to implement a single vision of an Israel united between the Mediterranean and the Jordan River. To be sure Israel has never shown the presence of any distinction between the borders of Israel and the occupied territories; all the maps and publications made by Israeli authorities show Israel stretching well through the OPT eastward to the Jordanian River (see maps 1 and 2). Taken from the Israeli Foreign Ministry official website, Israeli maps depict the OPT as Judea and Samaria (Yihuda vi Shomron in Hebrew) and/or ‘areas under Israeli control after 1967’. Maps and official state documents never use the term ‘Palestinian Territories’. Before the Oslo agreement the terms: Shtahim (regions) and ‘administered territories’ prevailed in

---

According to Tel Aviv Macro Center for Political Economics the cost of construction in the West Bank settlements over the last 40 years was a total of $17.4 billion. The cost of buildings for housing was nearly $13.7 billion, which is 78 percent of the total.” These numbers do not include the huge military spending on the security of settlements. In the fiscal years 2000–2002 the Israeli Ministry of Construction and Housing allocated 47 per cent of its annual budget to local authorities of settlements in the West Bank. Israeli government contribution to the budgets of these local authorities in 2006 reached 57 per cent whereas it was 34 per cent to local authorities inside Israel for the same period http://www.macro.org.il/lib/3218049.pdf. These subsidies reflect on the standards of life settlers enjoy. The settlements receive more than double the equivalent per capita funding provided to municipalities within the Green Line (when the security costs are added, an average settler receives about $9,000 annually in extra funds. http://www.peace-with-justice.org/Israeli%20Settlements.htm. More recently, the Israeli government spent well over US$533 million in sustaining Jewish settlements in the occupied territories in 2001, more than half the amount provided it by the United States as direct economic assistance during the same year, according to a report released by the Israeli Peace Now movement. http://www.commondreams.org/headlines03/0127-05.htm Although Israeli authorities refrain from announcing or revealing the detailed data on governmental expenditures in the OPT especially on settlements and the income generated by controlling natural resources and investments in these areas a study conducted in 2011estimates that since 1987 Israel’s occupation total cost reached $88.5 billion in subsidies, security costs, governmental budget, and tax exemptions. http://liamgetreu.com/2011/10/09/the-economics-of-israels-settlement-enterprise/.
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Israel’s official discourse. These are not isolated manifestations of linguistic guise or formal correspondence deliberations; that represent a state policy that aims at altering the spatial outlook of the territory and buttress Jewish historical lineage in Palestine.

Naming and Judaizing the space

Naming (and re-naming) policies are indicative if state policies in regard to the status and the futures of the OPT; it illustrates state systematic effort to invade the spatial sphere of the Palestinians and to establish Jewish existence in Palestine as an indigenous presence. Meaning and connotations are the most important qualities of place-names for any nation and political entity; however among all connotations (social, religious, and political) Israeli Jewish naming of Palestine and especially the OPT aimed at altering the spatial sphere by emphasizing Jewish ethno-religious ancient presence and suppressing all non-Jewish existence. Naming and renaming policy has been concomitant to Israel’s actions of land confiscation and ethnic cleansing of the Palestinians since 1948 and establishing Jewish residential centers in place of Palestinian expelled from them (Israel built 400 Jewish settlements in the first 10 years after 1948). Naming embodies the intersection of Zionist ideology, the symbolism it confers on the spatial sphere, and the behavior of the state and non-state organizations and institutions that consistently and systematically aimed at Judizing the geographical and spatial terrains of Palestine.

This pattern is prominent in all the Mandatory Palestine and has been “premised on a hegemonic myth cultivated since the rise of Zionism, and buttressed by the ‘nation-state’ myth, that ‘the land’ (Ha’aretz) belongs to the Jews, and to them only” (Yiftachel 2010:228). Idegenising Jewish immigrants and reconstructing the new entity (the state) as
a Jewish state required remarking and reshaping the space in accordance with the concept of *Eretz Israel*, Israel of David and Solomon (see map 3). Judisation plays a crucial role in establishing the extraterritorial value of the space that has become a vital aspect of identification in the Israeli polity in reference to the whole region of Palestine.

The term Zionism itself is derived from a place-name; Jerusalem’s Mount Zion that refers to the time of King David and the ancient name of the state Israel that was chosen to take the place of Palestine. Naming and re-naming spatial spheres of the territory conforms to the efforts to reconstitute the Jewish as a nation in Palestine; they embody an ideological upheaval that aimed at reconstructing the history of the landscape in accordance to the Biblical claims to the Land. Thus “place names are symbolic expressions of Israeli nationalism in the face of Palestinian Arab opposition” (Cohen and Kliot 2011:654) and considered part of the effort to exert ideological clout and political impress on the landscape. Ultimately the resurrection of biblical names emphasizes the historical lineage of the Jewish people traced down to Abraham that was interrupted by force. In order to materialize the claim of Jewish indigeneity in Palestine that precedes Arab idgendeity remapping history and remarking landscape in conformity to this remapping is crucial to Zionism and Israeli-Jewish settlement to sustain. Renaming policy has suppressed the non-Jewish presence in Palestine and uplifted and re-center not the Jewish but the Jewish-national presence as the defining historical element of the land.

---

80 The renaming processes started even before the establishment of the state of Israel as the Jewish National Fund formed a Naming Committee in 1930. The committee’s mission was to eliminate Arab place-names that are considered as carriers of Hebrew names from the regional map. In 1950 the state of Israel assigned a governmental Naming Committee that took the burden of renaming the landscape.
This pattern is as valid in the OPT as it has been within the Israeli proper in which Arab names were suppressed and substituted by Jewish Biblical/Talmudic names\(^81\).

Naming and renaming have given a deep sense of supremacy of territorial and spatial dimensions of the conflict more than historical narratives. Particularly after 1967 spatial and territorial excessive struggle has focused the conflict on the temporary political spaces shaped by the people living in Israel/ Palestine itself. Consequently, the main feature of the conflict during the last three decades has pitted expansive Jewish settlement versus Palestinian resistance and steadfastness (Yiftachel 2010: 217).

The conflict in this sense is not a struggle over narratives as much as on the spatial/territorial domain that correspond to and consolidate the narrative. Naming in this sense is an embedded element of the whole structures of domination and exclusion that uplifts Jewish religious ethno-nationality.

The ethno-religious definition of the state and nationality as Jewish rather than Israeli took a dramatic dimension after 1967 that brought world Jewry into a massive identification with what became a reality: the entire Promised-Land (Weissbord 2011: 198-200). From that point on Israel has become the dominant political and legal entity in the entirety of Palestine; in order to reestablish the historically symbolic relationship between the state of Israel and the OPT, re-naming landscape took a new impulse that also buttressed particular behavior: Israel’s Jewish-only settlement building in the West Bank, Gaza Strip and East Jerusalem. One short trip in the OPT can show the dramatic

\(^81\) Forty Seven per cent of Jewish settlements’ names in the OPT (Old Israel) are Biblical/Talmudic while Twenty per cent of settlement established in the Israeli proper have Biblical/Talmudic names (Cohen and Kliot 2011: 663). The discrepancy can only be explained by the exceptional sanctity with which the Zionist movement and settlement planners perceive the OPT as the heart of the ancient Kingdom of Israel.
and profound changes in the spatial outlook of the land that gives the visitor an impression that she is travelling in a place that belongs solely to the Jewish people; names of streets, squares, reservations, street signs and intersections, ancient sights, and monuments were all changed into Hebrew Biblical/Talmudic names. Signs that hold names of Jewish settlements and the roads leads to them are exceptionally large and positioned on eye-catching spots, while signs leading to Palestinian cities and villages, and the roads leading into them are smaller, marginalized in side-ways and dwarfed by those Jewish ones.

Renaming along with actual changes in transportation routes and settlement expansion have marginalized the presence of Palestinian sights and uplift that of Jewish domination over the spatial sphere. The reconstitution of the space to imbue Palestine with Jewish religious ethno-national outlook is part of Israel’s efforts to create a new reality not necessarily driven by religious interpretation as much as by political and strategic ends. To be sure biblical names were conferred to locations and sights that have no historical authenticity in terms of their particular geographic position especially in the OPT (Cohen and Kliot 2011: 666). Since the settlement in the WB as a whole represents

---

82 A cursory look at the names of many Israeli Jewish settlement in every region in the OPT offers a strong evidence of the Biblical underpinnings of settlement construction. For settler movements and Zionist adherents of the notion of Great Israel Biblical sites abound in the heartlands of the OPT that witnessed the prevalence of the Kingdom of David and Solomon and their successors. For example, the settlement of Elon Moreh (to the East of Nablus) refers to Abraham’s trip to the land of Canaan; Brakha (on Mount Gerizim adjacent to Nablus) means blessing and derived from the verse “Thou shalt put they blessing on Mt. Gerizim and the curse on Mt. Ebal; Bet-El (house of the Lord) to the north of Ramallah is related to the era of Abraham and the Second Temple; Bet-Horon (House of Horon) is mentioned in Joshua; Anatot (at the Eastern tips of Jerusalem) is believed to be where Jeremiah was born; and the settlement Shilo (between Nablus and Ramallah) is described as “where the Holly Ark and Tebernacles stood for hundreds of years” (Cohen and Kliot 2011: 664).
the materialization of the ‘Return’ to the Land of Israel the certainty of location matters less. What matters in this respect is the process through which the OPT - as the whole of Palestine should be Judized.

State policies withstanding, the development of the Jewish settlement enterprise in the OPT has gathered a self sustaining political and social momentum within the Israeli political system and society. Today, after more than four decades of settlement expansion and military rule settlers’ community –numbered 500,000 in 2010- and political forces uplift it represent an unstoppable political configuration. Settlement, colonization, and land control have become inextricably linked to the very social, political, and economic structures that hold Israel as a state and a polity together.

**Transforming the national-territorial nexus**

As early as first years of 1970s two mainstream perspectives prevailed in Israeli polity: the Labor Party position and strategy stated that Israeli control over the OPT can be sustained within a regional compromise with Arab neighboring states (not the Palestinians). In such a compromise Israel would maintain certain strategic parts of the West Bank and East Jerusalem and relinquish domination over highly Palestinian populated parts. The motto “territory in exchange for peace” was perceived to serve Israel’s strategic interests more than the insistence on controlling all the territories. The other perspective adopted by the Likud Party and other right wing Religious National
parties states that Israel must sustain its control over the entire OPT in perpetuity as part of the Land of *Eretz Israel*. This block is known as the Greater Land of Israel camp.

The Center-Labor strategy triumphed in the first decade of Israel’s occupation mainly because until the year 1977 Labor had been the dominant political party in the Israeli governments. The Labor Party sought to materialize its ‘regional compromise’ strategy through diplomacy on the one hand and the consolidation of Jewish control of the OPT in the other. Within this context it accepted the UN Security Council resolution 242 at the same time it established the first settlement in the OPT. Settlement expansion followed a pattern that conforms to Labor’s strategy: avoiding Jewish settlement in highly populated areas in the heartland of the WB and GS while focusing on the Jordan Valley and the parameter of Jerusalem as designated in the Allon Plan (see...

---

83 UN Security Council resolution 242 of 22 November 1967 emphasized “the inadmissibility of the territory by war and the need to work for a just and lasting peace in which every State in the area can live in peace”. It further reiterate the commitment of all actors to the respect of the UN Charter especially Article 2. The resolution stated that just lasting peace in the M.E should include the application of two principles: withdrawal of Israeli military forces from territories occupied in the recent conflict, and the acknowledgment and recognition of territorial integrity and political independence of all States in the region. The French version of the resolution (as appears in UN archives) refers to the OPT with the definite ‘de territories occupies’.

84 As early as September 1967, Kfar Ezyon became the first settlement to be established in the West Bank. It was established because of the pressure of a group of settlers, some of whom were relatives of the residents of the original community of Kfar Ezyon, which was abandoned and destroyed during the 1948 war. http://www.btselem.org/download/200205_land_grab_eng.pdf.

85 The Labor government endorsed and adopted the “Allon Plan” (referring to Israeli Defense Minister in 1967 Yigal Allon) for Jewish settlement. Allon presented the plan as a political settlement plan with the Arabs. According to the plan Israel would retain control over the Jordan Valley and the ‘back of the Mountain’ (the precipice vas area leading to the valley). This would allow Israel to control the WB militarily while granting Palestinians access to Jordan. Israeli military and settlement presence in the Valley will prevent any military power from entering west of the Jordan, which would be the eastern borders of Israel, so the plan suggests. Moreover, Israel would annex the corridor of Jerusalem, and the Palestinians would be given control over three populated enclaves: a north enclave including the cities of Nablus,
map 4). The plan espoused a permanent situation in which the Palestinian population in the OPT would be reduced to separate masses connected to each other by a network of roads and separated by belts of settlements and military bases. The ultimate goal was convincing Jordan to accept the plan that would grant Israel sovereignty over most of the OPT area while allowing the Jordanian ruling monarch to regain control over the rest of the territory and over the entirety of the population; this would be dubbed ‘the Jordanian Option’. Thus by 1976, about 40 percent of the OPT land had been confiscated and became under Israeli control and some 4500 Israeli settlers were brought to reside in 30 settlements. Another 50,000 settlers were living in the settlements of Jerusalem. In effect, Labor’s strategy provided a solution to the problem of Palestinian population intensity by a segregation plan that conforms to Likud’s perspective. The Allon Plan slice the OPT into three separate areas with those highly populated to be turned to the Jordanian rule whereas Israel would sustain control over most of the region. Settlement was the main tool to carry on the strategy.

Starting of 1977, with the ascendancy of the Likud to power, a massive colonization process of the occupied territories has been launched. This change marks the onset of a new dynamism of Israel’s colonization of the OPT; the new dynamism is characterized with profound ideologically-driven settlement intensive expansion; the introduction of

---

Tulkarm, Jenin and Ramallah; a southern includes Hebron and Bethlehem; an a third that includes Jericho and border-crossing to Jordan.

86 Although these settlement constructions followed the lines set up by the Allon Plan, Allon proposed expanding settlements in areas adjacent to populated Palestinian areas such as the establishment of the settlement Kiryat Arba near the city of Hebron, and suggested the “Jericho Plan” according to which Israel would return the city and its surrounding to the Jordanian rule in exchange for an intermediate agreement. See also Btselem special report “Land Grab: Israel’s Settlement Policy in the West Bank, 2002. http://www.macro.org.il/lib/3218049.pdf
the issue of the OPT into domestic Israeli politics as a matter of political outbidding, mobilization and legitimization; and the rise of Zionist/Jewish consensus on the vitality and indispensability of settlements for the survival of Israel and the Zionist objectives in Palestine.

*The climax of Jewish ethno-territoriality*

The Likud came to power leading a social coalition of forces converged by their disaffection with Labor Party policies. A disparate group of Israeli social segments voted for the Likud for different interests: the Mizrahi community in protest of Ashkenazi-dominated Labor party; the business strata discontent with Labor’s welfare policies; the religious groupings offended by secular stance of the party; and national-religious forces unsatisfied with what they perceived as Labor Party’s soft policies with the Palestinians and especially its slow implementation of settlement policy in the OPT.

With the Likud in power the question of the OPT and its relationship with Israel took the forefront of political debates within the Israeli polity and society. While the Labor party maintained a low-profile creeping annexation of the territories without stirring political or legal confrontations, the Likud announced its adaptation of an overt expansionist policy

---

87 The Likud part is the ideological offspring of the Herut movement, which had originally “asserted that all of 1917 Palestine, including Jordan, belongs to the Jews by right, and was unjustly divided by the British.” While most Herut and Likud members came to accept the reality of Jordan as an Arab state east of the Jordan River, from the mid-1970’s on secular ultra-nationalists from Herut and Likud who believed in territorial maximalism before all else—now in the entire area west of the Jordan—joined forces with their religious counterparts in the Gush and the NRP to build Jewish settlements throughout the territory. “These ideologies formed the core of a ‘Greater Israel’ movement.” http://www.chicagopeacenow.org/MF_issue6_9-5-04.pdf
by declaring that Judea and Samaria would never be relinquished (Younis 2000:147) to any other entity. Likud’s ideology as Avi Shalim puts it “could be summed up into two words- Greater Israel. According to this ideology, the OPT were an integral part of Eretz Israel the Land of Israel” (Cited in Oberschall 2007: 131). Likud’s manifesto of 1977 leaves no space for controversy in regard to its rejection of the establishment of a Palestinian state in the OPT and its unfettered commitment to the Judization of Palestine. For Ariel Sharon-the most hawkish Likud leader and the God Father of the most expansionist settlement projects in the West Bank- Palestinian state is to be anywhere but not on the W.B. or at least in segregated enclaves within the WB. In the words of Amos Elon, Sharon “is ready to allow a Palestinian state to be established only in Gaza and a very few disjoined enclaves in the W.G surrounded by Israeli settlements and military installations” (Oberschall 2007: 131132).

Likud’s adherence to the notion of “Greater Land of Israel” yielded a certain unintended consequence: the existence and demographic increase of the Palestinians in the OPT and the relatively limited numbers of Jewish settlers brought to live in these territories (comparing to Israel’s plans) coupled with Likud’s annexationist policies were creating dynamism of integration. Extensive colonization and Israeli domination by
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88 Likud’s Manifesto reads ‘The same Likud that people keep wrongly accusing of not wanting a Pal state...’ says FSM. This is what it actually said: The Jewish communities in Judea and Samaria are the realization of Zionist values. Settlement of the land is a clear expression of the unassailable right of the Jewish people to the Land of Israel. Likud will continue to strengthen and develop these communities and will prevent their uprooting. The Government of Israel flatly rejects the establishment of a Palestinian Arab state west of the Jordan River. The Palestinians can run their lives freely in the framework of self-rule, but NOT as an independent and sovereign state. Jerusalem is the eternal, united capital of the State of Israel and only of Israel. The Likud government will act with vigor to continue Jewish habitation and strengthen Israeli sovereignty in the eastern parts of the city. That’s pretty clear then - Likud OPPOSES a Palestinian state and wants the land”. http://www.haaretz.com/misc/comment-page/peter-sm-read-the-likud-manifesto-first-19.487304
means of sovereign power were heading towards the establishment of a single entity which would undermine the Jewish character of the state. It has become clear that Likud’s strategy was attempting to attain the unattainable. Israel would not be able to survive as a “democratic, great, and Jewish state” altogether. As Arye Naor (former Israeli cabinet secretary) puts it: “Israeli goals of a Jewish, democratic, and large state were irreconcilable; any two could be met, but never the three simultaneously” (Ibid). The logic here implies a racist assumption on the precondition of less or no Palestinians in the region for Israel to maintain its characters as democratic and Jewish. It echoes, with different language, the notion of transfer (ethnic cleansing) as the remaining solution for this Israeli dilemma. The sole obstacle to achieving a large, Jewish, and democratic is the presence of a majority of Palestinians in the OPT and within the envisioned Greater Israel on the whole of the Mandatory Palestine.

The Likud government came with an all-out settlement agenda that aimed at consolidating Jewish presence in the OPT making no differentiations between security, political, or religious settlement enterprise. Years of the Likud government in late 1970s had witnessed the emergence of the most dedicated settler movements in the history of the conflict at the time; Gush Emunim. Settlements are now established close to and around Palestinian residential areas and on hilltop with a tremendous infrastructure emerged to serve the new settlements and to circumscribe any Palestinian attempts to develop their rural areas. The policy not only “superimposed an exclusionary physical and spatial reality onto the occupied territories” (Younis 2000: 148) but more importantly this policy established the grounds for the creation a dual political, social, physical, and
legal reality within the OPT: two distinct communities living on the same territory and ruled by two entirely different sets of laws, norms, and measures; the Palestinian population and the Jewish settlers.

Thus, segregation was rapidly imposed founding a settler-colonial reality that turned the OPT into a colonial periphery to Israel within which the colonial buffer that separate the occupied from the occupier grew more entrenched. At this point the settlement grid has crossed a threshold: domestically settlement building and consolidation has become a ‘national priority’ and Jewish consensus. Daniella Weiss; currently mayor of the settlement Kidumim in the West Bank and one of the most prominent settler leaders, was amongst the initial wave of settlers, describes the reaction of the non-believers to the Gush Emunim faithful’s actions in settlement expansion:

Who are these strange hallucinating people?’ they would ask. ‘What are they doing [in these] Biblical hills? There's nothing there!’... They thought they'd be able to control us, to keep us in place and watch over us. They thought we'd grow tired and go back to Tel Aviv… This was the start of Kedumim.”

Likud’s policy of total settlement in the whole of the OPT has blurred the boundaries: legal, political, and psychological between Israeli proper and these territories as the result of the wholeness with which settlement construction was sought. During the 1980s through 1990 Likud governments’ political objectives were clear: taking control over the entire biblical land of Israel that would consolidate the “Greater Israel” under the

---

89 In his article ‘The real price of Israel's settlements’, Seth Freedman shows the ability of settler movements to influence Israeli decision makers’ policies on the issues of settlement expansion and allocating funds for settlement building. As he notices, the Likud period turned settlement activities into a massive process that each government succeeded the Likud had to follow. His interview with Weiss gives a flavor of this metamorphosis. http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2010/mar/25/israel-settlements-palestinian-territories-price
sovereignty of the Jewish people. Yitzhak Shamir; Israel’s Prime Minister in this period bluntly articulated these objectives:

This is our goal: territorial wholeness. It should not be encroached or fragmented. This is an a priori principle; it is beyond argument. You should not ask why. Why this land is ours requires no explanation. Is there any other nation that argues about its homeland, its size and dimensions, about territories, territorial compromise, or anything to the effect?”

To realize the wholeness of the settlements Israeli governments of the Likud and the national unity government of 1984 adopted and implemented three major settlement plans\(^9\) that resulted in the establishment of twenty-three new urban settlements and the construction of 300-450 Kilometers of roads. The number of settlers brought to these new

\(^9\) Likud settlement policy was informed and followed two leading plans: The first in 1977 articulated by Matitiyahu Drobles, head of the World Zionist Organization's Settlement Division. Drobles prepared a comprehensive plan for the establishment of colonies throughout the West Bank. Most of the colonies that were established as part of the Drobles plan were constructed on the central mountain ridge around Palestinian population centers. The Drobles Plan embraced the aims of Gush Emunim and signaled a governmental shift away from the Allon Plan. The second presented by the former Israeli Minister of Agriculture Ariel Sharon (1977-1981) (and former Israeli Prime Minister) modified and expanded the Drobles Plan and Gush Emunim, by intensifying colonization along the Green Line in order to secure the borders between the West Bank and Israel.

The Sharon Plan also called for increasing the colonization along the central mountain ridge. According to the Sharon Plan, only a small number of high density Palestinian communities were not to be under Israeli sovereignty in the future. The Allon Plan dealt with the 'demographic problem' posed to Israel by the Palestinian population through avoidance, whereas, the Sharon Plan continued the more aggressive policies that relied on removal and transfer of the Palestinian population out of the OPT. The ultimate aim of the Sharon Plan was the annexation of the West Bank, excluding small densely populated Palestinian enclaves. Following the preparation of Sharon's plan, the Ministry of Agriculture and the Ministry of Construction and Housing established ten colonies on the western slopes of the central mountain ridge in the West Bank, north of Jerusalem. Sharon's vision also included preventing the contiguity of developed Palestinian areas along the Green Line, by disconnecting and segregating the West Bank in areas north of Nablus, west of Jenin, and north of Ramallah, from the Palestinian communities adjacent to the Green Line within Israel. According to his vision, this disconnection would be accomplished by the creation and construction of sets of Israeli colonies on those areas. Sharon also planned to create corridors of colonies and a network of bypass roads all over the West Bank, connecting the 1949-Armistice Line (Green Line) with the Jordan Valley. As a result of the implementation of these plans in the year 1980 alone the Palestinians lost control over more than 27 per cent of the total area of the WG apart from East Jerusalem, and one-third of the entire GS, and by the year 1987, 52% and 42% of the land in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, respectively, had been expropriated by Israel. Land has been confiscated both for so called 'Security Reasons' and for the construction of Israeli settlements. http://www.arij.org/atlas40/chapter2.4.html
settlement reached to 51,000, which fill short of the targeted number according to the plans which was 80,000 (Btselem 2002:15).

The failure to meet the goals of the plans can be referred to the economic complications Israel was grappling with in the same period and contributed significantly to the rise of the Likud and other right wing forces. Thus Sahmir’s statement at one level reflected deep socio-economic changes and their political repercussions that marked a drift toward political right, nationalistic, and extremist politics. Those changes have had a fragmenting effect on the political and party system in Israel that stamped the ascendance of extremist religious, national-religious, and ultra-nationalist political parties. In effect these developments had turned the issue of settlements into a crucial factor in Israel’s policies in terms of its prevalence as an immutable policy implemented on a large scale regardless of the party or the coalition of parties in the government. Differences between different governments were insignificant and affected primarily by factors other than internal politics namely, Palestinian reactions, regional and international effects especially the initiation of the peace process.

---

91 The late 1970s through 1980s was a period of deep economic transformation in the state of Israel; moving away from the socialist system to a capitalist economy. The liberalization of the economy was embraced by the two main Zionist streams of thinking: the Labor Party and the Likud party. This process had left significant portions of the Israeli society behind especially among the poor masses of the Mizrahi Jewish (Jews from Oriental descent), the Haredim (ultraorthodox), and Palestinians. Social change resulted from the process was exacerbated more in the 1990’s with the arrival of one million Russian Jews to Israel. Liberalization, as in most regions of the world has deepened social disparities, increased levels of poverty and unemployment. Discontent with the new policy has led the affected masses to affiliate and identify with nationalist sentiments that the political right embodied, and to religious parties in the sought of redress. A multiplication of parliamentary parties and a drift to the right have become prevalent in the Israeli polity. Forming and sustaining governments have become more difficult and institutional instability has created a crisis (Ishay2011: 76-77)
Beyond the “ideological threshold”

Israeli governments have never shown any serious intentions to stop, freeze, or slow the pace of settlement construction. The 1970s and early 1980s had set the tone for a persistent pattern of colonization that witnessed relative fluctuations due to particular events and momentary factors. In particular, Israel’s political system had witnessed profound changes in the course of 1970s that culminated in a two-block politics in the 1980s that replaced Labor’s hegemony. As mentioned earlier, socio-economic changes in Israel has led to the fragmentation of the political system, which renders governments formation hard to achieve without offering significant concessions to small parties for a coalition. Under the circumstances prevailed in the election of 1984 the two big parties (Labor and Likud) tied up to find themselves in a situation whereby they had to form a ‘national unity government’.

The most remarkable change in the period was the increase of small parties; distribution of political power had changed dramatically with the decline of midsize parties. Building ruling coalition under these new configurations took an ideological path in which the Likud and the Labor tended to chose small parties from their ideological camps to form the government (Elazer and Sandler 1994). In effect this strengthened the political power of small parties especially supporters of Greater Israel ideology; a trend that would increase in the forthcoming two decades. Likud’s own failures in the late

---

92 The electoral rise of the Likud started at the 1973 election where it gained 39 seats of the 120 that consists the parliament comparing to 51 seats for the Labor Party. In 1977 and 1981 elections the Likud won 43 and 48 seats, respectively sending the Labor to the opposition for the first time since the establishment of Israel. However, the election of 1984 witnessed Labor’s electoral revival with a gain of 47 seats. Small parties in this period flourished in number to reach a total of 13 parties. Notably, those who were in the rise were religious parties such as Shas (See Elazer and Sandler 1994).
1970s and early 1980s (in the economic arena rates of inflations hit a peak that brought Israel to the brink of bankruptcy, and Israel’s war in Lebanon turned into a protracted conflict that led to Likud’s popular decline), and Labors image as the party of the constitution that aimed at offering territorial concessions to the Arabs, led to a coalition of necessity. Both parties needed to repair their popularity and gain legitimacy that resulted (among other things) in tightening Israel’s colonial policies in the OPT. Thus during the years 1983-1988; last year of Likud’s government and years of National Unity government between the Labor and the Likud the number of established settlements increased from 67 to 110 and the number of settlers leaped from 22,800 to 63,600 in the WB and to 100,000 in East Jerusalem (Btselem 2002: 17-18).

The election of 1988 the Likud and the Labor Parties tied up with 40 and 39 seats, respectively. The Likud led by Yitzhak Shamir formed the government with a wide coalition of small parties (National Religious Party, Shas, Agudat Yisrael, Degel HaTorah, the New Liberal Party, Tehiya, Tzomet, Moledet) all of which conform with Likud’s Greaterer Israel ideology. In this period the government focused on expanding the existing settlements (settlement population increased by 60 per cent) and built ten new settlements (Ishay2011: 76-77). The limited settlement expansion under this government was the result of the economic crises in Israel on the one hand, and more importantly it stemmed from the unprecedented pressure the U.S.A exerted on Shamir to halt settlement expansion. Israeli government involved in a confrontation with H.W. Bush Administration on the issue as the later sought creating conducive environment for the initiation of the peace process. Shamir’s refusal to U.S.A demands compelled her to
freeze loan-guarantees that were promised to assist Israel to absorb Jewish immigrants from the USSR. The crisis had led to the fall of Shamir’s government especially when most of the parties in the coalition withdrew protesting Shamir’s participation in the Madrid peace conference.

The revival of the Labor Party in the election of 1992 (44 seats) that also gave rise to pro-peace parties such as Meretz gave a measure of hope that creeping territorial takeover of the OPT would halt. Yitzhak Rabin’s government announced that a change of ‘national priority’ should be carried on; it committed to the U.S.A that it wouldn’t construct any new settlements or expand any existing ones except for purposes of ‘natural growth’. Another exception was added that Israel would continue settlement construction in the area of ‘Greater Jerusalem’ and the Jordan Valley; in conformity with the Allon Plan. However, these exceptions were all Rabin’s government needed to trick the America and the rest of the world. Rabin’s government expanded settlements in areas of post 1967 and annexed to Jerusalem; the natural growth (interpreted not in terms of birth rate but also in terms of new Jewish immigrants) had been used to construct 9850 new housing units in the existing settlements and new settlements were established as neighborhoods of existing settlements. Thus in the period of 1992 to 1995 the number of settlers rose from 146,000 to 282,000 in the WB and East Jerusalem (Btselem 2002: 17-18). Not less important under Rabin’s government Israel started to apply the system of movement-permit for the Palestinians from the OPT who wanted to move into Israeli proper. The restrictions on Palestinians’ mobility especially targeted workers, and it included prohibitions on goods exchange, movement of vehicles and people between the
WB and GZ and within the WG. Jerusalem was also isolated from the rest of the WB by military checkpoints and barriers. Using physical methods (military checkpoints, barriers, and roadblocks) and administrative methods especially the permit regime Israel aimed at controlling Palestinian movement and at channeling it to a few major checkpoints, depending on Israel’s needs. They are intended to keep Palestinian traffic away from the settlements, main roads used by settlers, and areas where Israel wants to strengthen its control and exclude Palestinians. Therefore, most of the checkpoints and obstructions are located on roads leading to Area C (the 60 percent of the West Bank under complete Israeli control), in East Jerusalem, the Jordan Valley, enclaves west of the Separation Barrier, and the settlements in Hebron (Bt‘selem 2010).

Thus Rabin’s strategy echoed his realization that Israel need to redefine its domination in the OPT towards consolidating territorial control couples with segregation and oppression in response to the profound change the Palestinian intifada brought with it. The intifada had challenged Israeli domination system and it redrew the boundaries of the conflict as an ethno-one whereby Israel has to confront a persistent people. As Rabin explained in 1995:

we had to choose between the Greater Land of Israel, which means a binational state whose populations would comprise, as of today, 4.5 million Jews and more than 3 million Palestinians…and a state smaller in area, but which would be a Jewish state; we chose to be a Jewish state” (Rabin: 1995).

It has become clear that Rabin was referring to an extended Jewish-democratic state that would encompass vast areas of the OPT. Rabin’s colonial policies and the segregation system his government entrenched in an unprecedented manner had created the
foundation of the following rapid and profound measures that consolidate the system of
grand apartheid in the OPT. The assassination of Yitzhak Rabin in May 1995 was
alarming in the sense that it uncovered the deep extremist currents beneath the Israel’s
society and polity rift to the right; a trend that would take an exponential rise in the rest of
the 1990s and the 2000s until today. Directly affecting Israel’s colonial polices in the
OPT, this rift only consolidated and already comprehensive settlement building during
the peace process. Settlement expansion during the peace process embodies Israel’s
determination to defy the element of time by consolidating its territorial and spatial
hegemony over the land. Rabin’s approach clearly aimed at determining the geographical
parameters of the aspired Palestinian state. So did all Israeli Prime Ministers regardless of
the peace process. The period also uncovered the increasing influence of Israeli right and
extreme right politics on governments’ policies. The chart below shows a striking pattern
of settlement expansion in the periods of negotiations between Israel and the PLO: As
notices above, Rabin’s “change of national priority’ gave a huge boom to settlement
expansion especially in and surrounding East occupied Jerusalem. In 1995, the
endorsement of Oslo Two agreement and the supposed Israeli withdrawal from additional
Palestinian territories and the end of the interim (transitional) period of the Oslo process
territorial control and settlement construction went up. Thus the number of housing units
in the settlements in the West Bank (excluding East Jerusalem) and Gaza Strip rose from
20,400 to 31,400 – an increase of approximately fifty-four percent in just seven years.

Israel’s persistent territorial expansion in the OPT took another profound level in
1996 by the new electoral victory of the Likud led by his hard-line Benjamin Netanyahu.
Although the Likud won 32 seats and the Labor 34 Netanyahu was elected separately from the rest of the parliament members under the new electoral law implemented in this year for the first time in Israel (to be revoked in the succeeding election). Netanyahu’s victory exposed the false assumption that years of U.S. efforts to bring political settlement to the conflict had achieved substantial progress. As a matter of fact Netanyahu came to power as the man who firmly opposed the Oslo agreements. This Likud hardliner victory represents the equivalent of the victory of Likud in the year 1977 in terms of the shift in the Israeli political spectrum to the ‘right’ and the trends prevailing in Israeli society. The election show the increase political power of religious and right wing parties: Shas gained 10 seats, the National-Religious Party 9 seats, Yisrael (Avigdor Liberman’s party) BaAliyah 9 while center-to-left Meretz lost 3 seats. With a government consisted of a narrow coalition of Likud, Tzomit, and Gisher Netanyahu came with new policy guidelines in regard to the peace process, which is considered to be a substantial change in the ‘peace process’ terms. A greater and more territorially-based emphasis on Israeli security was introduced: “Israel should be in a position to take responsibility to its external security by maintaining forces along the Jordan Valley, the Golan Heights, and Rafah border forever. In effect this means that Israel will control all points of entry and exit to the region; an aspect of sovereignty denied to Arafat (Aruri 2003:107). The election of 1996 entrenched the increasingly fragmented Israeli political system and Netanyahu’s strategy set the bar high for any government to come into office concerning any agreement with the PLO. So, when the Labor gained the election of 1999 it came to power in a highly fractured parliament with remarkably powerful small right and extreme right wing parties (Shas and Yisrael BaAliyah won 17 and 6 seats, respectively). Ehud
Barak; the new Prime Minister formed a government of odd bed-fellows: Shas (the religious Mizrahi party), Meretz (the center-to-left Oslo proponent party, and Yisrael BaAliah (Russian immigrants party that identify strongly with the Greater Land of Israel ideology).

The government announced Barak’s doctrine that drew on all previous efforts to consolidate Israel’s control of the OPT. Strikingly it also endorsed crucial elements of his predecessor Netanyahu. Barak announced his ‘four NOs’ as the basis for the achievement of a permanent peace with the Palestinians: no to any change for unified Jerusalem under Israeli sovereignty, as the eternal capital of Israel; no withdrawal to 1967 borders (the green line); most settlement dwellers in Judea and Samaria to remain under Israeli sovereignty; and no foreign army west of the Jordan River (Oberschall 2007: 150). This policy narrowed the gap between the two big parties in terms of the future of the OPT within a political system that has become stratified and the two-blocks politics in Israel entirely waned. Under these circumstances the two parties took a profoundly strategic step to unify their positions on the peace process and the limits of Israel concessions in regard to the OPT. Both parties agreed on the final outcome of any settlement as

precluding Palestinian sovereignty in any portion of historic Palestine…the concept of limited autonomy, adopted by the Knesset [Israeli Parliament] in 1977…was the centerpiece of Likud’s Camp David. It also became the essence of Labor’s Oslo agreement, and together they seem to promoting the ongoing atomization of the West Bank (Cited in: Aruri 2003:115).

The Likud and the Labor parties came along to solidify their rejection of the establishment of an independent Palestinian state by the agreement they signed in January 1997. The agreement entitled “National Agreement Regarding the Negotiations on the
Permanent Settlement with the Palestinians” rules out “Palestinian sovereignty, rejects the removal of Israeli settlement colonies from the OPT, negotiating the status of Jerusalem, repatriating the refugees, and dismantling the occupation” (Aruri 2003:218). Reaching this agreement is the ripe fruit of a long process through which Israeli polity came to stiffen its position concerning the OPT. The arrival of number of small parties to the parliament and the government following these developments turned the OPT into the most sacred issue in Israeli politics. Advocates of transfer (ethnic cleansing) are now setting in the government especially in the 2000s with the ascendance of the Likud led by Ariel Sharon and the eruption of the second Palestinian intifada in 2000.

The agreement between the Likud and the Labor coupled with the rise of pro-settlement political forces in Israel generated a blanket support for the doctrines included in Netanyahu and Barak strategies concerning the OPT. The events accompanied the Palestinian intifada especially the high levels of violence contributed to the ongoing rift to the right in Israeli society and polity; it added to the already established structures of segregation and colonization established in the 1990s. Regimes of segregation and territorial control reached a climax by the construction of the separation wall (the barrier in Israeli terminology, and the apartheid wall in the Palestinian discourse).
Israel’s security necessities used to justify the construction of the wall cannot survive the question of route and location of the wall. The most important aspect of the wall is that it has not been established on the ‘Green Line’. According to the UN only 11 per cent of the wall runs along the border line between Israel’s proper and the WB and in some parts it cuts and curves deep into the WB territory. Moreover, the wall is an institution of physical configurations and a set of measures and procedures that regulate

Source: http://www.economist.com/topics/israeli-settlements
and limit the mobility of Palestinians who live in the buffer zone of the wall. As such it creates another threat to individual and collective well-being and the possibility of an ordinary life (Roy 2004: 32). During the first phase of the wall’s construction, 51 Palestinian villages were isolated from most of their land, and 25 lost total access to their land, a critical problem for future economic survival. In the village of Jayous, for example, 138 of 3,250 acres were taken to build the wall and 2,150 additional acres (two-thirds of the village’s land) now lie in the seam zone. Early in the construction process, approximately 12,000 Palestinians in 14 villages and towns were wedged between the wall and the Green Line, an area known as the seam zone. They were cut off from the rest of the West Bank, from essential market outlets, and, to varying degrees, from the agricultural land they have farmed for generations. The most important issue about the wall for the purposes of our discussion is that the construction of such a giant institution has drawn the territorial counters of Israel’s domination within which Israel practices ultimate control; this area includes the vast majority of Jewish colonial settlements in the OPT. In this context Israeli state attorney has indicated that the territory between the Green Line—Israel’s border with the West Bank—and the wall will be declared a “closed

93The wall is not just a wall, the World Bank analysis notes. “Depending upon location, sections will comprise some (or all) of the following elements: four-meter [12-foot] deep trenches on either side; a dirt path ‘to which access will be forbidden’ where potential infiltrators would be exposed to IDF [Israeli Defense Force] fire; a trace path to register footprints; an electronic warning or ‘smart’ fence; a concrete barrier topped with barbed wire; a concrete wall rising as high as eight meters [24 feet]; a two-lane military patrol road; and fortified guard towers placed at regular intervals. See the report of the “Mission to the Humanitarian and Emergency Policy Group (HEPG) of the Local aid Corporation Committee (LACC). http://www.nad-plo.org/userfiles/file/Reports/wallreport.pdf.

military zone” (Roy 2004: 33). Therefore, the wall is designed to swallow the largest portion of the OPT lands while consolidating the segregation regimes (the dual systems of domination discussed above). It imposes prohibitive restrictions on the movement of Palestinians within the West Bank. Its route, continually modified by Israeli authorities, falls well within the boundaries of the West Bank and is designed to incorporate as many Israeli West Bank settlements as possible within Israel proper. Furthermore the Wall will effectively institutionalize the system of closure and restriction that has paralyzed the West Bank economically since late 2000 and fragmented it territorially since 1992. The wall in this sense serves a means to consolidate Jewish sovereignty on the majority of the OPT geography and simultaneously to undercut Palestinians’ sought of independence and self-determination by dissecting the OPT, territory and population into isolated enclaves. As such it is a tool of domination and hegemony that targets the Palestinian population as a whole with profound devastating effects. In essence the wall comes to close a cycle of simultaneous creeping grand apartheid that targets the territory and space on the one hand, and irreversibly atomizing the Palestinian Population into enclaves with no significant ties that preserve and galvanize their collective sense of belonging and collective aspiration for self-determination. Aruri (2003: 116) puts it eloquently

Now the Arab population lives in subordinated enclaves within a Jewish state. Oslo II provided Israel with the land without the people, thus meeting Labor’s requirement of ethnic purity and separation…and at the same time, accommodating Likud’s proclivity for penetration deep into Arab population centers. At last, Labor’s presumed ‘territorial settlement’ and Likud’s ‘functional settlement’ were reconciled.
Domination and duality

Israel’s refrain from formally annexing the OPT withstanding, the growing number of the Palestinian population in these territories and their determination to achieve Israeli withdrawal from their land remain a serious challenge to Israeli occupation and its policies. Land control and Judizing the space of the Palestinian life in such a sweeping manner discussed above, wouldn’t have been possible without the implementation of an equivalent system of domination that seeks to render the Palestinians into manageable fragmented masses segregated from the colonial society. Israel applied a multi-layered domination system that primarily aimed at sustaining distinctions between the Palestinians and the Israeli Jewish settlers in particular and Israeli society in general. Simultaneously this system was designed to control Palestinians as a fixed menace to Israeli Jewish original and driving imperatives discussed earlier.

This section examines Israel’s domination policies as derivatives of the primary overarching strategy of Judizing and colonizing the OPT and superimpose Jewish ethno-national identity on these territories. Thus methods of domination and control have been the result of the structural elements of Israel’s colonialism that were designed to “administer the lives of the people and normalize the colonization, while exploiting the territories resources (in this case land, water, and labor)” (Gordon 2008: xix).

Israeli polices in the OPT and their consequences can be assessed as a coherent system that works on two levels: (1) a macro level whereby Israel sought to sustain certain degrees of exclusion and control through land and resources control and economic
suppression. Alienating the Palestinian from the land and taking over their space is the most striking in this respect. Beyond ideological precepts and cultural underpinnings Isarel’s domination system is a tangible and timely phenomenon that is designed to redistribute wealth in order to draw as many Jews as possible to this area and to maintain a sustainable control of the Jewish population over a piece of land which is by nature bi-national” (Hever, 2010);

(2) a micro level in which Israel deployed the various strands of power to dominate the population as individuals and as a group through a set of military orders, administrative arrangements, legal procedures and means of oppression.

Alienation and exploitation: Israel’s colonial periphery

The pattern of Israel’s system of exclusion was sustained in the post 1967 phase of Israeli colonialism. Land control and exclusion would couple with the exploitation of the OPT (population and resources) to undermined Palestinians’ ability to form a coherent socio-political configuration that would challenge Israel’s occupation more successfully. Combined with the fragmentation of the Palestinians in Bantustrans, these policies are aimed at oppressing the expressions of Palestinian national identity and the prospects of Palestinian self-determination. Macro policies aimed at undercutting Palestinians’ ability of organized political action and mass mobilization.

-Land and Resources

Control of the land and alienating Palestinian from it not only reconstitute the spatial terrain of the land as a Jewish terrain but also it prevents the appearances of
Palestinian history and past that is tied to the land. Taking over the land in this sense fragments the Palestinian society and consequently prevents its ability to form a coherent and organized challenge to Israel. The attempt to cut the ties between the Palestinians and their land is an attempt to undermine and eliminate the rise of Palestinians as a people that has the right of self-determination on the land (Gordon 2008: 59). The principle and right of self-determination is linked to the integrity of the region on which a certain people has the right to practice this right. In this sense Israel’s land confiscation and expropriation represents a creeping annexation that “was intended to achieve the integration of the territories with Israeli terrain of hegemony but without people (Younis 2005: 145), and to deprive the Palestinians from the material geographic bedrock of their national identity and spatial connections.

Israel’s occupation of the OPT from the outset exhibited similar patterns of exclusion the Zionist movement had shown before the establishment of the state of Israel: the possession of more land and territory with a minimum, if any, non-Jewish population. After 1967 Israeli authorities launched a sweeping regime of land confiscation and expropriation using a set of mechanism: military orders, ‘legal’ procedures, bureaucratic regulations. The main tool remains declaring and recording land as “state land” that has been implemented since 1979. The procedure represents a policy that manipulates the Ottoman Land Law of 185894 by implementing those provisions of the law that allowed

---

94 The Ottoman Land Code of 21 April 1858 defined five classes of land ownership: milk (individually or privately owned), waqf (Islamic endowment), mīrī (public or state land), mattruk and mawāt (abandoned and uncultivated). For mīrī, mattruk and mawāt, the raqaba is vested in the hands of the state. Mīrī is cultivated or cultivable land acquired for the state through conquest or through forfeiture of milk due to a failure of heirs. An individual could gain rights over mīrī land by cultivating it and paying taxes; but the state continued to regulate its transfer and improvement. The tenant's rights to mīrī were forfeited by failure to
Israel to play the role of the sovereign (the Ottoman Sultan). Other means included military orders to size and control land for security needs, declaring land as abandoned, and expropriating land for public utilizes.

Thus By 1980 Palestinians in the OPT would lose 27 per cent of the WB land to Israeli authorities, most of which was reallocated for settlement construction. Using the Ottoman Law abovementioned between 1979 and 1993 Israel took over 913,000 dunams (16 percent of the West Bank) using this law (Bt’selem 2010). Settlers, with the acquiescence of the military authorities practiced de facto methods to take over lands adjacent to their colonies; during the first intifada settlers and Israeli military surrounded the settlements with rings of buffers that Palestinians were denied access. Those remained closed and annexed to the settlements. Using ‘legal’ methods of a kind was the hallmark of Israel’s land policy that turned most of the land to the exclusive benefit of the Jewish settlers, which not only violates the Geneva Fourth Convention of 1949 but also it is ultimately injustice as the duty of the occupying force is “not to ignore the needs of an entire population and to use land intended for public needs solely to benefit the settlers” (Bt’selem 2010). Among the different methods of land confiscation and expropriation Israeli governments resort to secretive measures such as resurrecting the “Absentee Law” of 1953” to take over land in the OPT (Cook 2005).

cultivate the land; such forfeited land is termed mahlül. In practice, neither the Ottomans nor the British ever repossessed mahlül. Mir included the largest portion of the landed property in Palestine. Mir land could be converted by order of the sultan into matrik mahmiyya (property for general public use such as lakes or roads) or into matrik murfaqa (property for use by a particular community such as market places and cemeteries). Mawāt is wasteland which an individual could (until 1858) turn into milk with the permission of the sultan and (until 1921) turn into mīrī by cultivating it for a given period of time and paying for it.
The regime of land takeover reinforced the dual system of domination and segregation that distinguishes between the Palestinian population and the Jewish Israeli settlers; Palestinians in the West Bank live in a series of roughly eight squalid, ringed ghettos and are governed by military courts. Jews living in the West Bank and East Jerusalem, like all full Israeli citizens, are subject to Israeli civilian law and constitutional protection. This differentiation tied to the land and territorial terrains that give segregation a rigid character. Moreover, changing the landscape of the OPT has been pervasive and intense as Chris Hedges (2010) observes the spatial outlook of the WB and East Jerusalem

…has altered dramatically since I first went to Jerusalem over two decades ago. Huge fortress-like apartment complexes ring East Jerusalem and dominate the hillsides in the West Bank. The settler population is now more than 462,000, with 271,400 living in the West Bank and East Jerusalem, and 191,000 living in and around Jerusalem. The settler population has grown at the rate of 4.6 percent per year since 1990 while the Israeli society taken as a whole has grown at 1.5 percent.

The pattern noticed in these lines goes for the rest of the West Bank that Israel has controlled 42 percent of its land until the year 2010; Bt`selem (estimation stands at 50 percent). Most of this land is controlled and/or allocated to the exclusive use of more than 200 Jewish settlements although the virtual area these settlements occupy is estimated at 1 percent of the WB. However, settlement local and regional councils have control over the 42 percent; (Stewart and Usbors 2010) most of which extend far beyond the built-up area and defined as "closed military zones" in the military orders. Palestinians are forbidden to enter these areas without authorization from the Israeli military commander.
Israeli citizens, Jews from throughout the world and tourists are all permitted to enter these areas without the need for special permits.

-Economic suppression-

Economic effects of Israel’s colonial policies are intertwined with land control and resources takeover. Israel’s policy of land takeover was reinforced by a lust for exploiting natural resources especially water. The process has dealt the Palestinian agricultural sector a serious destructive effect; the share of this sector in Palestinian GNP and employment has dropped dramatically as a result of land loss, Israeli competition, and lack of water resources that has been extracted for the benefit of settlers’ agricultural projects and their lifestyle. Settlement expansion on Palestinian land had already

---

95In 1967, 2,300 sq km of the West Bank and Gaza Strip were under Palestinian cultivation. In 1989 that figure had been reduced to 1,945 sq km, or 31.5 percent of the West Bank and Gaza Strip. Agriculture comprised 24 percent of Gross Domestic Product in 1966, the same percentage as in the 1980-85 (pre-intifada period). By 1994, the percentage had decreased to less than 15 percent. In 1966, the agricultural sector provided employment for 55,000 Palestinians, or 43 percent of total employment, whereas in the 1980-85 there were 40,000 people employed in the agricultural sector, comprising 24 percent of employed Palestinians. In 1993, the percentage of employed persons working in agriculture was 22 percent. These gross indicators do not lead to specific conclusions regarding the effect of settlements on agricultural employment or production or land under cultivation, because settlements are only one of a number of variables that must be considered when assessing these trends such as the competition with a much more advanced Israeli agricultural sector, Israeli restriction on export of Palestinian products…etc. There exists no systematic research on the direct effects of settlement on the decline of the Palestinian agricultural sector. However, there are specific regions, such as the Jordan Valley, where a direct link can be established between the loss of Palestinians’ agricultural opportunities and Israeli settlements. The confiscation of agricultural lands and their transfer to settlements result in the loss of agricultural income and employment, although this has never been quantified beyond anecdotal reporting. Contamination by sewage also directly affects Palestinian agriculture in the region around Kiryat Arba and elsewhere. There are also unquantified economic and environmental costs associated with Israeli-owned industries in the occupied territories, such as a recycling plant for used motor oil, stone quarries, and other plants where harmful and toxic by-products are produced. The effect of settlement construction is more direct on the Palestinian loss of water resources, which directly affected the development of agriculture and other vital aspects of life. Access to water, rather than a scarcity of land, remains the greatest obstacle to Palestinian agricultural development. For Israel, water has been a vital precondition for achieving its fundamental challenges—the creation of a vibrant economy to sustain an increasing Jewish community. According to a 1992 report for the American Academy of Arts and Sciences by Miriam Lowi, “almost the entire increase in Israeli water use since 1967 derives from the waters of the West Bank and the Upper Jordan River.” Not only Israel is exploiting water for its own population in Israel and the occupied territories, amounting to 15
reduced the cultivated area in the Palestinian territory from 36 per cent of total land area in the West Bank in 1966 to 27 per cent in 1984 and from 55 percent in 1966 to 28 per cent in 1985 in the Gaza Strip (Khalidi and Taghdisi-Rad 2009: 4). The decline of this sector was primarily the result of Israel’s official policy that would provide for “no development initiated by the Israeli Government, and no permits will be given for expanding agriculture or industry, which may compete with the State of Israel” (Khalidi and Taghdisi-Rad 2009: 4). Depriving the Palestinian economy of the main two resources (land and water) is the primary factor that explains its underdevelopment. As the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (2009) noticed, Israeli policies in the OPT since 1967 have evolved from aiming to integrate Palestinian economic resources (especially land, water and labour) into Israel’s “mainland” economy, to acting to marginalize and isolate the economy and markets of the Occupied Palestinian Territory” (Khalidi and Taghdisi-Rad 2009: 1). On the other end of the equation, Israel’s occupation provides for

percent of total consumption, it has also prevented the Palestinian community from increasing its water use to barely 20 percent beyond the amount used in 1967—and only for personal use, not for agriculture and economic development. Since the beginning of bilateral and multilateral negotiations earlier this decade at Madrid, Israel has sought to protect its continuing control over this resource in the West Bank, which was described by Israel’s state comptroller in February 1993 as the “principle reservoir of drinking water for the Dan region, Tel Aviv, Jerusalem, and Beersheba, “and the “most important long-term source in the [national] water system.” The water requirements of Israel’s settlements are a small segment of this larger mosaic of Israeli exploitation of the water resources in the occupied territories. At a time when settlers were barely 10 percent of the population in the West Bank (1987), Palestinian consumption totaled 115 million cubic meters while settler consumption equaled 97 mcm. A 1993 report by Peace Now noted that “the Jewish settlers’ per capita irrigated areas are seven and thirteen times larger than the areas accorded to Palestinians for irrigation in the Gaza Strip and West Bank respectively.” A November 1992 report by the Jerusalem Media and Communication Center (JMCC), “Israeli Obstacles to Economic Development in the Occupied Palestinian Territories,” notes that lack of water has forced Palestinian farmers to remove tracts from cultivation and that the digging of new, deep wells for settlements, particularly in the Jordan Valley, has caused subsequent shortages for Palestinian farmers. http://mondediplo.com/focus/mideast/question-3-2-2
immense benefits to be derived from rule over more than one million Palestinians: Israeli producers prospered from the conveniently located and captive market; employers profited from the pool of cheap, unorganized labor; and the resulting expansion of industry and services permitted Israeli workers to advance into better and higher paying jobs, abandoning those least desired to Palestinian workers from the newly acquired territories (Younis 2000: 145).

The new emerging conditions after 1967 led to a partial economic inclusion of the Palestinian working class into Israeli market as migrant labor on a daily basis from their homes in the OPT to their jobs. Opening the Israeli market to the Palestinians from the occupied territories contributed significantly to decrease in unemployment rates among the population and resulted in a boost of standards of living thus obfuscating the economic damage Israeli policies created. It also was aimed at silencing the national sentiments of the Palestinians and preventing a popular upheaval against occupation (Gordon 2008: 88). Israel’s initial strategy towards the Palestinian population was aimed at co-optation and containment rather than seeking to subjugate them violently. At that stage, consent was more important than coercion. Nonetheless, Israel prevented the development of a viable independent Palestinian economy, ensuring the occupied population was heavily dependent upon Israeli imports, Israeli financial institutions and employment by Israeli companies” (Snowdon 2010).

The structural contradiction between employment and its ‘positive’ consequences on the one hand and the systematic destruction of the Palestinian economy kindled Palestinian willingness to resist the occupation as the consequences of its policies became more entrenched. Israel’s destruction of the Palestinian economy had left a diverse strata of the population deprived of sources of living. Landless refugees in camps, small holding peasants in the countryside who lost their land and/or couldn’t afford the competition with the Israeli products, artisans, and small traders, turned into laborers in
the Israeli market by the mid of 1970s: in 1970, 49.3 percent of the WB and 60.0 percent of the GS workforce were employed for wages. This percentage increased to 57.3 percent and 67.6 percent, respectively in 1982. Those workers would have to apply for and get a work permit from local bureaus in the main cities in the OPT. Working permits was a means to prohibit workers from work any time Israeli authorities or employers saw in their interests. More important within this profound socio-economic change is that the majority of this new workforce would be employed inside Israel; by 1982 51.1 percent of the WB and 63.9 percent of the GS labor were working in the Israeli market. This pattern continued until the eve of the Oslo peace process and the late years of the intifada of 1987. By then

some 115,000 Palestinians worked in Israel, and unemployment in the Occupied Territories had declined to under five percent. These workers, who comprised one-third of the workforce in the Occupied Territories, supported hundreds of thousands of dependants” (Bt`selem-workers 2010).

Israel’s policy of open borders between the OPT and Israel allowed the Israeli economy from reaping the benefits of the occupation: Israeli producers are now making profits from a captive market with low production capacity and a destroyed agricultural sector; employers in the Israeli market were provided with cheap and poorly organized labor from the territories; and Israeli Jewish workers were advanced into better and higher-paying jobs. Palestinian workers were absorbed in sectors and jobs at the low level of production (construction, sanitation, farming…etc). Introducing exploitation anulled the Zionist credo of “Hebrew labor only” in favor of a more far-reaching objective namely, the containment and suppression of Palestinian viability as a people. Thus until late 1980s the result of this “deliberate “integrationism” was increased vulnerability of
the Palestinian economy to Israeli economic and political trends. For example, the 1986 recession in the Israeli economy, combined with the Government’s austerity program which aimed to increase wage and price controls inside Israel, had direct and dire consequences for the Palestinian labor market, social expenditure, and living conditions: This was particularly the case given the lack of domestic Palestinian institutions that could regulate the effect of these external factors” (Khalidi and Taghdisi-Rad 2009: 4).

Mechanisms of controlling the Palestinian economy after 1967 were diverse: Israel imposed a custom union on the OPT with limited movement of the Palestinian labor across the green line, and Israeli investors were allowed to invest in these territories mainly in settlement construction and the establishment of industrial zones and agricultural projects. Moreover, Israel imposed its own currency (the shekel) alongside the Jordanian Dinar and the US Dollar (Zagha and Zalmut 2004: 121-2). Palestinian economy was forced to integrate into the Israeli larger and much more advanced economy in which the exploitation and oppression of Palestinian labor was paramount.

In addition to the discriminatory methods applied on the Palestinian workers in Israel96 and economic repercussions of this process on the Palestinian economy, Palestinian middle class was crushed under the pressure of economic changes and the Palestinian society was homogenized and confined within their residential areas. Most of

96 Palestinian workers were channeled to lower levels of Israel economy, mostly to jobs that Jewish workers would not take. They were prohibited to form their independent unions and not allowed to join the Israeli union (the Histadrut), and Palestinian unions in the OPT were denied representing those workers. Moreover, they received in average half the wage a Jewish worker has gained for the same job, and were denied a wide range of social, health, and retirement benefits although their wages were subject to deductions (20 per cent of the paycheck) that goes to such benefits. In addition, Palestinian workers have been subject to different types of exploitation and abuse; “Not infrequently, Palestinian workers entering Israel also fall victim to exploitation by their employers and to abusive and cruel treatment by Israeli police officers and soldiers. http://www.btselem.org/workers.
them earned their living as daily immigrant workers (Younis 2005: 150). In effect this transformation created Palestinian reserves of labor and delayed the emergence of a national middle-class leadership of the nascent Palestinian national movement in the OPT and rendered the Palestinian working class politically crippled as a result of its fragmentation and the conditions of as day-to-day controlled immigrant labor. These conditions “inflicted huge costs on the Palestinian economy, it also increased its political dependence closures were increasingly used as a political weapon” (Zagha and Zalmut 2004: 120).

On another level, this process homogenized the Palestinian society within their reserves and henceforth facilitated the rise of national integration that galvanized national sentiments and opened venues for mass mobilization against the occupation, which contributed to the eruption of the first intifada. The 1980s were the worse for Palestinian economy when the euphoria of high income began to regress due to a combination of factors: Falling oil prices led to falling demand for Palestinian migrant workers in the Gulf States; the economic crisis in Israel, as we indicated above, led to problems for Palestinian workers in Israel as their income had fallen combined with the tightening of work opportunities for Palestinians, accompanied by discrimination and abuse. The growth of Jewish settlements inside the Occupied Territories involved the theft of Palestinian land, damaging the local economy. And Israeli policy became more belligerent, shifting away from seeking consent and accommodation. All these factors influenced the emergence of the first intifada, the militant rebellion by Palestinians against oppression, which started in 1987 (See Hever, 2010). Not less importantly the
intifada was a turning point in the sense that the profits Israel’s occupation generated from exploiting Palestinian land, labor, and resources and outweighed the security expenditures Israel accrued have turned into a costly endeavor. Israel’s approach to the population in the OPT would change profoundly into more exclusion and confinement, which exacerbated rates of poverty and unemployment. Now Israel would opt to closure, permit regime, and high levels of harsh measures and brutality against a population she sought its containment and cultivated its co-optation. Therefore Israel’s participation in the peace process and the acceptance to establish a Palestinian Autonomy in one level was to get read of the burden of the population while sustaining the core of the Israeli colonialism: land and resources. The rise of Palestinian nationalism and the perceived demographic threat (Zagha and Zalmut, 2004 p128) can be seen as vital elements in Israel’s willingness to sign the Oslo Accords in 1993. This would be clear by Israel’s change of attitude to the Palestinian labor and the restrictions it imposed on their mobility and the high rates of oppression and brutality against the population.

Thus the organization of economic relationships with the nascent Palestinian Authority (PA) was a priority for Israel. The Paris Economic Protocol (PEP) signed between the PA and Israel came to replace Israel’s integration of the Palestinian economy by mechanisms of control that turned it into a subordinate zone to Israeli economy. Under the terms of the PEP the OPT has become part of the “Israeli-Palestine zone” which enabled the Central bank of Israel to “effectively oversee the monetary union between Israel and Palestine, which is administered by the Bank of Israel alongside a virtually toothless Palestinian Monetary Authority” (Daud 2011). and henceforth facilitated
Israel’s occupation of the OPT. PEP provisions allowed Israel to monopolies fiscal and monetary policies of the PA; the Israeli central bank determines all monetary policy for both Palestine and Israel and the protocols provide no say for Palestinians in Israeli central bank decisions. So for example if Israel wants to increase short term interest rates it can do so without regard to the economic situation of the Palestinians. Moreover, the agreement allowed Israel, as the party controlling the borders of Palestine, to collect and transfer PNA taxes and custom duties imposed on Palestinian imports from or via Israel. These arrangements rendered the PA “fatally dependent on Israel rebates of customs and income taxes…Israel would interpret ‘imports’ into Palestine in a restrictive way” (Zagha and Zalmut, 2004: 124) that stripped the PA from important sources of revenue on imports to the OPT. This asymmetry notwithstanding, the Protocol recognized that Palestinian would continue to seek employment in Israel and no guarantees provided for free access. Actually the PEP gave Israel the right to solely determine the conditions for labor movement from the OPT into the Israeli market. Needless to say that any economic union of this type includes labor mobility, this provision of the agreement denied the Palestinian economy a vital source of revenue. It also provided Israel with a source of political leverage with a crucial magnitude. Palestinian workers’ accessibility to the Israeli market was paramount for the functioning of the Palestinian economy. Israeli authorities, in disregard of the PFP, imposed restrictions on the movement of specific agricultural products exported by the OPT.

Thus the PEP was utilized by Israel as a means of political subordination and oppression against the PA and the Palestinian population in the OPT; in addition on the
restrictions on labor movement, Israel opted to frequently delay and then often freeze the transfer of tax revenues collected for the Palestinians by Israel, which inflicted huge costs on the PA and sinuously undercut its ability to fulfill its duties in paying salaries for its public sector and in providing appropriate public services. Israel’s goal is primarily to show that the PA survival and political relevancy is in the hands of Israel. Israel has effectively undermined the emergence and development of the Palestinian economy. Israeli closures, its military order imposed on the OPT, and the most recent control of PA economic structures including Israel’s boycott of Palestinian labor have turned [the Palestinians] into simply an imprisoned population with almost no capacity for economic activity…a situation that is worse for Palestinians than Apartheid was for black South Africans” (Daud 2011).

Indeed, Israeli policies in the OPT were primarily aimed at confining the Palestinian population and undercutting its capabilities in order to render it amenable to Israel’s colonial expansionism. The development of Israel’s domination in the land, resources and economic arenas reveals that Israel primarily aimed at preserving and sustaining its occupation of the OPT. As Khalidi and Tghadisi-Rad (2009) put it

there is no Israeli economic policy towards the Palestinian people or the occupied territory; rather there is a policy to maintain occupation and administration of the Palestinian territory by whatever means available, including economic strategies.

-The invisible apartheid

Israel’s strategy towards the Palestinian population in the OPT has been dynamic and subject to the level of domination Israel accomplished in terms of Land control and settlement colonial expansion on the one hand and its ability to suppress and oppress
Palestinian nationalism in the territories on the other. The more success Israel achieved in its colonial territorial expansionism, and the more the Palestinians showed nationalist identification, the more it increased levels of exclusion, oppression and confinement. Whereas in the pre-1967 borders Israeli was relatively restrained by its own basic law and couldn’t implement total exclusion against its Palestinian citizens, this was not the case in the OPT. In 1948 exclusion and domination was achieved initially by the expulsion of almost two-thirds of the Palestinians which left a small minority that Israel would be able to manage. The OPT has a Palestinian majority and more importantly the social and political forces in these territories remained intact to a large extent in spite of the exodus that accompanied the 1967 war. Israeli’s strategy of exclusion within was designed to render the Palestinian population marginal and irrelevant (physically, politically and economically), if not to turn it into a minority on the long run. Israel took advantage of the loose legal framework in the OPT (a range of laws was in place, Ottoman, British, and Jordanian) and the effects of Jordanian and Egyptian control of the West Bank and Gaza Strip, respectively to maintain an obscure relationship between the occupied territories and the occupier. This strategy allowed Israel to implement a set of measures and procedures that would turn the OPT into zones of control; an open space for colonization with minimum costs and liabilities. The primary principle that informed Israeli policies in the OPT is that the Fourth Geneva Convention is not applicable to the 1967 territories and henceforth they are not occupied. Rather they are disputed lands. Thus Israel recognizes the applicability of humanitarian provision of the Convention apart from the right of the Palestinians of self-determination, and denies this applicability on the land (Grodon 2008: 26). In this sense Israel’s strategy of separating the people
from the land is the overarching principle that informed its strategies in the OP. Focusing on a set of laws and ‘legal’ measures, Israel presented its control over the people in terms of order and law in an attempt to give it a sense of normalcy and legitimacy to its policies and to conceal its colonial nature behind institutionalized and stratified lawful practices.

-Co-optation and normalization

Israeli strategy of total exclusion remained a leading tenet in the post 1967 territories. However, a significant change was introduced to mitigate exclusion of a majority of Palestinians in the OPT. In 1970s Israel opted to the co-optation of certain segments of the Palestinian society, particularly the traditional elites. Co-optation, however was coupled with coercion and oppression of militant forces and organized political activities, and aimed at creating intermediaries between Israeli authorities and the population not at political accommodation. In this period the ‘stick and carrot’ was instrumental in implementing a minimum direct intervention in administering the public sphere. However, controlling the population would take a dynamic nature beyond ‘stick and carrot’ in conformity to the rise of the Palestinian national movement and the needs of Israel’s apparatuses to update its institutional infrastructure of domination and control (Gordon 2008: 46, and Younis 2005).

Israel strategy at this stage was aimed at normalizing the occupation by adopting a control system that avoids intervention on a state scale. The policy was to encourage the population to carry on their life as usual and to make the occupation invisible (Gazit 2006). The locus of domination methods resided in the military commanders of the region who became the legislator and the executive atop of two military governments,
one in the WB and the other in the GZ and both were subject to Israeli government policies. Co-optation was provided by preserving and sustaining particular administrative institutions that prevailed in the OPT before 1967. Municipal councils, mayors and other functionary posts were reinforced and reactivated along with the preservation of Jordanian laws and currency. Setting local administrations in position was instrumental to avoid Israel’s direct involvement with administration of daily life. In the GS Israel kept the British mandate laws and regulations in effect. In both cases Israeli authorities appointed ‘moderate’ members of notable families in civilian posts; a policy that reproduced the traditional leadership for the role of intermediaries between the occupation authorities and the population in order to maintain calm and tranquility (Younis 2005: 113-4). In order to reinforce the policy Israeli government held municipal election in the WB in 1972 that resulted in the prevalence of Jordanian-affiliated traditional elites. Meanwhile Israeli policy in the GS differed significantly in terms of its military coercion stance. This may be referred to the armed resistance that Israeli faced in the Strip. The presence of the Palestinian Liberation Army (an army that was formed by Arab states following the establishment of the PLO in 1964) and significant numbers of armed residents enabled the Palestinians to wage more effective armed resistance from within the community. Israel responded with a massive offense during which it bulldozed avenues through residential areas especially refugee camps to quell the resistance.

However, Israeli policies of land confiscation, settlement expansion, and turning the economy into an open zone for Israeli exploitation have undermined the traditional elites Israel relied on to deliver tranquility and social order. The destruction of the
Palestinian economic viability undermined local bourgeoisies’ socio-economic status (Younis 2005:146) and increased public disillusionment with their role. Nationalist elements of the middle class especially from rural areas and refugee camps with an anti-imperialist and anti-occupation discourse rose as the alternative to the traditional elites (Robinson 1997). This development was faced with Israeli intolerance; no differences applied whether in the WB or GS.

Nonetheless, levels of oppression and coercion remained relatively low. However, Israeli policies in the OPT, particularly the ultimate use of military orders that codified Israel’s control in a wide range of areas (including imposing restrictions on movement, curfews, and the use of public parks, currency exchange rates, postal laws, and the transportation of agricultural products) (Gordon 2008: 27) led to a wave of protest among the Palestinians especially in the city of Jerusalem as Israel annexed the occupied Eastern part of the city, which ignited protest and militancy among the Palestinians. In 1972 many religious figures and social prominent leaders and associations in Jerusalem called for civil disobedience in protesting Israeli measures. Israeli authorities’ prompt reaction of deporting 514 leaders indicated its firm intentions to crush any signs of resistance. Israeli authorities issued military orders to eliminate political activism and all sorts of protest; they categorize all forms of resistance as insurgency97. Israel’s assault on the rise of protest did not carry the Palestinians to watch passively even after the deportation; they renewed the attempt to form an internal leadership by forming the

97 All manifestations of political activities or/and national sentiments were subject to banishment. This includes political meetings, raising Palestinian flags or any other national symbols, publishing or distributing any material with political or national content, singing or listening to national songs, and acquiring publications (including books) on other national movements or revolutions in the world.
“Palestinian National Front” (PNF) in 1973. The PNF represented the first politically organized leadership that was not only endorsed by the PLO but as well had popular legitimacy for it encompassed a wide range of political and social forces and for its organizational abilities. The PNF presented itself as a political arm of the PLO and declared its objective as the establishment of a Palestinian state through diplomatic means (Younis 2000: 115) and it managed to lead mass demonstrations and protest in 1974-5 before it was outlawed by Israeli authorities.

Municipal election of 1976 and the ‘Land Day’ the same year represented a watershed in the shift of the structure within which the relationship between Israeli occupation authorities and the Palestinians in the OPT. Adherents of the PLO had won the election of most of municipal councils while the Land Day signaled the vibrancy of national sentiments within the OPT and inside Israel alike as Palestinians took to the streets to protest Israel’s land confiscation policy. These events dealt a serious blow to Israel’s strategy of containment and normalization of military occupation and domination. Palestinians have shown a high degree national identification that had proven to be persistent and to override other identifications. Israel’s non-interventionist strategy and its efforts to atomize and neutralize the population failed and the national movement was able to mobilize and pose a challenge to Israel’s occupation.

98 Until today Palestinians in the OPT and their brethren in Israel commemorate the ‘Land Day’ on March 30th. In 1976 Israeli authorities announced its intention to confiscate thousands of dunams Palestinian land in the Northern Triangle. Palestinians responded with mass marches in the Galilee to the Negev. Palestinians in the OPT joined the protest in masses especially after Israeli security forces shot dead six Palestinians citizens of Israel and wounded hundreds.
‘Land day’ alarmed Israeli authorities on the degree of Palestinian vigilance and willingness to challenge its domination and the 1976 turned to be a millstone in the relationship between the occupied and the occupier. The two adversaries would change their behavior profoundly in ways that lined the majority of the Palestinians in the face of an increasingly overt domination and coercion regime of foreign rule. Israel’s strategy would implement a dual system of coercion and confinement on the one hand and cultivating alternatives to the PLO in the OPT on the other. Israel established the Civil Administration in 1981 particularly to increase intervention in Palestinians lives on the level of the state and the government of Israel alongside other apparatuses that were already established. The Civil Administration marked Israel’s introduction of its sovereign power to control the population.

With the Likud Party now in power population was reduced into masses that pose an obstacle to the achievement of the Greater Israel. The Likud opted to a dual strategy: applying a heavy hand against PLO supporters, and attempting to cultivate local rural surrogates to compete the influence of the PLO among the masses. The Likud realized that turning the population into a politically potent mass is the precondition for the success of its strategy. Thus, while Israel implemented an “iron fist” against pro-PLO leaders in the cities, refugee camps and towns (arrests, hose demolishing, and deportations were ubiquitous) it cultivated an alternative local leadership in the countryside; the ‘Village League’. The latter policy was espoused to impair the linkages between urban political-active Palestinians and rural residents who started to show strong signs of
mobilization. This attempt was reinforced in the aftermath of the peace treaty between Israel and Egypt in 1978; the treaty incorporated the establishment of a Palestinian autonomy within the OPT; which the Israeli authorities perceived as an opportunity to undermine the PLO by establishing rural representative bodies and local self-rule regions. The Civil Administration was established primarily to carry on the Likud plan of founding Palestinian autonomous enclaves. In this respect Israel encouraged Palestinians to identify with different local entities (religious, family, clan, and region) and Arab identification other than the nationalist which would facilitate their control. The Likud sought the total separation of the Palestinian from their lands and their utter division in segregated areas. Thus forms of sovereign power were introduced in this period in addition to the deployed forms of disciplinary and bio-power that meant to control the population as individuals and as groups. Sovereign power was deployed through the Civil Administration that had repealed whatever authority Israel allowed municipal councils, local/village councils, and Chambers of Commerce to practice. Israel also banned fund transfers to the OPT from the Arab countries as means to undermine the leadership (Gordon 2005:109). Thus by mid 1980s most city municipals councils were run by Israel military officers and Israeli military started to impose collective punishment measures such as curfews, blocking towns and villages, and more extensive house demolishing and massive arrests especially in the 1982-3. These measures withstanding Israel’s control strategies remained in place.

Although the phase of overt control during 1977-1987 and the high levels of oppression and colonization of the Likud differed from the previous phase by the
introduction if the Civil Administration and the departure from Labor’s ‘invisible occupation’ it sustained and maintained the main features and methods of control over the population. Both phases implemented the strategy of monitoring, controlling, and the surveillance of Palestinians that had been pervasive and penetrated every aspect of Palestinians’ lives. The General Security Services (GSS, known as the Shabak) played the major role in shaping the daily lives of the Palestinians in the OPT; the Shabak

influence decisions about if, when, and where to impose curfews, who to arrest, who to deport, and which houses would be demolished. It was involved in hiring and firing of principals and teachers as well as doctors and clerks, and decided when to open or shut down schools, universities and charitable organizations” (Gordon 2008: 31).

Another major element of control was adopted by the military institution; the permit regime. The regime was introduced in the 1967 and consists of a range of military orders, licensing (for vehicles and drivers), registration of business, building homes. The permit regime also included other daily activities such as changing address, traveling abroad, and for growing certain kinds of fruits and vegetables. To gain a permit of any kind was a long process of paper work, paying fees, and interviewing the Shabak. In effect the permit regime turned all activities of life in the OPT into a means to generate discipline as a privilege that the military commander may revoke under the pretext of enforcing the law.

In 1968 Israel began issuing Identity Cards for the Palestinians at the age of 16. The Card must be carried all the times to enable the military to track the movement of the people all the time. This regime has been functional in isolating areas in the OPT from each other by declaring a particular area a military closed zone; those who are not
registered in the area have to issue a permit to enter or exit it. The Jordan valley region has been under such a procedure for more than a decade. Moreover, Israel issued car registry plates that differ in color from those registered in Israel (blue for the OPT and yellow for Israel), and those in the OPT held the first litter of the city or region they registered at. The identity-card regime and car registry functioned as a repressive tool for the prevention of movement, imprisonment, and collective punishment of individuals and groups who belong to particular region or city or refugee camp that carries resistance activities.

These regimes and institutional measures, legal and procedural as they were presented have controlled the spatial sphere of the Palestinian social, economic, cultural, educational and political lives. Palestinians, in the name of the law were deprived of all rights of movement, free enterprise, expression, organization, work, and access to resources. Furthermore, the system of control atomized and segregated the Palestinian society in the OPT by means of differentiation; identity and permit regimes. The atomization of the population and suppressing Palestinian national sentiments included Israeli authorities’ control of the Palestinian educational system through monitoring curriculums prohibited teaching and learning texts about Palestinian national identity. The only identity affiliation Israel allowed is the identification with an Arab.

In 1987 Israel’s assumptions on the dismemberment of the Palestinians and fragmenting them that would lead to the decline of their national identification were blown away as the intifada (shaking off) burst in the West Bank, Gaza Strip and East
Jerusalem. The intifada also had ignited the Palestinians inside Israel who took to the streets in solidarity with their kin and kith in the OPT. The intifada was characterized with the high level of popular participation and the democratic means by which it was organized; it showed the mobilizing capacity of the national movement and its ability to turn the OPT into an ungovernable zone for the Israeli occupation authorities\textsuperscript{99}. As such it was the first serious and well organized challenge of Israel’s occupation since 1967. Under the leadership of Minister of Defense Yitzhak Rabin, Israel tried to smash the intifada with "force, power and blows." Army commanders instructed troops to break the bones of demonstrators. From 1987 to 1991 Israeli forces killed over 1,000 Palestinians, including over 200 under the age of sixteen while 16 Israeli civilians and 11 soldiers were killed by Palestinians. By 1990, most of the UNLU leaders had been arrested or deported (a total of 418 Palestinians were deported until 1992 including the 415 Hamas affiliated persons) and the intifada lost its cohesive force, although it continued for several more years.

The main two effects of the intifada were first that it shattered the status quo that Israel had established in the OPT. The normalization strategy and the divide and rule

\textsuperscript{99} A full account of the causes and natures of the first intifada of 1987 is beyond the main focus of this research. Among detailed scholarly accomplished studies Robinson Glenn E. (1997) Building a Palestinian State: The Incomplete Revolution is a leading effort. Also Ze'ev Schiff and Ehud Ya’ari’s (1990) The Intifada offers a useful insight from closely affiliated Israeli journalists. The intifada involved hundreds of thousands of people from all ages and social affiliations. For the first few years, it involved many forms of civil disobedience, including massive demonstrations, general strikes, refusal to pay taxes, boycotts of Israeli products, political graffiti and the establishment of underground schools (since regular schools were closed by the military as reprisals for the uprising). It also included stone throwing, Molotov cocktails and the erection of barricades to impede the movement of Israeli military forces. More importantly, the organization of the uprising reflected democratic elements; the National Unified Leadership of the intifada was a broad coalition of political organizations and national figures, and local and regional leadership Popular Committees were established in every corner to give the intifada its popular and participatory character.
policy failed to turn the OPT into an impotent political zone. As we mentioned earlier, the intifada redrew the political geography of the conflict to refocus it on the 1967 borders. Second, it shifted the center of gravity of the Palestinian national movement and the locus of Palestinian political activity from the exiled leadership of PLO to the OPT; the intifada had challenged Israel with a strong movement that exists at its doorsteps. Therefore Israel responded by deploying a large scale and full assault that was characterized with collective punishment and the ultimate use of coercion and sovereign power of the state: ordinary civilians found themselves without freedom to pursue even the most routine daily activities. Curfews were ordered for weeks and thousands of Palestinians were arrested. Schools and universities were closed by the military commander of Israel’s troops in and education effectively became illegal and teachers and students had to resort to “underground” (or popular schools) classes. Homes were demolished without warning, olive trees and agricultural crops were destroyed, vital water supplies were redirected to Israel and then water usage restricted so severely, people had to queue with containers for hours to buy back their own water. Under these circumstances calls for tightening these measures to force the Palestinians to flee the OPT arose inside Israel; Israeli Former Military Intelligence Chief General Shlomo Gazit (1988: 7) said that these measures were intended so that Palestinians would “face unemployment and a shortage of land and water and thus we can create the necessary conditions for the departure of the Palestinians from the West Bank and Gaza.”

100 During the first year of the uprising 1,600 curfews were imposed, so that by the late 1988 more than 60 percent of the population had been confined to their homes for extended periods of time. I the GS the military imposed permanent night curfew from May 1988 to May 1994 (Gordon 2008: 160).
The uprising marked peoples’ ability to take the initiative; it empowered the masses who turned many areas in the OPT into claimed ungovernable zones, and articulated their own civil services to their communities. The sense of empowerment changed the relationship between the subordinate people and their oppressor in an irreversible manner; as Ze’ev Schiff and Ehud Ya’ari (1990) notice in their book The Intifada, “This was a sharp psychological turnabout for a public that had discovered what it could do — and how to exploit the enemy’s weaknesses”. Beyond this positional achievement, the intifada marked the failure of Israel’s strategy of fragmentation and its efforts to turn the OPT into an economically integrated and subjugated area to the Israeli economy. It also dealt a serious blow to the normalizing policy that allowed high degrees of interaction across the green line, all of which came into a sudden halt. In terms of its responses to the intifada, in addition to oppression and collective punishment abovementioned, Israel resorted to three major strategic moves: First it increased and tightened the permit regime to encompass more categories of the population and to widen the criteria of differentiation among the Palestinians. Working in Israel turned into a distinguished privilege instead of a right. The new entry-permit (to Israel) was stratified to create divisions and to deter individuals from taking part in the intifada or even have any connections with activists and/or political organizations. (Gordon 2008: 160-2). Second, starting 1990-1991 Israel introduced the regime of closure that targeted the whole population of the OPT. The new regime sealed off the borders between Israel and the territories for long periods of time in one-way direction: from the OPT into Israel. Closure has become the norm in Israeli practices in the OPT and marked the initial phase of the complete segregation that would follow in the 1990s and in particular after the
Palestinian second intifada of 2000. Third, within the closure regime and increased restriction on movement and other draconian military measures Israel launched a massive settlement expansion (as abovementioned) and started building by-pass roads (Jewish settlers’ only) and constructing permanent and semi-permanent military checkpoints to consolidate the lines of segregation between the OPT and Israel on the one hand, and the Palestinian population and settlement areas inside the territories on the other. Ultimately, these policies led to the construction of the ‘separation wall’ and the confinement of the Palestinians in segregated enclaves.

Conclusion

These strategies withstanding, Israel’s domination and control in the OPT is in indistinguishable from the apartheid of South Africa. Military occupation implies a temporary or interim phase following a military conflict or war to maintain order and security until a peace agreement being held. The main difference between Israel’s occupation and South Africa under apartheid is that the latter had been designed and implemented as a formal system of racial subordination and discrimination whereas Israel’s occupation is originally a temporary situation. However, the practices and policies of Israel’s occupation show its planned perpetuation in the manner of a colonizing power, under the guise of occupation. It has permanently seized the territories’ most desirable parts — the holy sites in East Jerusalem, Hebron and Bethlehem and the fertile agricultural lands along the western border and in the Jordan Valley — and settled its own Jewish "colonists" throughout the land” (Dugard: 2006).
Israel’s colonization of the OPT through settlement construction and its takeover of the territory and separating the Palestinians from their land and controlling their spatial terrain are typical to colonialism. However, Israel’s policies in regard to the people living in the OPT have striking characteristics of apartheid in terms of its fragmenting and segregationist effects. “The West Bank has been fragmented into three areas — north (Jenin and Nablus), center (Ramallah) and south (Hebron) — which increasingly resemble the Bantustans of South Africa” (Dugard: 2006). In international law, apartheid is a general category of state practices and it is prohibited wherever it occurs. The 1973 International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid defines the word as acts “designed to divide the population…by the creation of separate reserves and ghettos for the members of racial groups, the prohibition of mixed marriages…[or] the expropriation of landed property” (Peteet 2011). South African apartheid “pass system” and the so called ‘influx control’ are a strand of the more ubiquitous and pervasive Israeli restrictions on freedom of movement imposed by a rigid permit system and other control measures we referred to above. Indeed many aspects of Israel's occupation surpass those of the apartheid regime. Israel's large-scale destruction of Palestinian homes, leveling of agricultural lands, military incursions and targeted assassinations of Palestinians far exceed any similar practices in apartheid South Africa. No wall was ever built to separate blacks and whites (Peteet 2011).

As noncontiguous as this entity will be, it wouldn’t be able to sustain any integrated strategy toward services, economic development, labor mobility, and most crucially Palestinians could not gain access to water sources already under Israeli control. Furthermore, the incoherency of the Palestinian autonomous enclaves will lead to the
erosion of Palestinian national coherency. Separated by Israeli settlement blocks, Jewish-only bypass roads, Israeli military checkpoints, and the separation Wall the Palestinians in the OPT will not be able to establish a viable social, economic, cultural, and political ties. The PA, already crippled by Israeli measures can manifest only very limited administrative capacities, which renders its polity and constituency split and factionalized. All of which are essential to nation and state building.

This state of affairs can hardly be sustained taking into account that Palestinian demographic growth in the OPT and their growing sense of alienations and strangulation. The enclaves’ population enduring poverty, mobility constraints, erosion of land available for residential and agricultural expansion, the narrowness of social spheres of interaction, all will result in a deep sense of disaffection and lead to the rise of resistance and violence.
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Chapter IX

The Palestinian national movement and the politics of liberation

Introduction

This chapter examines the emergence, characteristics, and development of the Palestinian national movement. It shows how the very nature of Zionist and Israel’s national-territorial nexus and their domination structures affected and shaped the main features of Palestinian struggle for liberation and then for independence and national self-determination.

The sections that follow discuss the consequences of international intervention in this conflict and the ways in which external forces, through the founding and legitimation of religious ethno-nationalism as the founding principle of political practices, contributed to the protractability of the conflict. Ultimately the lack of international convergence over the question of differentiation and exclusion of Israel domination created ‘Israeli exceptionalism’ from the norms and principles of universal democracy. The prime goal of these analyses is to show how territorial/spatial legitimating regimes and the fragmentation of forces confronting them result in a less likely processes of integration and the emergence of unitary entities based of secular democratic-civic norms and principles of governance.
The main argument here is the nature, properties and practices of the Zionist movement and the strategies adopted by the state of Israel were determinant factors in shaping the characteristics, political thinking, strategies, and the means the Palestinian national movement used since the early stages of its formation in the early 1900s. However, this doesn’t imply that internal effects within the movement were insignificant in shaping the features of the movement and the transformations it went through. External; particularly regional effects also have had their influence on the fluctuations and inconsistency of the political objectives of the movement at certain turning points in the history of the conflict. Palestinians’ strategic inconsistency is assessed against these conditions.

Challenging Colonialism and Zionism

British and French colonialism of the Arab East Mediterranean region, Greater Syria (including Lebanon), Palestine and Jordan at the turn of the 19th century came to disrupt an embryonic but consistently rising Arab nationalism demanding independence from the Ottoman rule. Inspired by the writings of intellectuals such as Najib Azuri and Abdul Rahman Al Kawakibi and provoked by the tyranny of the late Ottoman rule under Sultan Abdul Hamid, Arab elites in the region waged a nationalist struggle for the independence of Arab countries (Rogan 2009). The demand for independence has had to face the challenge of the Ottoman Empire in its decline and the colonial division of the
region as enshrined in the Sykes Picott agreement. The assignment of British and French mandate by the Supreme Council of the League of the Nations and its ratification in the San Remo Conference came to increase Arab disillusionment of the intentions of Britain and France.

Arab nationalism would rise to challenge both powers in Syria, Iraq and Lebanon. Palestinian nationalism, as an integral part of this movement in terms of geography and identification was caught in a qualitatively different challenge: in addition to the British Mandate, the advent of the Zionist movement and Jewish immigration represented a complex challenge. Indeed, this unique challenge would determine the peculiar Palestinian history that is quite different from Arab history (Said 1992: xxxv). Thus the early formation of the Palestinian national movement was to a large extent conditioned by the broader effects of Arab nationalism on the one hand and the struggle against British colonial government and the Zionist movement on the other. Identification with Arab nationalism had a divisive effect among the Palestinians in this period. The rivalries and to some extent the conflicts among Arab national elites on the question of identification with the Ottoman Caliph as opposed to the visions of Arab unity and independence were echoed within the Palestinian elites and intellectuals. Ottoman

101 Ottoman Empire involvement in the World-War One marked an opportunity for the Entente Powers to achieve their imperial ambitions towards the region: Great Britain, France, Russia each wanted a foothold in the East Mediterranean Arab countries. For Britain; the dominant among these powers dividing the region had to be craved in a way that maintains British simultaneous pledges to different actors. The Sykes -Picott (referring to Georges-Picott of France and Sir Mark Sykes of Britain) Agreement was the most important. The agreement was signed in 1916 according to which British and French officials drew lines for the division of the parts of the region that were coveted by Britain and France during the course of the war: France reserved the greater part of Syria, a portion of Southern Anatolia and the Mosul district of Iraq. Britain’s dominion extended from Southern Syria to Baghdad and Basar and the whole region from the Persian Gulf to the edge of France’s dominion. Britain’s also included Haifa and Accer. The agreement left Palestine out of the arrangement as a special international regime of its own (Antonius 1939: 244-5).
officials played the elites one against the other and henceforth created the chasms between the notable families who led the movement until the war of 1948: the Khalidies, the Nashahibies, and the Husseinies. However, with the rise of Turkish nationalism, repression against Arab nationalist sentiments increased and nationalist demands (Palestinians included) for independence became prevalent. Palestinian intellectuals were active in the rising Arab nationalist societies such as Young Arab Society (Al Fatat) and al-Lamarkaziyya (Decentralization) party. The most prevalent thought was of regional nationalist identification with Greater Syria (Bilad Al-Sham) including among part of the Palestinians elites. Palestinian Arab identification remained robust until the increasing Jewish immigration and British policies gave rise to Palestinian nationalism and “set [it] apart due to its confrontation with another people claims to the same land” (Pearlman 2011: 27) supported by British colonial government.

The implications of British colonialism in Palestine were more profound and threatening as it was intertwined with a unique challenge; the Zionist movement and Jewish immigration. In addition to the demand for independence from British rule, Palestinians also entertained the future threat of Zionism that was translated into their comprehension of the tangible and eminent threat of Zionist Jewish immigration to the life and livelihood of the indigenous population.

Zionism and Palestinian survival

Discerning the effects of British mandate and the influence of the Zionist movement on British policies in Palestine remains a difficult endeavor. As Antonius
(1939: 386-389) remarks, pseudo-facts, propaganda, and the secrecy with which British governments managed its involvement with the Zionist movement, and the clear influence of pro-Zionists in the British Parliament created a state of inequality between the positions of the Palestinians and the Zionist. Nonetheless, British colonialism and the Zionist settlement adventure had increasingly violated the natural rights of the indigenous Palestinian population: rights “derived from actual and long-standing possession” of the land of Palestine and the uninterrupted connection they have with their homeland that goes back to centuries. British colonial policies coupled with massive Jewish immigration and Zionist policies threatened the mass dispossession and dismemberment of the Palestinians that violated their natural rights. It also violated their political rights as indicated in Husain-McMahon Correspondence (Antonius 1939: 390). Violation of these rights sprung primarily and most effectively by “Zionist success in bringing Jews to Palestine and constructing a nation for them…meant in loss, dispersion, and catastrophe for the Palestinian natives” (Said 1992: xxxix).

British policies manipulated and obfuscated the dual process of constructing a nation and simultaneously negating the already existing one. As Hannah Arendt portrays it:

After the Second World War it turned out that the Jewish question, which was considered the only insoluble one, was indeed solved —namely, by means of colonized and hen conquered territory— but…the solution of the Jewish question merely produced a new category of refugees, the Arabs, thereby increasing the number of the stateless by another 700,000 to 800,000 people” (Quoted in Said1992: xxxix).

Thus Palestinian nationalism primarily rose in defiance to these violations and to preserve these rights and the right of self-determination especially after the revelation of the
Balfour Declaration content and the imposition of British mandate on Palestine in 1920 (Pearlman 2011: 28). The threat increased as the Palestinians witnessed how the Zionist movement was out for a Jewish majority and was using the Balfour Declaration, and European powers’ complicity as a legitimating base for the establishment of a Jewish state rather than a Jewish homeland.

Fundamentally, Palestinian national movement came into being as a response to an existential threat. As written in the Arab delegations response to Winston Churchill’s White Paper of 1922: “The intention to create a Jewish National Home is to cause the disappearance of the Arab population, culture, and language” (Cited in Sadi 1992: 83). British policies withstanding and the Zionist movement creeping control of the land, economy and the resources turned increasing numbers of Palestinians into landless masses; the reaction to which was the surge of nationalist self-preservation dynamics. As Antonius (1939: 397) puts it, the Arabs were determined upon defending their own existence as a majority for the sake of their existence on the land; when there was no doubt left that the problem was fundamentally one in which an aspirant nation from abroad aimed at ousting from its secular holding the nation in possession at home. History shows that a conflict of that kind, if allowed to develop, can only be resolved in blood”.

Indeed, the nature of the Zionist enterprise pitted the Palestinians in the face of what they saw as a colonial settler ethno-national force with exclusive and isolationist nature. The threat was surfaced more acutely following British implementation of the mandate provisions in 1923: the text of the Mandate reaffirmed Britain’s commitment to the Balfour Declaration and made no mention of Arab self-determination (Pearlman 2011:
Thus the conflict was shaped from the outset as an exclusive ethnic-territorial struggle that “underline the existential bedrock on which…our [the Palestinians] experience as a people depends” (Said 1992: xiii) which is the source of violence that came to distinguish the conflict. However, the years of 1900 to early 1930, although witnessed violent outbursts especially in 1920s, were marked with the politics of inclusiveness and peaceful protest under the elitist traditional leadership of the Palestinians.

Well organized and wealthiest social stratum, members of notable families (a`yan) took the lead of the nationalist movement by virtue of their previous role in the Arab nationalist movement and the status they gained under the Ottoman rule. Palestinian feudal land-based elite had derived its influence and power from family and clan affiliations and patronage networks and political status they gained as intermediaries between the population and the Ottoman rule and then the British colonial government (Robinson 1979: 1). Notables refrained from mobilizing the masses or taking a militant stance against the colonial government or the Zionist movement. On the one hand mobilizing the masses would weaken their social and political position, and on the other it would undermine their role and threaten the privileges they gain from their

---

102 Three Palestinian Arab Congresses were held in 1921-3 with large number of delegates representing the country’s regions, associations, and religious denominations. At the time the Arab Congress elected an Executive Committee and a wide range of local and regional associations (commerce and municipal councils, clubs, and societies) declared that the Congress represents them. This wide support enabled the Congress to establish a wide network of communication and coordination that embodied the structure of the movement (Younis 2000: 67-68).

On the eve of 1882 (the first documented Zionist Jewish immigration wave), the religious Jewish community in Palestine (who were as Palestinians as other religious groups) numbered about 24,000 (5 percent of the population of 500,000). By the conclusion of 1914 (after the second immigration wave) the number of Jews jumped to 85,000 (Pearlman 2011: 27).
intermediary role such as public employment, responsibility over crucial endowments, and the ability to reach to markets abroad.

The politics of this leadership were characterized mainly by its belief in petition, appeals, and delegations to the British government and other European powers. The demands were reflected a sound degree of national awareness. As the Third Arab Congress of 1921 stated them

…a national government responsible to a parliament elected by the native population Muslims, Christians and Jewish; the abolition of the Jewish Home principle; and not to separate Palestine from the neighboring Arab states (Pearlman 2011: 34).

The means above-mentioned and the objectives set forth by traditional national leadership clearly reflect a certain degree of political wishful thinking: In retrospect, those elites were acting out a false assumption that Britain was standing at the same distance between the Palestinians and the Zionist movement. Thus convincing the British with the fairness of Arab demands would yield. However, all these demands were met with rejection and instead Britain offered a representative assembly as a consultative body to the colonial government which the Arab leadership rejected. The offer reiterated the commitments of Balfour declaration and granted the Jewish community representation on an equal foot with the Arabs (at the time in 1922 the Jewish population represented 13 per cent of the total population) (Younis 2000: 58). It is very important to notice, though, the inclusive stance of Arab demands. Until the 1930s those demands were not ethnically, religiously, or territorially driven, at least the way they are articulated in the quote above. To the contrary; the democratic component of Palestinian nationalist
demand reflects the nation-state *Qutriyya*) concept of nationalism that swept the region at the time, as the term ‘native’ indicates.

Inasmuch as Arab Palestinian nationalists opted to inclusive nation-building they were aware of the dangers of the Zionist enterprise that would impede the achievement of democratic and parliamentary elected government. In this sense those demands are indicative of Palestinians’ awareness of the long-term objective of independence but failed to understand the immediate threats of colonial policies and Zionist practices that would soon surpass those demands. The effects of the immediate threats and British policies would undermine the traditional elite and usher for an era of violence.

The ability of notables to maintain their status and close relationships with the colonial government was conditioned upon their success in providing social order. However, colonial government’s policies and the confrontation with the Zionist movement undermined the notables and increased popular disillusionment with their leadership, as we discussed earlier. The popular legitimacy of the Executive Committee of the Arab Congress and its parliamentary, legal, nonviolent tactics was indisputable in 1920s, as Porath (1975) remarks. However, the increased Zionist influence and Jewish immigration undermined this legitimacy and increased its divisions which exacerbated its decline. The Notables were divided on the question of nationalism versus social change; whereas nationalist elites sought to gain political power through independence without changing the order of social relationships, status elites sought to maintain the political and the social status quo. Factionalism along these lines would prevail in the hierarchy of the movement for decades and would be a major source of weakness and inability to
adopt a cohesive and consistent political strategy or organize an increasingly changing society.

Profound socio-economic changes were sweeping the Palestinian society. Landless peasants lost their social status and ability to affect the events, while the attempt of increasing numbers of them to obtain jobs in the labor market met very limited success. Working class was small in number and scattered in small industrial projects, which prevented effective organization or mobilization. British non-recognition of Arab unions and prohibiting Arab workers from joining the Jewish Union (the Histadrut) left Palestinian workers to fend for themselves and left behind by the elites. The latter neglected workers specific class demands and the elitist nature of the national movement hindered their participation (Younis 2000: 66). Moreover, divisions within the elite found their proxies in the social structure, which divided the Palestinian society horizontally along regional belonging and vertically along Family affiliation; usually between the two main Jerusalemite families; Husseinis and Nashashibis or majlisiya and mu`arada. Traditional elites’ hegemony in the Palestinian society during this period prevented the rise of political parties genuinely independent from the influence of notable coalitions. As Robinson (1997: 7-8) notices, all political parties and institutions of the era were mere facades of notable politics with one late exception: the formation of the Istiqlal (independence) Party in Haifa in 1932. Although the leadership of the party was from notables, it had shown a significant degree of nationalist orientation and militancy. The party called for the independence from Britain, the end of Zionist settlements, for pan-Arabism, and for greater democratization within Palestinian politics. However, the
Istiqlal effect was limited and couldn’t change the taming effects of the elites’ politics that rendered the Palestinian society less politically organized and harder to mobilize.

Thus, the Palestinians entered the 1930s; a period of increased confrontation with the colonial government and the Zionist movement fragmented and lost between nationalist political demands and social exigencies of the rapid change accompanied Jewish immigration and colonial policies that recognized Jewish settlements (Yishuvs) as self-governing communities while dealt with the Palestinians as Muslims and Christians rather than a single nations (Pearlman 2011: 35). These circumstances had significantly undermined the political position of the Palestinians in comparison to that of the Zionist movement.

The existential connotations of this asymmetry were materialized as the economic base of the Palestinians development lagged behind the Jewish, and the Palestinian working class was impoverished and more peasants turned into landless masses, while the middle class was crushed and lost political viability. The ultimate result was the inability of the Palestinian national movement to exert significant political pressure on the British colonial government or to challenge the Zionist movement by tactics of legal protest. The prophecy of Antonius on the violent development of the conflict would come true. The policies of the colonial power and the creeping Zionist takeover of the land and their visible institutional structures that represented a political autonomous entity on the one hand, and the failure of the Palestinian politics of petition on the other hand explain the violent developments of 1930s.
By 1930s disillusionment with Britain’s policy coupled with the sharp increase of Jewish immigration and the clashes with the Jews in 1929 ignited Palestinian resistance. The independence of number of Arab countries in the region made Palestinian nationalism more assertive on the sought of independence and gaining control over the mandate Palestine as their national homeland. Political means of protest became more militant developing from demonstrations, strikes, and sporadic violence into an armed revolution. The violent events of 1929 especially in Jerusalem revealed the weakness of the national movement leadership neither to maintain tranquility nor to change British policies or Zionist threat. Masses disaffection and resentment increased watching aggressive depilation of their livelihood. In this sense 1929 clashes marked a shift from restrained mobilization from above to wide range mobilization from below that was facilitated by the aspects of modernization that changed the socio-economic features of the Palestinian society (Lesch 1977: 126). Advent social forces within the Palestinian society accompanied socio-economic transformations and political mobilization (professionals, artisans, and intelligentsia) in addition to peasants, villagers and workers who had to pay the highest price as displaced and dispossessed took the initiative from the traditional elite. The Istiqlal Party role was prominent in setting the popular stage for the General Strike and the revolution by mobilizing and organizing ‘National Committees’ in nearly all Arab towns before the close of 1935 (Pearlman 2011: 42). Traditional elites decided to jump into the mobilized nationalist wave and established the Arab Higher Committee (AHC) that claimed the leadership of an already in-the-making militant and increasingly armed campaign.
New political forces changed the structure of social forces in the national movement by creating an equilibrium that allowed a certain level of convergence over the main demands of the Palestinians and the means to achieve them. Along with the continuous British ignorance of the repeated Palestinian demands for independence, restraining and stopping Jewish immigration and the dynamics of increased dispossession mid 1930s provided a moment of ripeness for the revolution. However, the ability of AHC to sustain its leadership regenerated rivalries and fragmentation within the movement and between different armed factions which undermined Palestinians’ capability to turn the revolution into a political achievement as Pearlman (2011) lucidly argues. The AHC, in an attempt to co-opt the revolution in favor of its own interests appealed to the British parliament to establish a legislative council for all inhabitants of Palestine; a proposal that this leadership rejected in the 1920s as abovementioned. Now with the increased consolidation of Zionist colonial settlements the proposal seemed the only way to slow it down from the perspective of the AHC, not the revolution and mass militancy.

Nonetheless, the armed revolution engulfed nearly every region in Palestine especially in the countryside. The revolution aggravated mostly those wretched masses in city suburbs and villages. Political leadership of the national movement, the AHC neglected the armed resistance and distanced itself from armed struggle although claimed leadership of the broader uprising and the 6 months strike that accompanied the revolution. The strike of 1936; the longest in the history of the region, galvanized the traditional leadership of the national movement and the death of al-Qassam; the most
prominent revolutionary leader and the decline of armed resistance provided this leadership with a new opportunity to consolidate its position. The AHC soon organized another delegation to London appealing for the same demands to which the British government assigned the Peel Commission of 1937 to explore the causes of the conflict and to present recommendations for resolution. The Commission recommended the partition of Palestine into Arab and Jewish states, which the Arabs unanimously rejected. The proposal provoked a new round of violence for it envisaged the permanent dislocation of a large Arab population to make room for the Jewish immigrants in the proposed Jewish state (Antonuis 1939: 406). The Commission, however, noticed that Palestinian grievances were the same as those triggered previous protest and disturbances in the 1920s namely, “the desire of the Arabs for national independence” and “their hatred and fear of the establishment of a Jewish National Home” (Cited in Farsoun and Zacharia 1997: 107).

The revolution and particularly the wide popular participation and the diversity of the means of resistance (the general strike, disobedience, noncooperation campaigns, and the armed struggle) gave the national movement a strong state of convergence and the Palestinian community a strong sense of purpose. The Peel Commission Partition proposal embittered the Palestinians and created “a common feeling that they have been betrayed” (Cited in Pearlman 2011: 48), wrote Lewis Andrews British District Commissioner in the Galilee; the region where a vast majority of the Palestinians were to be dislocated according to the Partition proposal. The continuing revolution and British
harsh measures to curb it, and the divisions within the traditional national elites put the whole country in a state of random violence and chaos at the turn of 1940s.

*Shaping the ethno-territorial boundaries*

The second wave of the armed revolution that followed the Peel Commission recommendation couldn’t sustain under British extreme measures including the deportation and imprisoned most of the leaders of the national movement. Not less important an effect was the renewed rivalry within the movement and divisions among different armed groups. British cooperation with segments of Arab society (local “peace bands” formed and supported by the *Nashashibis*) gives an insight in the effect of divisions. More telling was British-Zionist alliance to curb the wave of armed struggle; the Zionist *Hagana* paratroops participated alongside British troops in the fighting. Coalitions against the revolution show the extent to which it threatened the political and social status quo within the Palestinian social and political configurations, and between the Palestinians, on the one hand and the British government and Zionist movement on the other. The achievements of the revolution: revolutionary forces controlled most of the rural areas by 1938103, and a new set of demands were adopted in a clear departure from the traditional leadership demands.

The revolution asserted on economic and political fundamental requests “including a moratorium on debts, a rent freeze on urban housing and other claims”

---

103 The year 1938 was also the most violent. The revolutionary factions took control of large stretches of the country and the British troops waged brutal offensive to quell the revolutionaries, at the time with an estimated participants of 15,000. The number of British killed in 1938 was 77 comparing to 30 in 1936, and the number of Jews killed in this year reached 255. Between 1936 to1938 a total of 5,000 Palestinians were killed (Pearlman 2011: 51).
These demands reflected the emergence of new leadership more assertive and conscious of its status as being subjugated and dislocated by the British colonial government and the Zionist movement. Moreover, these demands and achievements were the ultimate counter-partition plan that Britain adopted and represented a serious challenge to Zionist plans. While Peels Partition plan would have drawn the ethno-national territorial formation of the conflict, revolution demands aimed at empowerment and political independence that would have annulled Zionist project. Taking into account Zionist parallel territorial achievements reinforced by a well organized institutional structures (Jewish Agency, authorized by the colonial government established and consolidated a set of separated social, economic, administrative, political, and military organizations and institutions that guaranteed a de facto autonomous settler community, Jewish political authority within the Palestinian Mandate government had become entrenched as a state-within-a-state” (Farsoun and Zacharia 1997: 88). At this point Zionist Jewish structures of separation and ethno-territorial presence provoked Palestinian reaction as a threatened ethno-national people. This emerging character of the conflict is yet to be reinforced in the early 1940 by the continuation of violence and the sharp increase in Jewish immigration and the overt Zionist military actions against the Palestinians and the British.

The renewal of the armed insurrection in 1938-9, on one level marked the decline of Palestinian national movement as it became more random and lacked the organizational coherency and united political leadership; deep cleavages hunted the movement and traditional elite rivalries revived. The citrus harvest season was also
approaching; the disruption of the season would have caused an insurmountable cost for the Palestinian economy. Arab intervention also contributed to the decline of the revolution as King Abdullah called for the halt of armed resistance. The dissemination of the revolution escalated under the British oppression that led not only to the political quietism of the national movement, but also it weakened the Palestinian society as a whole. By the imprisonment and deportation of Palestinian leaders that played a crucial role in the fragmentation of the movement, British collective punishment of the population undermined society’s collective purpose. Terrorizing the populace by British brutality weakened its unity and dealt huge damage to its economic viability (Pearlman 2011: 49-50).

On the other side of the divide, the Zionist Jewish community became more organized politically as the different factions within the movement came to unify their efforts to face the increase Arab challenge. Their military apparatus (Hagana), well armed and trained by the British and the British initiative to establish joint British-Jewish policing force (Farsoun and Zacharia 1997: 108) gave Zionist settlers the upper hand as the UN resolution 181 was issued. However, British-Jewish alliance would suffer a fatal blow as a result of British White Paper of 1939 and its implementation. The White Paper asserted that Britain had never intended to create a Jewish state in Palestine, and restricted Jewish immigration to Palestine since, according to the paper, immigrations rates at the time had met the Balfour Declaration provisions. Furthermore, it pledged to grant independence to a unitary Palestinian state in ten years. The Zionist reaction was fierce and immediate: a diplomatic campaign in Europe and the United States coupled
with a Zionist armed campaign against British troops and institutions in Palestine during 1944-1947\textsuperscript{104}.

The UN resolution 181 launched all-out hostilities between the Palestinians and the Zionist paratroops while British was preparing to withdraw their last remaining troops from the country leaving the Palestinians to defend themselves in an asymmetrical confrontation. The Palestinian society was already drained by the years of the revolution that left its national movement and social and economic structures in tatters. By contrast, Zionist movement troops were well armed and trained, and their organizations remained enact and prepared for an all-out confrontation. The Zionist movement emerged victorious even after Arab military intervention in the war of 1948 that was undermined militarily and politically by the political ambitions of Prince Abdullah of Transjordan who secretly accepted the Partition resolution. The 1948 events especially the establishment of Israel (the *Nakba*, catastrophe in Palestinian Historiography) came not only to formally and profoundly consolidate a system of exclusion created by the Zionist movement with the support of the colonial power, but also to announce the failure of the Palestinian national movement to thwart its adversaries and their objectives. The UN resolution yielded one state; Israel. The Arab state is yet to be established, and the Palestinians would endure another major setback in 1967 before they revive their national struggle. Meanwhile, the minority Jewish community led by the Zionist movement was turned into a majority overnight within a top-down established state of their own. British

\textsuperscript{104} The Jewish paratroops of Hagana and Irgun launched a campaign of terror and rebellion that was marked with bombings and assassinations against the British. In 1946 Jewish terrorists blew up the King David Hotel, the Headquarter of the Mandate government in Jerusalem killing 91 people including Jewish, British and Palestinians. The military stand-off between the two parties resulted in the death of 169 British soldiers and 37 Jewish terrorists between 1945-1947 (Farsoun and Zacharia 1997).
complicity with the Zionist movement and international legitimation of the establishment of Israel has turned an otherwise heterogeneous settler colonial society into an ethno-national cohort and a sovereign state.

The lost two decades: Re-establishing a captive movement

The events of 1947-8 and the Nakba destroyed the Palestinian society and national life in every respect: The dispersion of the Palestinians (10 percent remained in Israel’s proper, 10 percent of the population went to Jordan, 39 percent to the West Bank, 26 percent to the Gaza Strip, 14 percent to Lebanon, 100 percent to Syria, and 1 percent to Egypt) would structurally condition the development of Palestinian socio-economic configurations and the revival of the Palestinian national movement. The movement that lost its political and armed struggle against the Zionist movement partially due to its factional politics would have to overcome geographical fragmentation of its people. Moreover, Palestinians refugees -scattered in refugee camps administered by the United Nation Relief and Works Agency of Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA)- were expelled from their homes leaving behind them all means of livelihood. Reestablishing their lives from scratch represented another challenge to resurrect their national identification and viable social life and political affiliation. Inside Israel, the Palestinians faced a unique situation: separated from the rest of the Palestinians they had to maintain their social texture and political life facing discrimination and military rule. The participation of those Palestinians living in Israel in national struggle was no less of a challenge than mobilizing Palestinians in the WB and GS and Diaspora. The resurrection of the movement also confronted the Arab increased intervention in the Palestinian
question. In particular, Jordan’s control of the West Bank and Egypt’s administrative authority in the GS following the Nakba represented another odd situation that undercut the ability of the Palestinians to reconstitute their movement in a collective and cohesive manner. Arab regimes manipulated the Palestinian cause for their own purposes and to manage their rivalries while restricted, if not oppressed Palestinian political activities in their countries especially before the 1967 war.

Palestinian dispersion and Israel’s rejection of the UN resolution 194 denying the return of the Palestinians to their homes was supposed, as the Israeli leaders hoped to lead permanently to the assimilation of those refugees in their new locations. This hope was not completely unfounded as the Palestinian national movement, defeated as it turned, was in a precarious position taking into account the structural challenges abovementioned it had to struggle against. The mission confronted the movement was beyond its organizational abilities and resource in its disposal: the reconstitution of the Palestinian society and its social and national ties; securing refugees’ right of return, and reversing the consequences of the Nakba and liberation. Palestinian national movement had to resurrect a near disintegration Palestinian national existence (Pearlman 2011: 63); an uphill fight that exceeded the capabilities of the Palestinians.

In exile, dispersal and fragmentation engendered the emergence of competing political plans as segments of the movement were co-opted by Arab regimes, others sought to overthrow those regimes as a necessary step in the way to liberate Palestine, while a third segment espoused the creation of an independent Palestinian movement (Younis 2000: 100). Moreover, many Palestinian intellectuals, professionals, and
intelligentsia joined political parties and nationalist movements in the surrounding Arab countries which increased the difficulty to establish a coherent movement with a certain sense of unity and centrality. These difficulties withstanding, Palestinian elements in the WB, GS and the Diaspora started to re-organize the movement in the late 1950s. These attempts were faced with three systems of oppression and power: Israel, Jordan and Egypt; each for its own reasons oppressed Palestinian national sentiments and their sought to revive. The instability created in the neighboring Arab countries following the Nakba in 1948 (military coups in Egypt and Syria and the advent of Arab nationalism), and especially the war of 1956 against Egypt under Nasser provided a window of opportunity for mobilization and revival for the Palestinians.

A new nationalist cohort emerged in GS and the WB that took the lead to resurrect and strengthen Palestinian nationalism around the collective feelings of historical injustice, exile, and alienation from homeland. The consequences of the Nakba were still fresh in the hearts and the minds of Palestinians. Not surprisingly, those consequences were the in essence the ground in which the reconstruction of Palestinian national life was planted. Reuniting the dispersed and fragmented population required a powerful aggravating centripetal process with a core. Palestine, land and history have become the ultimate inspiring core of mobilization of Palestinian nationalism regardless of the location, social status or profession. As Anis al-Qasim puts it:

“Every Palestinian was lost…it made no difference whether he left the homeland or remained in it, whether he was impoverished and lived in a tent or became rich and purchased gardens, or whether he carried a refugee certificate or a diplomatic passport” (Cited in Pearlman 2011: 63).
Exile, loss, homeland, and return became the main identification elements of the re-emerging Palestinian nationalism and identity. The depopulation of Palestine in the eve of 1948 and its population with Jewish Settlers resulted in a strong Palestinian identification with the land as the ultimate sanctuary of social cohesion and political expression of the common identity. The replacement of Palestinians with hundreds of thousands of new Jewish immigrants who took their land, businesses, and properties was echoed in strong identification with land and space; homeland. Therefore Palestinian refugees and the Palestinian national movement saw in the Right of Return a core element of collective identification. Return of the refugees “was always a matter of when and how, not whether they would return” (Farsoun and Zacharia 1997: 127) that links national identity with the territory, space, and political rights.

Yet, reshaping the Palestinian collective national identity is one thing and turning it into a politically organized action is quite another. Unifying the Palestinians; the ‘Nakba generation’ and the ‘generation of revolution’ (to use the Palestinian parlance) and mobilizing them behind a well-defined objectives and strategy would take almost two decades of organization. The effort to resurrect the national movement by the ‘generation of the revolution’ in 1950s and 1960s ushered the emergence of new social forces that would take the painstaking burden of reconstruction. New conditions coalesced to produce different socio-economic and political configurations: the Palestinian population was transformed from agrarian rural and illiterate to urbanized, increasingly proletarianized, and literate (Farsoun and Zacharia 1997: 127). These processes increased levels of social differentiation and allowed the emergence of new young educated
middle-class leadership that took the initiative in the 1950s to establish the “National Liberation Movement” (*Fateh*). At the time, *Fateh* echoed the rising nationalist sentiments and longing for redress, repatriation, and reversing the consequences of the *Nakba*. Thus it adopted a nonpartisan organizational scheme and took ‘unity and liberation’ through armed struggle as the pillars of its agenda. However, the ability of *Ftah* to unite the Palestinians in the Diaspora and those remained in Palestine was compromised not only by geographical fragmentation and dispersion but also by the Arab regimes’ heavy hand on the Palestinian cause during the 1950s until the Sex-Days war of 1967.

Nascent clandestine Palestinian armed groups in Gaza Strip and the Diaspora initiated by *Fateh* in the late 1950s and early 1960s lacked the structural capacity and the resources to form a coherent and politically effective institutional framework. This framework was provided through a top-down Arab effort to co-opt the rising trend among Palestinians to widen and increase armed struggle against Israel. Jamal Abdul-Nasser of Egypt held the first Arab League summit in 1964 and announced the formation of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) under the leadership of Ahmad Shuqayri. *Fateh* and other Palestinian armed groups resented the plan not just because they were excluded from its constitution but as well for *Fateh's* mistrust of the intentions of the Arab regimes and their ability to deliver the goal of liberation. Nonetheless, Shuqayri, following Nasser’s decision and support succeeded to hold the first Palestinian National Council (PNC) in Jerusalem the same year. The PNC as the legislative body of the PLO adopted the first Palestinian National Charter and announced the formation of the Palestinian
Liberation Army (PLA). The Charter, as the informing document of the goals and means of struggle reflected a broadly stated agenda. It firmly cites the Palestinian people’s right in his sacred homeland, Palestine and confirms the inevitable combat for the liberation of Palestine by mobilizing Palestinian material, military, and spiritual resources in the sought of this goal.

Although both the PLO and Fateh aspired the same end namely, the liberation of Palestine neither side spent a serious effort to mobilize the Palestinians masses whether in the Diaspora or inside Palestine. Fateh’s approach was still in the phase of underground recruitment while the PLO was meant to contain Palestinian mass mobilization. Fateh waged a campaign of armed operations inside Israel to show its relevance and the weakness of the Arab-led PLO. Other armed groups joined the effort to prove their nationalist credentials (Pearlamn 2011: 66).

Unified by the means of struggle, these groups were divided under the effect of Arab regimes’ rivalries and antagonisms: Egypt-Jordan tensions on issues of Arab nationalism and the relationships with Britain and the participation in Baghdad Pact, and Egypt-Syrian competition to take the lead of the Arab Nationalist movement (See Rogan 2009: 83-92) split Palestinians on the question of the relationship between Arab Nationalism and the liberation of Palestinian. Fateh insisted on the notion of self-reliance and the independence of the Palestinian decision; a position that was emboldened after Israel’s invasion of the GS in 1956 and the armed resistance she faced. Contending that the liberation of Palestine is the precondition for Arab unity, Fatah gave supremacy to Palestinian unity and populace politics whereas other Palestinian-Arab-Nationalist groups
preached for the opposite logic. Fateh published its own journal *Filastinuna* (our Palestine) that incorporated the movement’s principles and tenets: as the name of the journal indicates, *Fateh* simply sought to “call to life” the Palestinians and to restore their common purpose, the liberation of homeland\(^{105}\) through the reconstruction of their own movement independently.

Palestinians were already involved in Arab politics through active participation in the plethora of political parties and movements emerged after 1948: communists, Muslim Brotherhood, Ba’thists, and pan-Arab and Arab Nationalist movements aggravated many Palestinians including those turned in the early 1960s to form autonomous Palestinian armed groups such as the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP) and the Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine (DFLP). Arab parties and movements offered the Palestinians a window of opportunity for political expression and identity that promised to compensate for the dispersion and fragmentation. Thus at the eve of the 1967 war, Palestinians in the Diaspora and in the WB and GS were struggling primarily to reassemble the pieces of their shattered social, political, and economic, structures and to give a sense of identity and direction to their forthcoming liberation mission. The period from 1948 until the eve of 1967 was strikingly a period of survival and rejuvenation through which the Palestinian national movement could not exert any significant political pressure on Israel. The latter consolidated its sovereignty in its proper and strengthened

---

\(^{105}\) *Filastinuna* argued in a language of embittered and angry nationalists that “…hysterical or anaesthetizing broadcasts and rousing speeches, the contents of which we all know in advance...The Arabs have [bound] the Palestinians’ mouths, tied their hands, deprived them of their freedom of action in what is left of their country, resisted the idea of their regroupment, turned them into theatrical claque which applauds this and reviles that...We cannot just sob and wail...we cannot just recite our woes and reiterate our complains. We must gird ourselves-we alone- to solve our problem in our own way” (Quoted in Farsoun and Zacharia 1997: 175-6).
its political and military structures to a degree where any military challenge from the
Palestinians or/and Arab neighboring countries would be rebounded.

**The rise of Palestinian ethno-territoriality**

*Falstinuna,* cited above echoed Palestinian disillusionment with Arab regimes’
policies towards the Palestinians and Fateh’s sought for political representation and
national revival in the Diaspora and in Palestine. However, a clear plan to deal with the
differences between the conditions of different Palestinian cohorts in different locations
wasn’t articulated. At the eve of the 1967 war Palestinians in the WG and GS endured
both similar and different experience. Jordanian and Egyptian regimes adopted a dual
policy of co-optation and suppression: both regimes co-opted traditional social elites in
their bureaucratic apparatuses as well as in their political institutions in the case of Jordan.
Simultaneously, they suppressed political expression and organization especially in the
WB where the Jordanian monarch practiced sovereign powers. The emergence of the
middle-class that would take the lead of the national movement in the WB and GS was
had been crippled by these factors. No socioeconomic profound changes took place as the
pattern of weak industry and shrunk market persisted. Most of the Palestinians in these
areas especially in refugee camps were dependent on UNRWA aid and on seasonal jobs
in agriculture. The merger of the WB with Jordan and opening Jordanian economy to the
Palestinians made the development of a national movement weaker. The emerging
middle-class in both areas, however, managed to mobilize popular support, even though
slowly, to its radical nationalist and anti-imperialist stance (Younis 2000: 105). In GS extreme exclusion from the rest of the Palestinians and the Suez war against Egypt of 1956 and Israeli invasion of the Strip triggered a stronger armed resistance movement against Israel. In the Diaspora, Palestinian armed groups were gaining more ground whereas the Arab-led PLO was increasing its legitimacy among Arabs and Palestinians alike. Palestinian armed groups, inspired by the Algerian revolution, Vietnam liberation wars and Cuban revolution, ignited a new spirit for people’s liberation armed struggle as the key to redeeming the lost homeland (Farsoun and Zacharia 1997: 178).

The PLO was gathering political viability in a large context due to the endorsement of a wide range of popular and professional organizations that were established after 1948 in an effort to rebuild Palestinian ties and social structures. Thus, 1960s was a period of revival and rejuvenation for the Palestinian national movement in spite of factional politics, ideological rivalries and Arab manipulations. The Palestinization of the struggle against Israel by means of people’s revolutionary war became the motto of the newly formed Palestinian factions (Younis 2000: 107) that started to mobilize and recruit Palestinians and Arab cadres to their ranks.

The war in 1967 marked a turning point in the conflict: now the entirety of Palestine became under Israel’s control and the WB and GS have turned formally into the Occupied Palestinian Territories. The war disrupted a process of Palestinian national

---

106 Early 1960s witnessed the formation of several occupational, sectorial, and public organizations that subscribed to the PLO and became part of its structures. These organizations were growing in size, representation and activities: The General Union of Palestinian Students (GUPS), The General Union of Palestinian Workers (GUPW), The General Union of Palestinian Women (GUPWomen), The General Union of Palestinian Teachers (GUPT), and the Palestine Red Crescent Society (PRCS), were established and represented the main popular backbone of the PLO.
revival that was in the making accompanied, and indeed resulted from the reconstruction of Palestinian social networks in exile. The consequences of the war on the Palestinian political thinking and strategizing were profound. In the first place it confirmed Fateh’s argument that Palestinians could not rely on Arab states to solve the Palestinian calamity. Thus the aftermath of the war witnessed immense Palestinian efforts to unify ranks especially following the battle of Al-Karameh on the Jordanian soil in 1968 in which Palestinian guerilla fighters and the Jordanian army fought a heroic battle against the invading Israeli troops that were forced to retreat behind their cease-fire positions of 1967 (Farsoun and Zacharia 1997: 182).

The Arab defeat in the war and the renewed Palestinian catastrophe has injected a new spirit of survival and national identification: “The word ‘Palestinian’ for two decades synonymous with the downtrodden and displaced came to conjure images of youth, intelligence, courage and sacrifice” (Pearlman 2011: 67). The new spirit gave a remarkable opportunity for mobilization and unity as the Arab regimes eased their restrictions on Palestinian political activities following their defeat. The late sixties and early seventies ushered Palestinian national resurrection which, in the words of Edward Said (1992: xx) had been

a painful reconstruction of an exiled Palestinian identity. The efforts of many Palestinian political workers, fighters, poets, artists, and historians to sustain Palestinian identity—all of these have teetered alongside the confounding fear of disappearance, given the grim determination of official Israel to hasten the process to reduce, minimize, and ensure the absence of Palestinians as a political and human presence in the Middle Eastern equation.

The torn apart Palestinians in Diaspora were rising in unity and national pride in the wake of a major loss with a collective sense of purpose as a people; the Palestinian now has
regained her identity and assured his purpose in liberation of the homeland. In the OPT steadfastness on the land and its protection and collective self-restoration were supreme goals in the face of Israel’s colonialism.

More profoundly, Arab defeat and the following events enabled the Palestinian factions led by Fateh to take over the PLO in 1969. Yasir Arafat was elected as the PLO Chairman by the PNC and a new era of national unity under the umbrella of the PLO was ensued marking the revival of the movement within a new structural framework. Israeli occupation of the West Bank, Gaza Strip and East Jerusalem in 1967, ironically, contributed to the solidification of Palestinian nationalism by pushing them to the wall. Israel’s dismissal of the Palestinians as ‘Arabs’ and then as a ‘demographic reality’ – never as a people\textsuperscript{107} - produced unintended consequences; it provoked Palestinians’ collective instinct for survival and revival. For the Palestinians their very existence as a relevant political entity was on stack. Simultaneously the mobilization strategy of the PLO re-established the ties between Palestinians in the newly occupied territories; the Palestinians remained inside the Israeli proper; and the Palestinian in the Diaspora. Popular organizations of the PLO and the recruiting efforts of the factions within it made remarkable achievements in terms of resurrecting Palestinians’ collective sense of identity and unity as Lustik notices (Cited in Knox & Quirk 2000: 91). However, the revival of the Palestinian national movement was compromised by the lack of organizational coherency and factional politics, and strategic inconsistency of the PLO.

\textsuperscript{107} In 1969, Golda Meir said that there were no Palestinians and her consultants called them ‘Southern Syrians’. Yitzhak Rabin always referred to the Palestinians as “the so called” Palestinians and his Labor’s policy sought turning them into Jordanians. Menachem Begin referred to the Palestinians as the “Arabs of Eretz Israel, Israel’s ‘own’ blacks (Said 1997: 138).
Perhaps no other national liberation movement has gained the degree of solidarity all over the world, especially in the Third World that the Palestinian national movement elicited:

It has been the most successful in obtaining worldwide attention and formal recognition from governments and international organizations. It is the only political movement in the recorded history that is formally recognized, by more governments throughout the world, than its adversary’s government” (Ahmad 2006).

This paradox becomes more perplexing taking into account that at the turn of the twenty-first century the PLO has to struggle not for liberation but rather to salvage a portion of the Palestinians’ rights for a portion of the Palestinians on a portion of the Palestinian land. This “discrepancy between important political, moral, and cultural gains on the one hand, and, on the other, a droning ground bass of land alienation is at the heart of the Palestinian dilemma” (Said 1992: viii). It becomes more striking when we think of the ability of the Palestinian national movement to endure despite not only its inability to achieve its goals but also to circumscribe the successes of its adversary.

This section discusses the failure of the PLO to adopt and sustain a consistent, coherent and functioning strategy based on a meaningful ideology or vision that is drawn from the lessons of confrontation with its adversary since the onset of the conflict. This misgiving indicates another failure: the inability of the PLO leadership to grasp the complexity and dynamism of Zionism and the nature of its power, and therefore to adopt strategies and goals that can challenge Israel’s power and domination. These dysfunctions
impeded PLO ability to develop and adopt a coherent and consistent winning strategy that minimizes dangers and maximizes opportunities.

There is a wide agreement among scholars and observers of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict that PLO strategic objectives and the tactics it deployed were distinctly inconsistent (E.g. Said 1992, Gordon 2008, Pearlman 2011, Ahmad 1996, Klien 2010, and Abunimah 2006). Writers on this topic notice the volatility of the contexts within which the conflict developed. Indeed, the two characteristics of PLO strategy shifts and the volatility of domestic and regional contexts are interlinked at many levels. PLO inconsistent political aspirations and the lack of a coherent blueprint that it may have sought persistently since the articulation of the National Charter in 1969 cannot be explained apart from understanding certain contexts that constituted and reconstituted PLO political thinking until its sharp turn toward capitulation in 1990s.

PLO Internal dynamics

The Fourth Palestinian National Council of 1968 adopted the Palestinian National Charter (PNCH)\textsuperscript{108} that enshrined the objective of the Palestinian national struggle as the liberation of Palestine from the Zionist colonial grip. The Charter articulated the triad: “[Palestinian national] unity, [Arab] national mobilization, and liberation (Article 11) that

\textsuperscript{108}The Charter (or the Covenant in some resources) was declared in July 1968, and it consists of 32 Articles. It was ratified by all the members of the PNC who included representatives of all Palestinian organizations and factions. Article 32 states that the Charter is not subject to changes unless within a special session of the PNC with two-thirds of the members voting in favor of changes. (From the official website of the PNC). http://www.palestinepnc.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=542%3A2011-06-27-09-43-21&catid=94%3A2010-05-25-10-53-41&Itemid=357&lang=ar
intensified the main goals of the movement. Articles 1 and 2 of the charter asserted the Arab identity of Palestine as the homeland of the Palestinian people. The logic of the Charter is based on the linkages between the Palestinian people’s right of self-determination and the liberation of Palestine (Article 3) as the prerequisite for practicing this right on the one hand and the illegitimacy of the state of Israel and the partition resolution of 1947 (Article 19) as antithetical to the Palestinian natural right in their homeland on the other. Moreover, the Charter annuls the Balfour Declaration and all that resulted from its implementation, and rejects the historical claims of the Zionist movement in Palestine as anathema to the facts of history.

The Charter depicts Zionism and the state of Israel as colonial racist entities; “Judaism is not a nationality but a religion and Jews do not constitute a single people”; rather they are citizens of the states where they live, as the charter states. Therefore the Palestinians reject any resolution to their plight short of ultimate liberation of the entire Palestine as defined geographically by the Mandate (Articles 20, 21, 23).

The PNCH, at least theoretically represents the overarching document that draws the strategic objectives of the Palestinian national movement. From the articles presented above it leaves no room for improvising on the rights of the Palestinian people in terms of their homeland, Palestine and the exclusivity with which it perceives Zionism and the state of Israel. It represents the conflict as a zero-sum game where Palestinian aspirations are linked necessarily to abolishing the colonial presence of the adversary. Although it doesn’t include any religious or mythical connotations and justifications, the PNCH puts forth the epistemological underpinnings of the conflict in secular materialist nationalist
terms. Palestinian nationalism in this sense is the negation of the negation that inflicted upon the Palestinians. It is also inclusive and democratic in terms of the definition that it presents for the Palestinian as an individual and the Palestinians as a nation; all Palestinians are equal regardless of their religious, ethnic, gender or any other affiliations. This philosophy was indeed the antithesis of the Zionist/Israeli religious ethno-national territorial enterprise.

However, the PNCH turned into a normative scheme that underpins the aspirations of the movement not the actual political blueprint of all its components. Taking into account the new facts in Palestine in the wake of 1976 (dubbed the Naksa or the catastrophe in Palestinian terminology) and the balance of power between the PLO and Israel, the former assumed a maximalist stance in the face of maximalist Israeli colonialism. As the political program of Fateh indicated, Israel’s extreme aggression on the Palestinian land and rights should be met with Palestinian extreme measures; the sole means of resistance is armed struggle and the goal is to liberate Palestine, the whole Palestine (see below). The charter, in a large measure, reflected the political thinking of Fateh as the largest, most popular, and most influential in the PLO, and changes in PLO political strategy would result mainly from Fateh’s own assessments. Fateh’s hegemony in the movement was not friction-free and the way the PLO and its factions perceived the PNCH and the goals of the movement within the overarching objective of the Charter were crucial in shaping PLO’s politics.

The PLO after 1969 encompassed factions of all ideological strands; secular nationalist (Fateh), leftist Marxist-Leninist (DFLP), leftist Marxist nationalist (PFLP),
organizations affiliated with Arab regimes (Sa‘īqa, and the Arab Liberation Front) and the other smaller organizations. Each of those factions and organizations had a high degree of autonomy vis-à-vis the PLO; the structural organization of the PLO hadn’t included any authoritative leverage over the decisions and actions of those entities. Added to the regional and geographical dispersion, the existence of many independent factions compromised PLO’s ability to construct a coherent organizational structure of command and a consistent political translation of the PNCH. Thus, in spite of the fact that the Charter set the broader framework for the Palestinian national movement each faction and organization maintained its own political program that challenged other programs as a tool of recruitment, mobilization and legitimacy. Ideological and personal rivalries especially between the three main factions –Fateh, PFLP, and DFLP- impeded their coordination around common goals and means of struggle. The loose organizational structure of the PLO that gave each faction a certain degree of autonomy forced the adoption of a consensus framework of decision making, which turned the PLO into a political system rather than a structure of national liberation movement. The leadership could never exercise a degree of monopoly over the national decision that characterizes most of the successful national movements of the modern-day, as Helena Cobban lucidly remarks (Cited in Pearlman 2011: 7). The PLO lacked the powers of a sovereign entity that would have enabled it to enforce binding rules and codes of conduct to compel the factions and organizations within it to act in a unified fashion. Decision making remained a matter of consensus Twafuq where leaders of the factions (especially largest ones) immersed in marathon deliberations to reach a compromise. Competition and rivalry
among the main factions and their political perspectives overshadowed the ultimate ends as articulated by the PNCH:

*Fateh* focused on nationalism as the supreme arena of struggle; avoided social questions and class-struggle; and rejected the intervention in Arab host states’ own affairs and denounced international armed operations. It defined the Palestinian struggle in simple terms; the liberation of the whole of Palestine and the liquidation of the Zionist entity. This goal is not the sole responsibility of the Palestinians although they play the central role in it; it is also the obligation of all Arabs. Therefore the conflict is not only national-Palestinian but also and as much is national-Arab. *Fateh* also envisioned the creation of an independent sovereign democratic Palestinian state that preserves the rights of all its citizens on an equal foot, with Jerusalem as its capital\(^{109}\). PFLP by contrast, called for Arab unity, social revolution, and the overthrow of authoritarian Arab regimes, and practiced armed activities against civilians in the region and beyond.

The political program of the PFLP calls for armed struggle in the sought of the right of

return, self-determination, and the establishment of the Palestinian sovereign state en route of defeating the Zionist entity and the liberation of the entire national soil and the establishment of the democratic state of Palestine in which all citizens enjoy equal rights without discrimination on racial, gender, or religious belief, on the way to establish a democratic social society as the ultimate end. (italics are mine)\(^{110}\).

---

\(^{109}\) See the official website of “Al A´sifa”, the armed wing of Fateh. [http://alma3raka.net/spip.php?article829&lang=ar](http://alma3raka.net/spip.php?article829&lang=ar)

DFLP adopted the “Staged Program” in 1971 that called for the achievement of the right of return, self-determination, and the establishment of the Palestinian sovereign state on the OPT of 1967. On the long run the DFLP espoused the establishment of a democratic secular state in all Palestine\textsuperscript{111}. The DFLP agreed with the PFLP in the necessity to thwart ‘reactionary’ Arab regimes but it shunned the nationalistic stance of the PFLP and called for a strict adherence to Marxist-Leninist principle, and took the side of Fateh in rejecting armed struggle against civilians or international operations. The one can’t but notice the striking similarities of these programs as to the general goals of the movements and their differences on the milestones to achieve on the road.

The paradox that PLO leadership confronted was that in order to maintain unity as a categorical imperative it has had to accommodate all factions and tolerate ideological rivalry; unity in this context hindered the achievement of a consistent national strategy, a political blueprint, and stable alliances. Under these organizational circumstances politics within the PLO became increasingly contentious especially on the two issues of the relationships with Arab regimes and the acceptance of diplomatic initiatives to reach a political settlement to the conflict. Fateh, has been able to shift the strategy of the PLO not by virtue of internal institutional processes of decision making deliberations; rather by resorting to its hegemonic political position, its popularity, and its ties with Arab regimes. The rule of consensus was compromised dramatically after PLO departure from Lebanon in 1982; Yassir Arafat opted to a majority decision making process ignoring criticism of other organizations in the movement. Although in the 1970s Palestinian
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internal rivalries and disagreement created serious cleavages within the PLO, the unity of the movement took a supreme imperative. In the aftermath of 1982 expulsion and the from Lebanon factional contentious politics turned into a divisive stance that reached a climax in 1992-3 when the PLO signed the Oslo Accords against the will of most the factions within and out of the PLO. There is nothing indicative of the effects of Arafat and Fateh’s hegemony than changing the PNCH in 1996, which officially changed the underpinnings of the PLO as a national liberation movement as we discuss below.

Regional and international dynamics

The fact that the PLO was formed and based in the exile and that the main bulk of its constituency lived in the refugee camps in the countries surrounding Palestine made the movement vulnerable to regional politics and Arab states’ rivalries. Soliciting Arab hosting regimes’ acceptance to operate among Palestinian refugees and using their territory as a base required the PLO and different factions within it to modify their policies and discourse in accordance with regimes’ considerations and sensitivities. Regional politics of the 1960s were an arena of pacts and counter-pacts in which rising nation-states (Egypt, Iran, Jordan, Syria, and Saudi Arabia) sought a supreme status. The PLO was caught in the middle of these power circles without gaining a strategic and stable ally among those powers. Quite the opposite, PLO suffered serious strategic setbacks as a result of the animosities and conflicts with those powers (Said 1992: x-xiii). In Jordan; the first and closest base to Palestine the PLO and its factions was involved in an armed conflict with the ruling monarchy following PLO attempt to impose
revolutionary authority alongside the government. The military confrontation of 1970 that was decisive in determining which party has the upper hand and in solving what came to be known as a “dual authority” ended with PLO defeat. Leftist organizations (PFLP and DFLP) were adamant on the necessity to overthrow the Jordanian regime while Fateh opposed it and called for focusing on the struggle against Israel. Although the PLO did not trust the regime in Jordan as competing and disputing the legitimate representation of the Palestinians, the lack of unity and agreement on a strategy triggered the military confrontation in Jordan (Pearlman 2011: 75). Fateh’s position was taken by the DFLP and PFLP as a verification of their earlier criticism of Fateh as abandoning the principle of revolutionizing the Palestinians and Arabs that is necessary for the long term struggle against Israel. They accused Fateh of having vested interests in allying with reactionary Arab regimes (Farsoun and Zacharia 1997: 193).

The confrontation with the Jordanian regime resulted in major strategic loss of the most important, widest, closest to Palestine and most populated area of Palestinian refugees. The PLO had relocated in Lebanon where it was more successful in establishing its status as a political power in internal Lebanese politics. The weak state in Lebanon enabled the PLO in 1969 to strike an accord with the Lebanese government that granted the latter control over the refugee camps and the right to wage armed struggle against Israel from southern Lebanon. For the Palestinian refugees in Lebanon this was a source of relief after years of oppression by the Lebanese security apparatuses and discrimination as they were treated as “alien residents”. The PLO consolidated its position in Lebanon vis-à-vis the government by building a resistance coalition with
Lebanese progressive movements creating an atmosphere of revolutionary sentiments that gave boost to armed operations against Israel. However, this interference coasted the PLO another heavy political and strategic price when it involved in a long and bloody Lebanese civil war that lasted from 1975 to 1981 (Younis 2000: 159-161, Farsoun and Zacharia, 1997: 184-5, and Pearlman 2011: 74-76) and resulted in complicating the relationship between the PLO and the Syrian regime, and the increase of mistrust and animosity between the Palestinian national movement and Jordan.

Regional development in the 1970s introduced opportunities and restraints to the Palestinian national movement. Arab military offensive against Israel in the 1973 war coupled with Arab ‘oil embargo’ against Western states revived Palestinians’ hopes and expectation for the liberation of their homeland. The war showed Israel’s vulnerability but also revealed the limits of Arab military power and their political willingness to challenge Israel’s great power ally; the U.S.A. Under the pressure of the American diplomacy Arab combatants signed cease fire agreements with Israel. The agreements as well as the resulted UN resolution 338112 sidelined the Palestinian element of the conflict and offered Israel a de facto recognition by Arabs who accepted the resolution as the basis for solving the conflict. For the first time since 1948 Egypt, Syria, and Jordan accepted UN invitation to participate in the Geneva peace conference alongside Israel.

112 In response to the Ramdan War (Yum Kipor in Israeli historiography) in which Egypt, and Syria initiated a surprising war against Israel, the UN Security Council issues the resolution 338 of October 1973. The resolution includes three articles distinguished with a strong language to stop the war and start peace negotiations based on resolution 242 of 1967: it called all the parties to “cease all firing and terminate all military activity immediately, not later than 12 hours” after the adoption of the resolution. The resolution also called the parties to start implementing resolution 242 in all its parts right after cease fire. The Security Council also “Decid[ed] that immediately and concurrently with the cease-fire, negotiations shall start between the parties concerned under appropriate auspices aimed at establishing a just and durable peace in the Middle East” (http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/RESOLUTION/GEN/NR0/288/65/IMG/NR028865.pdf?OpenElement).
UN resolutions 242 and 338 ignorance of the Palestinians and their rights was further entrenched by Israeli refusal of PLO participation in the conference. More to the resentment of the PLO, the USA refloated the idea that Jordan was the representative of the Palestinian people. Under the pressure of these critical diplomatic developments the PLO, to the resentment of the PFLP and other smaller organizations and under through a coalition between Fateh and the DFLP, supported by delegates from the West Bank and Gaza strip -participating for the first time in PNC meetings- took the first and major strategic shift of its agenda in both the objectives and the means of the struggle.

In the 1974 Twelfth Meeting of PNC the PLO adopted a new strategy that abandoned the goal of a ‘democratic’ secular state and the liberation of Palestine in favor of establishing a Palestinian ‘national authority’ on any liberated part of Palestine. The 10-Point Transitional Program in Point 1 reconfirmed the PLO rejection of UN resolution 242 and in Point 2 called for the establishment of a national authority in any Palestinian areas liberated from or evacuated by Israel as a ‘phased’ plan en route to total liberation. The new blueprint also endorsed the use of all means of struggle and thus sanctioned the resort to diplomatic alongside armed struggle to achieve this goal and reiterated the PLO commitment to achieve all Palestinian legitimate rights especially the right of return.\(^{113}\)

Arab regimes pressure and their new strategy compelled the PLO to make a profound

\(^{113}\text{The PNC, in the introduction of the decisions taken in the meeting confirmed the drivers of the shift in policy as “the new political developments and circumstances emerged in 1972-3 (referring to the 1973 war). It is important to notice that the PLO in order to show that the new strategy does not imply capitulation included articles that confirm the refusal of any political initiatives that provide Israel with recognition or grant it secure borders or reconciliation and reaffirmed its commitment to achieving all Palestinian rights especially the right of self-determination (From the official website of the PNC). http://www.palestinepnc.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=542%3A2011-06-27-09-43-21&catid=94%3A2010-05-25-10-53-41&Itemid=357&lang=ar}
transformation from a guerrilla revolutionary movement to a political and they rewarded this transformation by the recognition of the PLO as the sole and legitimate representative of the Palestinian people in the 1974 Arab League summit in Rabat (Morocco). PLO quest for recognition made another breakthrough following this shift; the UN granted it observer status. In a deeper level, this shift marked the beginning of a redefinition of the PLO as a national liberation movement.

The involvement of the PLO in the diplomatic processes that aimed at a political settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict based on the consequences of the 1967 war implied the de facto transformation into a national independence rather than a national liberation movement. This question, however, was not answered fully as Said (1992 p134) until the current day as the PLO is still oscillating between its inability to achieve neither objective.

Thus in 1977 the PNC clarified the 10-Point Program of 1974 by stating that the ‘national authority’ objective means the acceptance of a state in these borders. The PLO went further to show its willingness to coexist with Israel: leaders of the PLO started holding meetings with Israeli peace activists and initiated indirect dialogue with the United States (Pearlman, 2011 p86). Two major events at the turn of 1970s reinforced the transformation of the PLO and its explicit acceptance of the two-state solution, with the implicit recognition of Israel: First, The Egyptian-Israeli peace treaty of 1979 under the auspices of the U.S.A. The treaty changed significantly the regional balance of power in favor of Israel the treaty ushered by depriving the Arabs, and the Palestinians in particular, the most militarily powerful state that could challenge Israel and deter its
aggression (Farsoun and Zacharia 1997: 203). Moreover, the provisions of the treaty on the Palestinian question endorsed Israel’s –particularly the Likud- vision that espoused creating Palestinian autonomy within populated areas in the OPT (autonomy over the population not the land). Second, Israeli invasion of Lebanon in 1982 that led to the departure of the PLO from Lebanon and to moving its headquarter to Tunisia while the most of the military infrastructure of the Palestinian organizations and the PLO was depilated and the remnants of it were dispersed in different Arab states. Now the balance of power between Israel and the PLO witnessed a new level of asymmetry in favor of Israel. The military threat of the PLO through the Lebanese borders was curtailed to a large extent and the political viability of the PLO and its ability to maintain relevancy were significantly undermined.

The rapid decline of the PLO contributed to the PLO unified acceptance of the Fez Arab League summit peace plan of 1983. The plan specified the terms for achieving peace in the Middle East as the establishment of an independent Palestinian state in the WB and GS. It also confirmed the right of all states, including the proposed Palestinian state, to live in peace and security (Ibid p203). The Arab peace initiative virtually adopted the basic elements of the Saudi King Fahd’s ‘Eight-Points Plan’ of 1982¹¹⁴. The Fez plan implicitly recognized the state of Israel. Development of this magnitude was welcomed

¹¹⁴ The elements of the plan were familiar, and loosely based on UN Resolutions 242 and 338: Israel to withdraw from 1967-captured territories, including East Jerusalem (but not the whole city), dismantling of settlements, recognition of the PLO as the Palestinian representative, establishment of an independent Palestinian State with Jerusalem as its capital, and secure guarantees of peace. Fahd’s plan was not popular at home with the Saudi intelligentsia, middle class, and clergy who were strongly critical of any proposal that recognized Israel. http://www.palestinefacts.org/pf_1967to1991_fahd_1981.php
by the United States as a breakthrough while rejected by Israel who was at the time battling its way on the Lebanese soil to reach Beirut.

Israeli continuous military invasion of Lebanon undercut the Fez peace plan. However, the consequences of PLO departure from Lebanon were yet to be translated into more shifts in Palestinian political behavior in the same direction. The 16th PNC meeting in February 1983 accepted the Fez peace plan as the minimum requirement for Arab political strategy; it also noticed the positive aspects of President Regan plan for peace that he initiated at the wake of the Lebanese war. However, the PNC dismissed Regan plan as inadequate for achieving a just and durable solution for the Palestinian cause. Israeli and U.S.A ignorance of the Fez peace initiative and PLO new stance coupled with the deterioration of PLO in this period and the financial crisis it endured pushed the leadership, Yassir Arafat and Fateh in particular to seek a political and diplomatic revival. For this leadership sustaining the PLO as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people had become an end in itself and sustaining its role as an accepted player in the region became a priority. Ignoring internal huge opposition\textsuperscript{115}, Arafat continued his diplomatic endeavor and reached an agreement with King Husain of Jordan.

\textsuperscript{115} PLO sense of threat on its own survival and political relevancy as a main actor in region’s politics can be noticed in the language and the substance of the 16th PNC decisions. The PNC stressed “the rejection of all plans that aim at undermining PLO right in representing the Palestinian people” and reiterated the centrality of sustaining “the independent Palestinian decision” (Official website of the PNC). In 1983-4 the PLO was divided as never before; the internal consequences of PLO strategic shift after 1982 were manifested in polarizing political forces along the entire spectrum of Palestinian factions and organizations within and outside the PLO. The PFLP, DFLP, and other factions formed the Democratic Alliance that opposed Arafat’s leaning towards Jordan and advocated a policy of alliance with Syria. However, they maintained their position of sustaining the unity of the PLO. The PFLP-General Command of Ahmad Jebriel, the Palestinian Popular Struggle Front (PPSF), Fateh defectors (the Revolutionary Council) and the Sa’iqa (all of which Syria’s allies) formed the “National Alliance” and rejected the PLO under Arafat’s leadership. Arafat and Fateh remained the major block in the PLO (Pearlman 2011: 90).
in 1984. Amman Accord announced Jordan-PLO a comprehensive peace in exchange for withdrawal from the OPT. The Accord deepened the chasm within the PLO; all opposition organization apart from the DFLP and the West Bank-based Communist party (later on the Palestinian People’s Party PPP) came to form the “Palestinian National Salvation Front” as the alternative to the PLO. For those Arafat’s explicit acceptance of the two-state solution was nothing less than treason. The main opposition organizations, the DFLP and the PFLP boycotted the next meeting of the PNC that rectified Amman Accord. The PLO would remain divided and the PNC wouldn’t be assembled again until 1987 when the Palestinian intifada in the OPT erupted; the later development was another turning point in the history of the PLO and the Palestinian strategic political thinking.

*The intifada: restoring ethno-territoriality*

The accumulated experiences of the national movement in the OPT and Israeli occupation policies created the background for the revival of Palestinian nationalism. One of the main consequences of Israel’s occupation is that it rekindled national awareness of those Palestinians who became under its direct military rule as a people bound to other Palestinians in Israel and the Diaspora with a distinguished connection. They are not any more the ‘Arabs’ Israel expelled and dispossessed, now they reemerge under Israeli oppression as nationalist and patriot Palestinians (Sadi 1992: 137) whose self-consciousness re-emerged and consolidated particularly in the face of Israeli negation and ignorance. This consciousness had been gradually translated to political actions in the OPT, as we discussed earlier, by early 1970s. Israeli policies and regional developments abovementioned drove people en mass to identify with the PLO and
different factions under its umbrella. Socio-economic transformations of the Palestinian society in the OPT that sprung from Israeli policies contributed significantly to the rise of nationalism: Robinson (1997) notices that Palestinian labor in Israeli market and employees’ remittances from expatriate and refugee Palestinians in the Gulf raised living standards for many Palestinians. Real GDP increased by 1119.5 percent in the WG and 86.4 percent in the GS from 1967-1987.

These changes undermined the traditional social base of affiliation; conservative and patron-client social structures waned and replaced with growing middle-class configurations. Inequality, Palestinian labor working conditions in Israel, subjugating Palestinians to oppression and taxes…etc created a ripe soil for political activism and militancy against Israel’s occupation. The mobilization effort and success gave the movement more confidence and opened the eyes of the exile leadership on the crucial role of mass mobilization and organization in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. Fateh, following the example effort of leftist organizations, had involved in the establishment of mass organizations for students, women, workers, artisans, teachers…etc. Mobilizing the masses through these politically-oriented and top-down-led organizations in the 1970s and 1980s had created the organizational structure within which the intifada of 1987 took place. The role of the “inside” (Ad-Dakhil) is not any more perceived in terms of steadfastness but also as crucial in resistance to occupation through direct actions and militancy (Pearlman 2011: 96). Although factionalization and rivalry of the PLO were transferred to these popular frameworks as Younis (2000: 168) notices, the pressure and daily confrontation with Israeli system mitigated the effects of fragmentation. The
flourishing mass organizations contributed to the rise of democratic norms of leadership and participation that gave the movement more political relevance and strength in challenging Israeli domination and rule by establishing the power of people. Gaining a political and moral leverage over Israel’s occupation would reach its peak in 1987 with the onset of the Intifada.

This pattern of national mobilization and political militancy was deepened in response to main two events that ignited Palestinian protest: the Israeli-Egyptian Camp David peace treaty and Israeli invasion of Lebanon in 1982. The Camp David peace treaty sidelined the Palestinian question and reduced the rights of the Palestinians to mere “autonomy” (or self-rule) over the population. By ignoring the PLO Israel, Egypt, and the U.S.A stroke a deal on behalf of the Palestinians while excluding their representative. Thus the Palestinian question was left to Israeli own discretion. Palestinians were left to the Likud aggressive colonial policies were escalated as Begin now had a free hand to conquer his ideological precepts. Israel colonial machine, now under the supervision of Erik Sharon (a minister in Begins Cabinet), was unleashed to construct a network of by-pass roads, settlements, and military bases on the purpose of confining Palestinians. Ultimately, this process was creating a continuous Zionist presence in the OPT and a discontinuous Palestinian existence. Autonomy plan coupled with Likud’s colonial offensive left in the minds of the Palestinians that the autonomy could never become anything more than a carefully regulated, minutely controlled reservation for confining them, and an authority on Palestinian nationalism…for eliminating their national aspirations” (Said 1997: 207).
It further created a sense of abandonment and neglect by the most powerful Arab state that was until recently the vanguard of Arab nationalism and Palestinian rights. The treaty triggered a wave of demonstrations that Israeli security forces curbed forcefully; killing protesters, imposing curfews, and mass arrests were used to silence the protest.

Related to the Camp David treaty, as Begin felt the free hand and taking the opportunity of sidelining the Egyptian balancing power, Israel initiated its war on the PLO in Lebanon in 1982. Accompanied the war an Israeli massive and harsh oppression in the OPT against the GNC and the upheaval that erupted in protest of Israeli military assault in Lebanon. As we discussed above, the war left the PLO in a political and organizational debacle that was exacerbated by the divisions within its ranks. Arab political and financial support to the PLO also declined significantly in the years following the war\(^\text{116}\): the Arab summit of 1987 ignored the Palestinian issue altogether in its deliberations. It was the first time since the establishment of the Arab League in 1945 that the Palestinian question did not dominate the Arab political agenda, which alarmed the Palestinians especially the PLO for the necessity to take action in order to restore its status as major player in the region. These developments positioned the OPT as the main arena for the PLO to reconstruct its political viability and to revive Palestinian ability to sustain the Palestinian question as a core, if not the core issue in the turbulent Arab region in the 1980s.

\(^{116}\) The decline of Arab financial support to the PLO can be seen as a result of the economic crisis of the 1980s that stemmed from the decline of oil prices; oil prices that plummeted from a high of $42 per barrel in 1982 to $8 in 1986. Arab and world exporting countries were in serious economic retrenchment and recession. PLO main source of financial aid was seriously decreased. Moreover, Arab regimes were preoccupied with Egypt’s exit from the Arab politics and Arab league following its peace treaty with Israel and the Iraqi-Iran war. Lebanese continuing civil war was still a main issue in Arab politics. All these issues contributed to the Arab position in the summit (Farsoun and Zacharia 1997: 204).
Palestinian vigilance and willingness to mobilize and organize in the OPT following the political objectives of the PLO was the last resort of the PLO leadership now operating from Tunisia; a decisive challenge that required restoring the movement’s unity and political/diplomatic relevance. The split in the PLO following Amman Accord and the devastating internal armed conflict within Fateh left the whole movement in disarray (Younis 2000: 162). In short, the very legitimacy of the PLO was on stack. Under these conditions reliance on the role of the Palestinians in the OPT became paramount, which entailed shifting the emphasis and political and operational energies from the Diaspora to the interior (ad-dakhil). The shift changed the political map of the conflict whereby the main arena of confrontation would be inside Palestine\textsuperscript{117}. The 18th meeting of the PNC in April 1987 -5 months before the eruption of the intifada- restored the unity of the PLO especially after dismissing Amman Accord. Retaining Palestinian consensus on the challenges and objectives of the struggle in this period reawakened the PLO and reinforced its popular support among the Palestinians especially in the OPT. The meeting reassured the “commitment to achieving the immutable national rights of the

\textsuperscript{117} From my own observation of the atmosphere in the OPT in the mid 1980s as an undergrad in An-Najah National University in the city of Nablus and a political activist I can register the euphoria of national revival. The war in Lebanon, and particularly Israel’s siege of Beirut and the heroic resistance of the Palestinian factions and PLO and the Lebanese nationalist forces ignited the masses in the OPT. The image of Palestinian freedom fighters in Lebanon captured the minds and hearts of the people and provoked action. PLO’s debacle in Lebanon and Arab silence while Beirut was under Israeli assault especially in the wake of the massacre in the Palestinian refugee camps of Sabra and Shatila had outraged people and created a fertile soil for mobilization and recruitment. Simultaneously, Israeli occupation authorities launched a massive security campaign to undercut the increasing wave of nationalism; arrests on a large scale, house demolishing, curfews were deployed. Collective punishment had become the norm especially in response to stone-throwing and cocktail bomb attacks. In 1985 Israel revived the efficacy of the British emergency law of 1945 that gives local military commanders wide range of jurisdiction to enact all kinds of procedures against the population including shutting down schools and universities. The latter were targeted in specific for students’ leading role in the events. Relying on the 1945 law Israel detained and deported 10s of activists and kept hundreds under Administrative Detention for indefinite periods of time. Israel’s draconian measures only increased resentment and willingness to militant confrontation among increasing numbers of Palestinians especially the youth.
Palestinian people”. It also reconfirmed that “the PLO is the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people” and the rejection of intervening in Palestinian own affairs and/or the attempts to create an alternative to the PLO. Alluding to the Camp David treaty, the PNC reiterated the rejection of UN resolution 242 and all other plans that aim at the liquidation of the Palestinian cause\textsuperscript{118}.

Thus the moment was ripened in 1987 for a mass uprising. The intifada itself reflected the overwhelming sense of unity and political strength generated by the restoration of Palestinian common goal as the achievement of national self-determination. The degree of organization and militancy of the intifada gave the Palestinian national movement the first and most important achievement since the 1948: it gained political leverage over Israel. Israel was not able to curb the uprising regardless of the extreme measures it took, which raised questions within Israeli polity and society on the political, moral and economic costs of upholding the occupation…It became clear that the existing forms of control were not producing the desired calm and that another strategy was needed” (Gordon 2008: 169).

Political leverage the Palestinians gained was primarily and to a large extent the result of the convergence of Palestinian struggle against Israel’s occupation. Convergence was evident on two main levels: political and organizational.

On the political level the intifada reaffirmed the oneness of the Palestinian people in Palestine and the Diaspora under the leadership of the PLO. Thus it gave credibility and vibrancy to the PNC resolutions few months before its onset. Slogans and periodic

\textsuperscript{118} For details on the PNC decisions in 1987 visit http://www.palestinepnc.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=558&Itemid=345&lang=ar
communiqué of the National United Leadership of the Intifada (NULU) stressed the Palestinian people’s right in self-determination, the right of return and the establishment of an independent Palestinian state in the OPT. The NULU also reasserted that the PLO is the sole and legitimate representative of the Palestinian people; this was the consensus as 90 percent of the Palestinians in the OPT claimed the PLO as their representative according to polls (Pearlman 2011: 101). These objectives and proclamations echoed the pillars of the PLO strategy thus far. The NULU expressed the popular will of the vast majority of the Palestinians in the WB and GS who demanded an end to the Israel’s military occupation of their land. The intifada united the “inside”, the “outside”, the factions, the society en mass, and the political leadership behind single and clearly articulated demands for the first time.

On the organizational level the intifada turned almost instantly from outrageous upheaval to a very well organized effort with levels of command and popular institutions under the NULU. The ability of NULU to establish the organizational elements of the uprising was not surprising taking into account the years of mobilization and organization of popular committees and organizations, as we discussed above. In the words of Joost Hilterman who was in the city of Ramallah at the time remarkable… that the entire population could be mobilized simultaneously, and however, NULU was remarkable in terms of its ability to create a vertical hierarchy that encompassed the main components of PLO factions in the OPT (Ftaeh, PFLP, DFLP, PPP) and prominent social figures.

A horizontal structure for popular participation and organization was established by constructing the “Popular Committees of the Intifada” (PC) in every city, village, refugee camp, and in neighborhoods within these residential areas. Thus the NULU,
being in direct connection with PLO leadership in Tunisia, brought the “outside” with the “inside” in one organizational process. Moreover the NULU was not only the legitimate leadership and the “highest law of the land” but also it devolved decision making to “Popular Committees” to choose their own members and to carry activities within the broader political and programmatic framework of the NULU.

Ultimately, the vigor with which the NULU and the “Popular Committees” led the intifada “inspired and was inspired by an invigorate sense of collective purpose in society. A society that participated in the intifada through the PCs in defiance campaigns, street demonstrations, displaying national symbols, general strikes, boycotting Israeli goods, social solidarity activities, civilian protection and security groups…etc, had shown exceptional ability to sustain and redraw the geographical politics of the conflict as a struggle for national-territorial self-determination on the OPT. Images of Israeli soldiers breaking the bones of Palestinian protesters, and youth throwing stones in confrontation with heavily armed Israeli troops captured media outlets all over the world and generated a sweeping movement of solidarity with the Palestinian cause. From the Palestinian perspective moment seemed ripen for a political breakthrough to take advantage of this unique change of the political balance of power.

One Year through the intifada the PNC was called for an extraordinary meeting in Algeria mid November 1988. Resolutions taken by 18th PNC conference (The 19th in some sources that do count the Amman meeting of 1985) (The Session of the Intifada,
National Independence, and the Martyr Khalil Al Wazir\textsuperscript{119} were a landmark in terms of the extent to which PLO was willing to reach in the dubbed “Palestinian Peace Offensive”. As the name given to the conference suggests PLO transformation to an independence movement was the hallmark of the peace offensive. In addition to the “Declaration of Independence” that the meeting issued it recognized UN resolutions 242 and 338 and the ‘Land for Peace’ formula proclaiming the state of Palestine with the occupied territories as its patrimony and East Jerusalem as its capital. The image of Yassir Arafat in the midst of a storm of applause declaring “…in the name of God and the name of the Arab-Palestinian people we declare the establishment of the state of Palestine on our Palestinian land…” conquered the headlines and Palestinian zeal in the OPT reached a climax. The Palestinian new position included an implicit recognition of Israel that is embedded in the UN resolutions 242 and 338, and called for an international conference under the auspices of the UN to settle the conflict in the ME. The PNC was clear in the demand for Israeli withdrawal from the OPT and to annul Jewish settlements and all other forms of annexation in the OPT (PNC official website).

In effect the PNC also recognized the UN Partition resolution of 1947. Factions and organizations who opposed PNC new policy, especially the PFLP maintained their position for the record but abided by the majority and refrained from defecting the PLO.

\textsuperscript{119}Khalil al-Wazir (Abu Jihad) was one of the founding leaders of Fateh and considered to be the Second in ranking following Yassir Arafat. Abu Jihad was known as one of the most talented military commanders and has led the Fateh’s most important armed brigades, AL-Qita` al-Gharbi (The Western Sector) that was specialized in armed attacks inside Palestine. Israeli intelligence affiliated the man with the eruption of the intifada. In addition to his history in armed struggle Israel assassinated al-Wazir in his mansion in Tunisia on April 16 1988. Israeli commandos were deployed on the Tunisian shores headed by Ihud Barak stormed the house and carried the killing. His assassination stirred a wave of rage and anger in the OPT where the intifada was already in its heyday. For the Palestinians Israel aimed at cutting off the intifada by removing one of its masterminds. Massive demonstrations were launched in every corner of the WB and GS and Israel imposed curfew on almost the entire OPT.
The meeting authorized the Executive Committee of the PLO and Chairman Arafat to pursue and exhaust diplomatic initiatives in order to give the Palestinian offensive international and regional efficacy and momentum. Arafat and PLO legitimacy was as high as never before: the PNC reunited the PLO and gave Arafat a free hand to seek diplomacy and the support from the OPT and the NULU galvanized his position. Soon thereafter, and depending on the Palestinian consensus the PLO issued a joint statement at the close of a meeting with U.S Jewish delegation in Stockholm. The statement further indicates the length to which Arafat took the PNC resolutions. It stated that the both sides agreed to inter into peace negotiations at an international conference under the auspices of the UN; establish the independent state of Palestine and the acceptance the existence of Israel as a state in the region; the PLO declared its rejection and condemnation of terrorism in all its forms including state terrorism; they called for a solution to the Palestinian refugee problem in accordance with international laws and practices and relevant UN resolutions (including right of return or compensation) (Farsoun and Zacharia, 1997 p206).

The Palestinian “Peace Initiative” gave the PLO a new international recognition as more than 100 states recognized the Palestinian state, and Arafat was invited to give a speech to the UN General Assembly. The U.S.A Government denied Arafat a visa and the UN moved the session to Geneva where he addressed the UN reiterating the elements of the Palestinian peace initiative and stressed PLO condemnation of terror.

However, the Palestinian imitative receded for many reasons, the most important among which was Israeli rejection. Israeli government under Yitzhak Shamir and the Likud did not reciprocate. Rather it dismissed the initiative as a mere show of deception by Arafat. The U.S.A followed on the Israeli path and demanded Arafat to abandon ambiguous language and recognize the right of Israel to exist and to renounce terror not
merely to condemn it. Moreover, by the turn of 1990 the intifada was in decline due to Israeli oppression that left its organizational structures in tatters. These developments were followed by the Gulf crisis and the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait that led to the first Gulf war of 1991 in which Yassir Arafat took the Side of Iraq against U.S-led invasion. Arafat’s position pitted Gulf States and U.S against him. Meanwhile, Israeli authorities imposed the extremist security and military measures in the OPT (long term and wide range curfew was imposed and transportation and mobility were impeded and an unprecedented campaign of arrests was carried out) when Iraq was bombarding Israeli cities with long-range missiles. The PLO and the Palestinians found themselves in a precarious position as the war ended with the U.S.-led coalition triumphed at the time when the Soviet Union was collapsing, which marked a dramatic change in international and regional balance of power in favor of the U.S and its allies; Israel being among the those.

The Madrid Peace conference of 1992 was one manifestation of the new power configurations in the region following the Gulf war and ushered the beginning of a new phase of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict under the Palestinian Authority that would become the main outcome of the Oslo peace accords signed by the PLO and Israeli government. This phase strikingly marked the decline of the Palestinian national movement and PLO backtracking even on the independence scheme. The PLO came into terms with Israeli conditions as it accepted to establish a nominal authority that accomplished merely part of the Palestinian national and political rights (as the PLO espoused them), for part of the Palestinian people (those who live in the main cities of the
OPT marked as “A” areas in Oslo agreements), on part of the Palestinian soil (the OPT and particularly parts of the WB and GS), to which we return in the conclusion of this whole part of the study.

To wrap up one may say that the experience of modern Palestinian national movement as represented by the PLO was born within and conditioned by certain structures that shaped its main characteristics and crippled its ability to exert serious challenge to Israel’s domination. The first and most important of which is the consequences of Israel’s success in controlling the entire territory of Palestine in 1948 (expulsion, fragmentation, and dispersion) and 1967 (alienation, exclusion, and exploitation). In the first place Zionist and Israeli exclusionism and the system of colonial segregation they established generated a maximalist Palestinian stance that aimed at abolishing Israel’s aggression and its illegitimate takeover of Palestine. This had resulted in a Palestinian rigid nationalism that sought total reclamation of what was lost namely, homeland.

Israel’s entrenched colonial buffer that it established deprived the Palestinian national movement from the geographical base to engage the domination system of its adversary from within. The rise of a democratic national liberation struggle while the Palestinian community is shuttered and dispersed was hindered by these structural conditions. Although the PLO in the late 1960s adopted a democratic liberation agenda, the limited access it had to the space and geography of Palestine undermined its ability to unify and mobilize the Palestinians in a democratic struggle. Following the 1967 the PLO
suffered another strategic loss that deepened the asymmetrical power relationship between the Palestinians and Israeli rule in favor of the latter. The dynamics of the conflict have consolidated its ethno-nationalist and territorial nature. Two parallel trajectories were in the making: Israel’s territorial maximalist stance, and the PLO’s territorial minimalist demands. The prospects for a democratic struggle were sidelined and a struggle for independence prevailed as the two adversaries consolidated their ethno-national ethos within spatial and territorial boundaries.

The structures of Israeli colonialism, however, do not explain the entire Palestinian shifts in strategy; Palestinian national movement’s own structures and social build-up played a crucial role. The movement and the PLO is the youngest in the Middle East. Time has important implications in this respect in terms of the decision making mechanisms, organizational traditions, and ideological underpinnings; all of which contributed to the peculiar volatility and inconsistency of PLO’s political thinking and shifts of strategic planning. PLO is a coalition of disparate factions led by Arafat. Each of which has its own politics and led by the same manner Arafat led the movement; vertical hierarchy and personified leadership. Fraction and rivalries, the lack of structural and organizational center, and different agendas have undermined the movement ability to adopt a unified blueprint and seek it persistently. Moreover, PLO’s emphasis of the armed struggle had put the political arena of struggle in the second place and with it the role of the masses especially in the main arena of struggle, Palestine. It also postponed the rise of people’s political will and power to engage in a mass organization to turn Israeli occupation into a costly enterprise politically, morally, and economically. The main arena of struggle,
Palestine has not witnessed the emergence of the Palestinian challenge that would have turned the OPT into an ungovernable terrain for Israel until mid-1980s. Downplaying the role of masses and popular resistant contributed to fixating the struggle as between two political entities and henceforth undercut the democratic dimension that could have developed. Perhaps the most important outcome of PLO characteristics and political thinking is the failure to establish the necessary organizational constructs to elevate Palestinian struggle as one people that should have encompassed the Palestinian inside Israeli proper; the absence of this dimension gave Israel the political and legal ability to divorce its Palestinian citizens from the broader movement of Palestinian struggle for liberation. PLO style and political attributes contributed significantly to the development of the conflict in the ethno-territorial direction it took and reached to the point of capitulation for Israel’s terms and conditions in who and how to determine the territorial institutional boundaries of Palestinian independence.

**Israeli exceptionalism**

Systems in general collapse either by internal dynamics of decay, erosion and structural contradictions, or by external effects. In many occasions both effects overlap to lead a system decline especially social systems for the fact that they are interactive and dynamic. Under certain circumstances external effects play an enabling role that reinforces the internal dynamics of change; South African apartheid regime is an example. As Sisk (1995) notices, the apartheid regime collapsed primarily as a result of its own dynamics whereas regional developments (the rise of anti-colonial nationalist regimes in Southern Africa and South Africa’s military adventures) contributed significantly to the
salience of apartheid on international agenda. The latter waged a series of sanctions and boycotts against the regime that changed the decision making environment of the regime. More importantly, international tools of pressure on the regime were diverse and steadily developed to converge in one direction. Except for the United States of America who joined international campaign later on, a front of governmental and non-governmental forces all over the world pooled their effort to de-legitimize the regime in South Africa. In this respect world’s efforts, almost consensus, on the illegitimacy of an ethno-racial regime to which the sole alternative is a unitary democratic no-racial regime also converged with internal struggle seeking the very same objective.

The South African case shows the crucial importance of international convergence on universal principles that overlapped with domestic struggle for the same universal norms namely, the principle and right of self-determination; the impermissibility of racial, ethnic, religious, or any kind of domination; and the prevalence of Human Rights, equality, and universal democracy as the acceptable norms of governance and nation-building. International de-legitimating of the South African regime, although took place against the background of the demise of the Cold War and the changes accompanied it, which created new strategic constellations of global power, was instrumental in the collapse of apartheid.

Obviously, the nature of the international order has changed in post-Cold War era and with it the nature of conflicts and international intervention approach. The willingness of powerful states in the world to intervene in many conflicts has decreased, which has serious implications when it comes to the duration and violence of many
conflicts as Zartman (1997: 5) notices. Spheres of influence that characterized the Cold War and drove superpowers to intervene in order to maintain their respective spheres have changed; regions of importance in the new distribution of world power also changed. Ethnic and civil wars, intrastate disputes, and irredentist movements flourished. International reluctance to intervene poses serious questions: “How much unconstrained conflict and brutality will the international community allow? How widespread is the right of self-determination, and who may claim it?” (Zartman (1997: 5). And more particularly, in the ear of post-totalitarian regimes and the collapse of authoritarianism, how acceptable is the domination of one ethno-national group/people on another ethno-national group/people? In this respect, the Palestinian case is unique; it is the last case (along with Kashmir) to which the decolonization principle of self-determination applies to. It is the most internationalized national liberations case (taking into account heavy international presence in the conflict since 1917 through all phases of the conflict). However, international efforts to solve the conflict only exacerbated its rigidity, and superpowers’ support of one party, Israel impeded the emergence of international consensus or convergence on the requirements to resolve the conflict.

In post-Cold War the Palestinian-Israeli conflict cuts deep into the abovementioned questions. It begs answers to the question: What drives the world of today to legitimate a system of religious ethno-national differentiation namely, Israel’s ethnocracy? And how, in spite of all changes in the structures of the international system Israel has maintained its position as an exception of the universal understanding of inclusive democracy? Parallel to this Israeli source of power and impunity is an ongoing
Palestinian plight having to fight an exceptionally favored regime in the international arena. What is the main source of Israel’s ability to sustain such close ties with international dominating powers and generate identification with the Zionist and Israeli enterprise in Palestine? In spite of major changes in regional and international constellations of power and changes in geopolitical and security configurations Israel maintained its privileged status in the western countries especially in the U.S.A; what accounts for this phenomenon?

First this section examines the peculiar type of relationship between a self-sustained colony with global centers of power. Remarkably, Israel and the Zionist movement succeeded to continuously situate their existence and viability within international power dynamics in the ME as indispensable regional hegemony. The peculiarity of the Israeli quasi-colony is that Israel obtains a high level of autonomy and ability to exert leverage over its sponsors. Among the most important consequences of this type of relationship is the discrepancy between the internationalized nature of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict and the inability of international institutions to intervene effectively to resolve it. Second, we entertain the relationship between the United States of America and Israel as one of the major obstacles to reach a political settlement to the conflict. US policies in regard to the Palestinian-Israeli conflict play a major role in impeding the emergence of a convergent international position and policy that would contribute to the resolution of the conflict. American strategic relationship with Israel contributes significantly to crippling international institutions’ ability to fulfill its role and abide Israel by the resolutions of the UN and provisions of International law pertaining to
the conflict. Ultimately, American support to Israel and shielding it from international intervention put the Palestinians and the PLO in a precarious position facing a powerful strategic alliance that gives their adversary unprecedented impunity. The two considerations we discuss ultimately contributed significantly to the entrenchment of the ethno-national territorial character of the conflict, and consolidated Israel’s self-identification as an ethnocracy, which stands anathema to a democratic outcome of the conflict.

Israel and super-powers: a quasi-colony-metropolis link

The conceptual framework (Chapter II) discussed the peculiar nature of settler-colonial societies as distinct from classic types of military foreign colonization. The former gain life of their own and gradually, usually in a long period of time, they transform into an ethno-national group in and for itself. In this sense their relationship with their metropolis changes and they achieve more independent. French colonizers of Algeria, for example and their adherents in France became a political and institutional power in French politics and succeeded to postpone French withdrawal from Algeria for a long time. The price was heavily bloody, though. In South Africa, the Afrikaner white state although was formally established by Britain, it sought independence from British influence ferociously. Those had been self-sustained settler societies who sought the metropolis political, diplomatic, and military support as autonomous colonies. Self-sufficiency of settlers’ societies had been reinforced and solidified systematically by
asserting sovereignty and righteousness vis-à-vis the external world and segregation vis-à-vis the native nations they conquered.

The case of Israeli is peculiar in this respect. The Zionist movement was not a colonial settler society that belongs to the colonizing power citizens. Rather, British preferred the Zionist movement to colonize Palestine and the Zionist movement brought Jewish immigrants from all over Europe and molded them (or milted them) into one religious ethno-national group. Although, Zionism relied on British support and legitimation (recall that the Balfour Declaration was the first and most important juridical basis of Zionist claims in Palestine) Zionist Jews did not hesitate to turn against Britain once the latter showed reluctance to allow more Jewish immigration. Zionism at this point was turning its energy to the U.S.A, the rising global power. This reorientation of international strategy was consolidated following World War II and resituated Israel within the new world order as a western fortress in the face of the communist threat and nationalist sentiments.

Zionist movement and the state of Israel have waged the struggle for their purposes in the international arena with the same, if not more persistent and importance, they gave to their efforts in Palestine. Zionist leader, Chaim Weizmann is a leading example, realized that their objective should be raised and planted in the interests and moral identification in the great capitals of the western countries (Farsoun and Zacharia 1997: 322). Zionist most prominent thinkers such as Moses Hess, Theodor Herzl, and Joachim Prinz (see page 27-8) submit that Zionism is to be carried out by the Jews themselves with the assistance and support of major European powers. They argued that
Zionist plans for Palestine would reinforce European powers’ position in the ME. Zionism, in this sense was presented as a colonial agent that would mediate between European civilization and the backward region by establishing Zionism as a Jewish entity. Thus European powers’ most crucial complicity with Zionism was nurturing the perspective by which Palestine, a territory outside the metropolitan Europe was declared empty and available to white European settlers to civilize it. Two factors were functional for the ability of Zionism and Israel to fit within the western global dynamics of power, colonization and most recently with U.S.A. hegemony: presenting Zionism as a national liberation movement that conforms to the liberal ideas of Europe and the U.S.A, and Israel’s democratic discourse and it’s the notion of Israel’s indispensability for the protection and existence of the Jewish people. We turn now to each of these two factors.

First: Zionist movement introduced itself as a national liberation and anti-colonial movement that was fighting the British colonial rule and a minor penniless residue of Arabs. The struggle against the wishes and the rights of the indigenous population was suppressed and concealed from western nations whereas notions of higher purpose and civilization were emphasized. Zionist discourse and justifications for colonizing Palestine conformed to European colonial precepts. We noticed earlier the European colonial element of the Zionist enterprise in Palestine. The extension of the colonial logic relied particularly on argument pertaining to the idea of a “higher more worthy, more modern, more fitting interest, cause, or mission” (Said 1992: 15) that supersedes the indigenous Palestinian existence and the right of native Palestinians. The higher interest was not only Zionism’s but as well British. In the Words of Balfour himself promising Palestine for
Jewish Homeland serves interests that render indigenous rights and opinion irrelevant: “…in Palestine we do not propose even to go through the form of consulting the wishes of the present inhabitants of the country” (Quoted in Said 1992:16).

This discourse overlaps, as Tilley (2005) remarks with the history of the Jewish problem in Europe and the USA that is still producing some hard self-critique in these countries as a result of the atrocities perpetrated against the Jews in the first half of the Twentieth century. Western and especially European powers’ long-standing moral deficit vis-à-vis Jews is one of the main sources of these countries’ exceptional treatment to Israel. Even before the Holocaust, opposing Zionist appeal for the reconstruction of Palestine as a Jewish homeland would have been considered anti-Semitic especially after the advent of fascism. Taking into account that Zionism not only linked its objective to colonial justifications (claiming Palestine as a backward and uninhibited territory) but also as the place where Jews could reestablish their unique historical linkages with their promised land. In this sense Zionist ideas resonate to the Christian-ethnic and religious belief that Palestine is a biblical land plays an important role in the support Israel receives in these countries. Palestine for Millions of Christians in the West is a proto-Christian terrain, and the Jewish people of Israel is seen as the carriers of the Judeo-Christian values and therefore nullifying the indigeneity of other religious or ethnic peoples lived or living in Palestine.

Zionist enterprise in Palestine fits neatly with the precepts and justifications of white colonialism of Northern America in particular. Clearly, Zionist propaganda conformed to the same mentality that motivated and drove white settler-colonial practices.
in these areas. Indeed, Zionism and Israel “enjoyed an astonishing dominance in matters of scholarship, political discourse, international presence, and valorization” (Said 1992: xiv). However, propaganda does not create states and nations; it did not establish Zionism and Israel as well but it enabled diffusion the ideas on Zionist-Jewish successes as a pioneering movement, with exceptional institutional and moral enthusiasm that turned Palestine into a blossoming land. This Jewish model plays a crucial role in the perceptions of the western nations on Palestine, particularly in the Anglo-Saxon culture and mentality. American people, as a society of pioneering settlers find it easy to identify with the Zionist model. Suppressing Arab Palestinian existence and social, cultural, and laborious life in their land has been part of the diffusion of the idea of ‘higher purpose’ of Zionism that corresponds to the White colonialism in Northern America that applied the same diffusion of ideas about Native Americans that accompanied and justified the destruction of native civilizations in the USA and Canada. In Northern America, as in Central and Southern America, white

pioneering colonialism seeks to exclude and eliminate the native inhabitants rather than to occupy and exploit them….it is a form of colonialism that offers refuge to the disinh erited, to persecuted minorities and to the surplus, marginals, and misfits created by industrialism and modernization in the metropolis” (Ahmad 2006: 303).

The epistemology of colonial settler enterprise that negates the native Palestinians and seeks to suppress their existence resonates with the colonial past of the Europeans within Europe and in the Western hemisphere.

The idea of higher purpose turned to be that the Jewish ought to rule in Palestine as a distinct, and indeed exceptional, religious ethnic-national people. In essence, British
and Zionist agreement on the irrelevance of the indigenous and “downplaying them as somehow secondary and negligible” (Said 1992) remained a core element in the Western world and particularly in USA policy towards the Palestinians. Supplanting the Zionist movement as its institutional expression, the state of Israel has become the supreme focus of the west and the U.S.A. Thus, western countries not only created the state of Israel but also pledged to its survival and strength until the current day.

The prevalence of the Zionist discourse in the west yielded its most important fruits in 1948; UN recognition of the state of Israel ignored totally demographical facts and social and ethnic texture of Palestine. When Israel was declared a state, Jewish immigrants and the Zionists legally owned 6 percent of the land. These facts seemed irrelevant from an Occidental point of view that distinguishes European colonial mentality; the natives as backward, less human, less valuable, and their rights are inferior to those of the European settler and to the Zionists as bearers of European civilization. In essence UN resolution legitimized state and nation building that was an anachronism: legitimating a settler-colonial society as an ethno-national sovereign state in the era of decolonization. This brings us to the second point, Israel.

Second, international position and political discourse especially in the West spring, at least partially, from the ability of the Zionist movement to link its legitimacy with the existence of the Jewish state as a prerequisite to prevent genocidal intents against the Jews people. Israel’s “right to exist” and Israel’s security” represent the overarching mantra under which Israeli exceptionalism is being justified. This linkage underlies the argument that criticizing Israel undermines the legitimacy of Jewish people’s right to
exist and defend itself, therefore “either a Jewish state will survive or Jewish annihilation will follow” (Tilley 2005: 133).

Jewish history in Europe plays a major role in this connection; persecution of the Jews, discrimination they endured, and the Holocaust generated a paradigm within which Zionism was equated to Jewish survival, and Israel equated with sanctuary. Criticizing either Israel or Zionism can easily be considered anti-Semitic. Israel’s legitimacy and exceptional status it enjoys in the western world relies heavily on the epistemological underpinnings we presented as they pertain to liberalism. The ability of Zionism and the state of Israel to conceal its racist character, its expansionist colonial endeavor, and its ethno-religious nationalist tenets originate primarily from Israel’s image as a democratic regime fighting an insurgence movement, and then a terrorist menace, rather than a national movement seeking national self-determination. At different turning point of the history of the Palestinian-Israel conflict, Israel, Zionist movement, and their adherents invoked the infamous mantra: “Israel is the only democracy in the Middle East”; the only regime that conforms and identifies with western values in the desert of Islamic and Arab dictatorship. Thus, “Zionism and Israel were associated with liberalism, with freedom and democracy, with knowledge and light with what “we” [in the West] understand and fight for” (Said 1992: 29). To be sure, Israel is the only state that can claim a religious-ethnic identity and a liberal democratic. In both accounts there is no room for non-Jews who cannot afford liberalism and democracy.

The extent to which Israeli political system could be considered Western democracies plays a crucial role in justifying their policies towards their adversaries. As a
majority in domination, Israel established its political system as a liberal democracy; for Jews only though as we discussed earlier. The most important consequence of this identification has been shielding Israel against comparisons. Israeli exceptionalism, in this sense, becomes clearer as many Israeli and Zionist leaders supported by allies in the West defy the comparability of Israeli domination over the Palestinians with other systems of domination elsewhere where ethnically and racially based nation and state building was rejected and defeated. International tolerance of Israeli nationhood as essentially a

permanent Jewish-national domination over state institutions and governance within a territorial state...ha[s] rendered the Israeli-Palestinian conflict uniquely resistant to peacemaking methods applied elsewhere” (Tilley 2005: 134).

In comparison to other conflicts that have settler-colonial origins; charged with rival discourses of idegeneity; characterized with mutual ethnic or racial fears; and have similar structures of deep domination and discrimination, international powers accept Israeli ethno-religious domination over Palestinians while pushed for a democratic solution in other cases such as South Africa and Northern Ireland. The castigation of the South African apartheid by global powers targeted its fundamental underpinnings of white domination as an ominous extension of racism; it challenged the foundation of the state and its moral standing. In contrast, Zionist and Israeli system of apartheid had been legitimized and justified by international acceptance of the very foundation of Israel as a Jewish state.
Consequences of Israeli exceptionalism

This research assesses the implications and consequences of Israel’s exceptionalism in terms of its quasi-colony correspondence with western global powers and more particularly with American hegemony in world politics especially U.S. Middle East foreign policy. The linkages and privileged status of Zionism and the state of Israel in the west turned them by choice, and necessity into an appendage, or a quasi colony for the USA following the decline of Britain and especially after 1967 as we discuss below. Israel has turned into a major actor in strategic calculations of western superpowers starting with Britain, and then for a short period of time with France in the 1950s. In the wake of 1967 war Israel emerged as a main ally to the rising superpower; the United States of America. As we discuss below, American foreign policy in the ME would develop steadily in congruence with the development of the ally with Israel. The primary outcome of this development has been more marginalization of the Palestinians and their national movement that, within US policy, turned into a burden not an actor. Developing the ally with the USA, Israel has deepened its reliance on a metropolis assistant and support.

However, the quasi-colony position of Israel and its increased dependent of American economic, financial, political, military, and diplomatic backup implied that Israeli policies would be constrained generally by U.S. requirements and considerations. However, on the Palestinian question American administrations have shown a striking acceptance of Israel’s conditions and terms for a settlement of the conflict. Thus the U.S. rebuffed all Arab and PLO peace initiatives in 1970s and 1980s and in 2000s for these
initiatives recognized Palestinian people’s rights; included a certain level of international intervention in the form of international conferences or referring to UN resolutions. The quasi-colony relationship that links Israel with its sponsor, the U.S is part of the system of power and hegemony the U.S. established in the region, which gave Israel the ability to practice political leverage over U.S. policies in specific issues especially the Palestinian question regardless of considerations of international law or international community political will.

The governments of Israel have long been assertive in defying external pressure and international law, and have shown a great deal of insensitivity to international critics to their policies. This stance is congruent with domestic policies, namely treating all outsider parties as hostile; a policy that has proven to be domestically productive. By refusing to compromise and by rebuffing international castigation and demands for recognizing Palestinian right of national self-determination Israel produced a warrant of its own value: the righteousness of Israel and Jewish people are denounced and attacked by the unrighteous who seek the destruction of Israel and the Jewish people.

A major consequence of Israel’s ability to correspond its existence and strategic importance to superpowers hegemony in the region and thus its ability to defy international law, norms, and rules is that the role of international institutions in resolving the Arab-Israeli conflict in general and the Palestinian question in particular was reduced to a mere arena for demonstrating norms and ideals of international law and universal principles. Western, and especially U.S support of Israel’s rejectionist behavior has crippled UN ability to act and granted Israel a certain degree of impunity against
international intervention and universal norms including UN Charter itself. In particular, rejecting relevant international conventions and international law provisions that apply to the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, particularly the Fourth Geneva Convention of 1949 deprived the Palestinians from a crucial source of strength facing a powerful foe.

Thus while international community (except Israel) gave South African apartheid the cold shoulder and refused to recognize the Bantustans as independent political entities (Sisk 2010) this community took sidelines watching Israel turning the OPT into Bantustans and isolated enclaves. In Israel-Palestine, there is a long history of warm world support for the concepts of territorial partition and ethno-religious separation. The UN formally endorsed partition in 1947, and today every major effort to bring peace to Israel-Palestine or engender amity between its peoples is predicated upon the two-state solution that endorses the ethnic-territorial foundation of Israel. More to the point, the international community in the Oslo era including the “Quartet” of the US, the European Union, Russia and the UN secretariat is promoting a peace process that calls for neither a complete Israeli withdrawal from all territories occupied in 1967 nor the dismantlement of the bulk of the settlements built since then. Nor it endorses or calls for a democratic one state thus it has given its blessing to the idea of a non-contiguous Palestinian entity on parts of the OPT.

The linkages between Israel and the existence of the Jewish people have never been expanded and stretched the way they became in the 1990s and 2000s where Israel’s security justifies apartheid. Israel’s segregation wall and Israel’s blockade on Gaza are two striking examples of international community’s acceptance of Israel’s expansionism
and aggression. The US harshly rejected the 2004 advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice against the wall in East Jerusalem and the West Bank on the grounds that the wall is a necessary and legitimate means of deterring Palestinian attacks on Israel, a defense it extends to checkpoints, restrictions on Palestinian freedom of movement, home demolitions, extrajudicial executions and other violations of international law. Most dramatically, the US, with the tacit backing of European and Arab allies, has eagerly enforced the years-long siege on Gaza and acquiesced in several Israeli assaults upon the territory, including the egregious Operation Cast Lead over the winter of 2008-2009. Thus slicing the OPT and the amputation of Gaza doesn’t seem to the international community as an impediment to the establishment of “viable Palestinian state” as Julie Peteet contends. These remarks bring us to the last and most important source of Israel’s impunity and exceptionalism in international arena namely, Israeli-United States relationship. This relationship stands as a huge challenge to the Palestinians who have to find an answer to the question: How to succeed against a regime that has been able to sustain legitimacy through the pretense of democracy; the image of victim, and the unconditional support of the most powerful state in the world?

U.S.-Israeli strategic ally from the perspective of Palestinian rights

The strategic relationship between Israel and the U.S.A in terms of its determinants and regional and international implications is beyond the scope and purposes of our inquiry. Rather we focus on the underpinnings and consequences of this relationship in so far as it pertains to the Palestinian-Israeli conflict and particularly to Palestinian people’s rights in self-determination, ending Israeli occupation, and
compelling Israel to abide by international law and international community’s will as presented by UN resolutions and peace initiatives. Although regional and international implications of the Israeli-American ally overlaps with its repercussions on the conflict, we focus our attention on the latter while incorporating the broader implications of regional considerations.

Our main task is to show how the unprecedented American support of Israel has established an institution of rejectionist policy of all initiatives to realize a political settlement to the conflict that accommodate Palestinian rights. The U.S. has rejected any initiative that doesn’t meet Israel’s own conditions and terms even though such rejectionist policy has compromised America’s own interests in some instances. As Mearsheimer and Walt, (2006:1) contend

For the past several decades, and especially since the Six Day War in 1967, the centerpiece of U.S. Middle East policy has been its relationship with Israel… This situation has no equal in American political history. Why has the United States been willing to set aside its own security in order to advance the interests of another state?”

By the same token, U.S. exceptional support to Israel flies in the face of international efforts to establish a consensus or at least a convergent position on the accepted requirements for a peace settlement of the conflict. The Obstructionist role the U.S. played to impede international and Arab convergence has resulted in Israeli increased intransigent position, which enabled it to sustain, maintain and consolidate its colonial settler grip on the OPT. Moreover, America’s unconditional support to Israel helped the latter to turn its demands from the Palestinians into international prerequisites and thus creating a convergence that subjugate the Palestinians to Israel’s terms. Ultimately, this
state of affairs also obstructed the necessary conditions for the establishment of a
sovereign Palestinian state on the OPT and simultaneously reinforced Israeli self-
identification as a Jewish, ethnocratic state which stands as a structural hindrance against
the emergence of a democratic resolution of the conflict.

United States’ presence in the region developed into a paramount priority that
turned it into institutional presence as early as the 1956 Triad War that included Israel,
Britain, and France allied against Egypt. The U.S.A, realizing the increased importance
of the region in the Cold War and its natural resources especially oil had driven
Eisenhower’s administration to exert a significant pressure of the allied states to cease
fire and withdraw their forces (Rogan 2009: 283-285). Following the Arab-Israeli war of
1967 American presence as Said (1992: xv) notices, was coupled with cementing the
strategic ally with Israel as tailored by the Nixon administration and consolidated during
Regan’s administration.

The Nixon Administration re-supplied Israeli war machine during the October
War and protected Israel from the threat of Soviet intervention while US deep
involvement in the negotiations between the combatants not only ended that war but also
led to the Disengagement agreements that granted Israel a political victory (Mearsheimer,
and Walt 2006: 1). Arab military achievements in this war were circumscribed by U.S.
pressure for a cease fire that reiterated the UN resolution 242 as the basis for resolving
the conflict. In effect American position sidelined the Palestinian rights and shielded
Israel from a diplomatic loss. The strategic alliance between Israel and the United States
was, however, conditioned by the balance of power between USA and the Soviet Union, which granted Israel a strategic role in U.S. containment policy. Israel’s need for U.S support in a hostile region and America’s reliance on Israeli role in the region especially in the face of nationalist movement enabled Israel to obtain monopoly over the Palestinian question.

Thus Israel was able to defy international demands and resolution even when the US holds a different position. In early 1970s, for example, the USA position in regard to the interpretation of UN resolution 242 was close to the European one: 242 implied Israeli withdrawal from all the occupied territories of 1967 with minor and mutual adjustments. The US, as Arthur Goldberg; US ambassador to the UN clarified, asserted on the principle of mutual and minimal adjustments “that would not, of necessity, be detrimental to the Arab states” (Chomsky 1994: 208). Israel refused this principle and defied UN initiative for peace based on 242; Israeli government declared that no withdrawal to the pre-1967 borders will happen. Events and developments of 1970s show clear evidence that the quasi-colony link between Israel and the U.S. gave the former a political leverage over the latter especially on the Palestinian issue. Particularly, U.S. policy in the region would center on achieving Israeli’s supremacy and impunity vis-à-vis its Arab adversaries and especially Palestinians; American diplomats would unconditionally accept Israel’s own terms as U.S imperatives.

Following the war of 1973 and under Nixon-Kissinger’s US policy in the region changed to accommodate Sadat’s regime to conform with US interests. Thus the US accepted Sadat’s peace initiative of 1977 after eliminating its call for recognition of the
Palestinian national rights echoing Israel’s own position. Kissinger’s strategy in the ME as cited by Chomsky (Chomsky 1994: 212-213) aimed to keep the soviets out of the diplomatic arena, “to isolate the Palestinians” so that they would not be a factor in the outcome, and “to break up the Arab united Arab united front” thus allowing Israel “to deal separately with each of its neighbors. The first major success of this policy was the Egyptian-Israeli peace treaty of Camp David in 1978. Although American alliance with Israel in the 1970s coasted U.S. a high price in terms of its relationships with Arab allies; Arab oil embargo during the war of 1973 was provoked primarily by US military and financial back-up to Israel and had triggered economic and financial crisis in the U.S and worldwide.

The main achievement of Camp David peace treaty for Israel and American policy, as Kissinger espoused, was dividing the Arab world and containing Egyptian challenge to Israel. Now Israel not only has the upper hand over Arab adversaries and Palestinians but also neutralized the main source of power that deterred its ability to militarily attack its neighbors. Shortly afterwards Israel invaded Lebanon under the pretext of eliminating PLO threat to Israel northern borders. However, isolating the Palestinians and destroying their political viability was the main aim of the war: taking into account that the PLO was gaining increased international and regional recognition as a result of strategic change it adopted was a source of threat to Israel’s position. Moreover, PLO political position and new agenda of 1974 opened a new venue for a political settlement of the conflict that recognizes Palestinian people’s rights.
Thus in spite of these development U.S. and Israel persistently worked to annul international consensus on the acceptance of a Palestinian state on the OPT that developed in 1970s. In 1976 Arab “confrontation states” (Jordan, Egypt, and Syria) and the PLO proposed a political settlement base on the international consensus and presented to the UN. The proposal reiterated most of the provisions of resolution 242 except for adding the recognition of Palestinian political rights and the establishment of a Palestinian state. Israel showed a strong rejection to the resolution and refused to attend the session that discussed the proposal, and the USA vetoed the proposal in the Security Council and eliminated a serious breakthrough to resolve the conflict. Resorting to the veto turned into a powerful tool to obstruct international role and granted Israel impunity beyond the reach of international instructions, law and conventions. Since 1972 the US has vetoed 71 UN Security Council resolution on the Israeli Palestinian conflict and Israeli policies in the OPT and the region. Those resolutions confirmed the Palestinian people’s right of self-determination, condemn Israel for settlement building in the OPT, condemn Israeli human rights record in the OPT, discuss sovereignty over natural resources in the OPT, concerning the right of displaced Palestinians to return to their homes, concerning Israel’s use of excessive force against the Palestinians, call for the end of Israeli 22 day attack on Gaza in 2009…etc.

This pattern of American-Israel rejection of international initiatives to solve the conflict that doesn’t meet their terms aimed at depriving the Palestinian from the only source of leverage and a reliable reference in their legal, diplomatic, and political struggle against Israel. The pattern also shows a persistent policy in monopolizing diplomatic
arena on which the conflict being treated; Israel and the United States rebuffed all proposals for international conferences, annulled UN attempts to play a significant role as America vetoed almost each Security Council resolution that would empower the UN to take action, and ultimately enabled Israel itself to gain monopoly on the requisites for reaching peace with the Palestinians. The pattern reached a peak in the Oslo process. A cursory look to U.S.A policies toward the Palestinians and the PLO shows that its position has been, to a large extent an extensions to Israeli policy: American administrations rejected to recognize of the PLO at the time when the latter was changing its strategy and gaining regional and international recognition, as we discussed above, it rebuffed all peace initiatives proposed by Arab states and/or international actors, and in 1988 US Secretary of State George Shultz denied Yassir Arafat a visa to inter the US to address the UN. Simultaneously, American authorities required the closing of the Palestinian Observation Mission at UN, which was defeated by in US District Court.

Arafat’s speech to the UN took place in Geneva and presented PLO peace initiative that resulted from the new dynamism created by the Palestinian first intifada. Although Arafat’s initiative was dismissed by Israel and the U.S, the later with the consent of Israeli government accepted to open an informal dialogue with the PLO based on three conditions: that the PLO abandon its call for an international conference included in its initiative, and to stop violence i.e. the intifada as an act of terror against Israel, and that Arafat should not only condemn but also renouncing terror. Humiliating Arafat was the main aim of the policy as George Shultz asserted (Chomsky 1994: 228). Humiliating the PLO leader was accompanied by turning a blind eye to Israel’s brutal
oppression of the Palestinian intifada. Obviously, beyond humiliating Arafat Israel and the U.S. aimed at bringing Palestinians into terms with Israel’s conditions. U.S. representative to the PLO dialogue, Ambassador Robert Pelletreau presented to Arafat what were actually Israel’s conditions as the Israeli semi-official the Jerusalem Post daily stated (Chomsky 1994: 228).

Thus until the eve of the first Gulf war and the collapse of the Soviet Union; the demise of the Cold War, Israel’s quasi-colonial ties with the United States enabled Israeli to maintain its conditions for a political settlement with Arab states, to isolate the PLO and deny Palestinians political and national rights, and to sideline international institutions. This phenomenon among other Israeli successes in diverting U.S. foreign policy in the region poses a question on the immutability of Israeli importance for American national interests and strategy in the Middle East regardless of the international and regional changes. We turn now to the competing explanations of American unprecedented support to Israel and the development of a strategic ally between the two parties. Within the driving forces of this ally we emphasize the dynamics that led to U.S. policies in regard to the peace process between the PLO and Israel and how Israel succeeded to bring the U.S. to accept and defend Israel’s territorial expansionism, the establishment of a segregated apartheid-like system in the OPT, and to turn the OPT into Bantustans that executed the two-state solution.

*Containing the PLO and reducing Palestinian rights 1992-2000s*

For many accredited scholars (E.g. Mearsheimer and Walt 2006, Christinson 2002, Ahmad 2006, Chomsky 1994) Israel’s strategic importance for the USA and the interests
of western powers is not as it had been during the Cold War and especially after the Six Day War of 1967. Israel’s role in the containment strategy against the Soviet Union extended the ability of the US to circumscribe Egypt and Syrian nationalist stance and their close relations with the Communist Block. At the turn of 1990s, as Mearsheimer and Walt (2006) contend Israel’s importance for U.S strategy and national interests has declined especially following its role in the Gulf crises of 1991 and 2003. While in the first instance Israel was a burden and needed US protection and assistance against Iraqi missile attacks, in the second it was told to take the sideline. In both cases Israeli-American special relationship could have jeopardize America’s strategy by provoking Arab resentment and rupturing US-led coalitions against Iraq. Furthermore, Israel’s policies in the OPT at crucial turning points were anathema to US foreign policy, so the argument goes.

After September 11 attacks in the USA American efforts were fully concentrated on building a wide international coalition in its declared war against terror; Arab regimes include. Erik Sharon’s government took the opportunity to wage a sweeping military attack against the PA in the main cities in the OPT. For many Arab regimes, who were facing increased public anti-American sentiments particularly because of Israel’s policies; being part of US aspired coalition could have complicated their participation. Arab regimes announced that “if America wanted Arab support in its fight against Bin Laden’s terrorism, it had first to put an end to the state terrorism of its protégé (Mansour 2002).

Mearsheimer and Walt (2006) and Said (1992) the source of Israeli ability to maintain its relationship with the USA is not due to common strategic interests or moral
imperatives. Rather it derives strength and durability from American domestic politics namely, the effect of the Israeli lobby on American internal politics. As Said (1992: xxiv) puts it “Palestine was a domestic American issue, dominated since 1948, almost without demurral anywhere in the society, by the Israeli lobby” led by the American Israeli Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC). Although the effect of the Israeli lobby is strikingly blunt, understandably, on the Palestinian question it also affects American foreign policy in the whole region where it

…managed to divert U.S. foreign policy as far from what the American national interest would otherwise suggest, while simultaneously convincing Americans that U.S. and Israeli interests are essentially identical” (Mearsheimer and Walt 2006).

While Israel’s actual importance to America’s interests dwindled in the post-Cold War era it maintained an increased level of support by the U.S., which reflects to a large extent the power of Israeli lobby. Mearsheimer and Walt argue persuasively that the four justifications upon which Israeli backers establish their case for an unqualified U.S support to Israel are unfounded. They contend that “Viewed objectively, Israel’s past and present conduct offers no moral basis for privileging it over the Palestinians” and the explanation lies in the unprecedented ability of Israeli lobby to mobilize support. As they put it “Were it not for the Lobby’s ability to manipulate the American political system, the relationship between Israel and the United States would be far less intimate than it is today”.

Furthermore and beyond the direct effect of the Israeli lobby, there exists a chilling atmosphere in the USA when it comes to any public debate of the American-Israeli relationship or Israeli policies. This exceptional sensitivity of the Israeli-American
ties impedes public discussion and resulted in public avoidance whereby “most Americans have decided that it is simply safer to leave Israel out of the discourse. So, unconditional support continues without much review or debate (Porter 2011) which left American unconditional support to Israel unchallenged. Lack of public debate gave the Israeli lobby a bigger chance to dominate the agenda in regard to the Palestinian issue. Moreover, Perceptions on Palestine and the Palestinians in the USA were affected profoundly, more than any other western country with Zionism and Israel’s image as a liberal, enlightened. Zionism corresponds completely with American ideas about man and society and criticizing Zionism not only odd but also equally denounced as anti-Semitism.

In her groundbreaking study Perceptions of Palestine: Their Influence on U.S. Middle East Policy, Kathleen Christison (1999) shows the preposterous nature of the perceptions prevailing in U.S. among the public and decision makers alike on Palestine. She argues depending on detailed examination and evidence from the nineteenth century until George W. Bush administrations that there are two pre-existed assumptions that direct decision makers and the public: first, Palestinian national aspirations are mischievous, and second the source of the Arab and Palestinian-Israeli conflict is Arab refusal to recognize Israel’s right to exist. Added to a certain degree of ignorance on the history of the conflict American perceptions and approach to the conflict has always been perceive through Israeli lens. The sheer magnitude of this problem, as she concludes resulted in absolute denial of Palestinian rights and many wars and bloodshed.
Changing the strategy and the advent of the Peace Process

Without undermining the role of Israeli lobby and the prevailing perspectives in the U.S, seen from another perspective the end of the Cold War and the advent of U.S. uncontested influence in the Middle East Israel regained its strategic significance to American interests. As Chomsky (1994) argues the major shift in American foreign policy in the Middle East in this era has been driven by economical imperatives. In particular, America opted to a strategy that deploys military force to protect economically critical regions for its interests. The decline of the USSR made military power a useful foreign policy tool for the US in the region that aims ultimately to enlarge American sphere of influence instead of focusing on containment. Thus America must intervene militarily to defend this objective including the intervention in regional conflicts that may have consequences to the new strategy (Chomsky 1994: 31-32, 69-71). From this perspective, Israel has maintained its strategic importance to the US as a military power. One of the greatest fears of the US after World War II namely, the spillover of nationalist ideas and movements to the Gulf Arab states was renewed in the post Cold War era; an ear of democratic transitions. Democratic transition in the Arab world hadn’t been part of US foreign policy in the region; it hasn’t been in the 1990s and currently as well. Therefore, Palestinian rights, plight, and Israel’s occupation of their land and its discrimination against them have a very minor importance in US policy in the past and in the present alike. In the structure of power that US established in post World War II and post Cold War Palestinians had no significant whatsoever, whereas Israel remains significant from the point view of the American hegemony in the region. Thus the new
order that U.S. sought to found has reestablished the strategic importance of Israel. Israel’s acceptance to involve in the Madrid peace conference and Arab-Israeli talks in 1992 fit into this strategy through which U.S attempt to rearrange the security and geopolitical sphere to guarantee its interests. The role of Israel in the new strategy is obviously crucial and Israeli decision makers realized the change and grasped on the opportunity.

Accepting a limited autonomy for the Palestinians within this context seemed a minor price comparing to the position Israel would gain in the region. As Shlomo Gazit (2006) stated

Israel’s main task has not changed at all, and it remains of crucial importance. Its location at the center of the Arab Muslim Easy predestines Israel to be a devoted guardian of stability in all the countries surrounding it. Its [role] is to protect the existing regimes: to prevent or halt the processes of radicalization and to block the expansion of fundamentalist religious zealotry.

Indeed, at the turn of the of the 1990’s, the eve of Oslo Accords, Israel has never been more important;

never before had Israel had a cart blanche from Washington –to confiscate Arab land, build settlements, enlarge Jerusalem, terrorize the Lebanese, pauperize Palestinians, and sustain such transgressions with U.S. taxpayer funds, UN Security Council vetoes and Congressional standing ovations (Aruri 2003: 103).

The new position Israel claimed in U.S. security strategy in the region turned it into a special state for the interests of America. American support to Israel has continued uncompromised and reached unprecedented levels in terms of financial/economic, diplomatic, and military aid regardless of America’s financial and economic crises or the burden it lays on American tax payers. Understood within American new strategy the
peace process between Israel and the PLO (the Oslo process) aimed at silencing the conflict; manage it to conform to the broader purposes of U.S. and Israel. American conduct and policies since the endorsement of the DOP in 1993 shows that American administration without exception accepted Israeli interpretations of the agreements, pushed toward changing international accepted requirements to reach a resolution to the conflict, and monopolized the role of broker; a dishonest broker though as Aruri (2003) contends. U.S. monopoly over the peace process only led to deploy monopoly to Israeli governments.

A quick survey to the role of the U.S in the profound changes in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict shows that US administrations’ most remarkable contribution to the “peace process” is “preclude effective international action on the [conflict] by always promising but never reaching its serious discussion” (Tilley 2005: 127). American complicity with Israeli policies reveals the built-in hindrances they created in the process itself that wouldn’t allow any meaningful resolution to the conflict that accommodate Palestinian national and political rights. By engineering the whole process around Israel’s security and downplaying Palestinian rights to mere autonomy, as Aruri (2003) argues the process changed the requirements for a just and durable peace; it “have dealt a crippling blow to the foundation of the global consensus on the solution of the question of Palestine”, which was the establishment of an independent Palestinian state alongside Israel.

International divergence on how to approach Israeli occupation and thus its inability to exert meaningful and effective pressure on Israel to adhere to international
law has been instrumental in the ability of Israel to manage the ethnic-religious founding principles of domination under the auspices of the peace process. In essence the process provided Israel with a cost effective and diplomatically comfortable environment to managing the presence of the ethno-national existence and demands of the Palestinians by “outsourcing the occupation”, as we discuss in the conclusion of this part. U.S role in this change has been substantial and instrumental especially in the wake of September 11 terrorist attacks.

One can’t but notice how gradually, but steadily U.S. administrations yielded to Israel’s terms; in the words one American participant at Camp David talks of 2000 “far too often, we functioned . . . as Israel’s lawyer.” Thus, under Bill Clinton’s administration before the Camp David the U.S. changed its position on opposing any unilateral actions - such as Israeli settlements- that are aimed at determining the final status of the OPT and the city of Jerusalem. Clinton was the first president to refer to the OPT as disputed territories and announced in March 13, 1994 that he opposes any reference to Jerusalem as an occupied territory (Aruri 2003: 139). Clinton administration for the first time ceded to Israel (by then under Netanyahu in 1996) in writing, the sole right to determine the extent of any further Israeli redeployments in the OPT which came to assure Israel the acceptance of its own interpretation of the resolution 242.

The failure of the Oslo process became clear as the Palestinian intifada of 2000 erupted, which triggered an international debate in the UN to seek mechanisms that would out the process on the track especially with the increased Israeli oppression and killing in the OPT. Thus the UN Security Council convened to consider a resolution to
deploy unarmed international observers to the OPT. The resolution was strongly rejected by Israel and vetoed by the U.S. Under the pressure of increased violence on the ground and international disaffection with U.S. position, Clinton administration formed the Mitchell Committee and the resulted Road Map that was sidelined by Israel’s increased military oppression.

The most dramatic change in U.S. policy in this respect came after September 11 where George W. Bush administration ceded to Erik Sharon’s government the final say in the progress of the peace process and accepted Israeli military assault on the Palestinians as a self-defense act. More importantly, the U.S. US administration accepted Sharon’s definition of violence and cease fire. Sharon conditioned the cease fire upon the PA ability to maintain a series of security conditions, the least of which is to sustain a total tranquility in the areas under PA jurisdiction and the detention of Palestinians whose name would be provided by Israeli security forces. The two administrations maintained a low level of direct involvement and conceded to the Israeli government the decision whether the PA has abided by Sharon’s conditions of cease fire or not. Bush administration’s main concern was not about bringing the Palestinians and Israelis back to the track of negotiations. Rather it aimed at appeasing the confrontation and preventing its spillover effects in the region (Mansour, 2002).

The primary effect of the terrorist attacks of September 11 on the United States reinforced the view, already prevalent in the US, Israel, and the western countries, that lumps all international terrorist groups with local terrorist actions, national liberation struggle with terrorism, opposition movements, political Islam, Palestinian nationalism,
Turkish Kurds, and so on in one category. This view contributed significantly to the all-out war against terror. It played in the hands of Erik Sharon as “carte blanche to set the rules of the game in the Israeli-Palestinian sphere and that the red lines no longer applied”; within two days after September 11 Israeli troops launched a massive attack on most of the West Bank and Gaza Strip cities and Sharon declared Arafat as Israel’s Ben-Ladin. US position supporting Israel’s military measures against the Palestinians gave Sharon the needed green light to go and change the rules of the game with the PA. Sharon’s assault on the PA and the main cities under its jurisdiction following two suicide-bomb attacks in Israel sidelined American new initiative to bring both sides back to the negotiating table. President Bush announced from the podium of the UN General Assembly that he favors a two-state solution. Ten days later His Secretary of State Colin Powell added other elements to this declaration, speaking of the “Israeli occupation” and the need to end it on the basis of UN Security Council Resolution 242, the importance of a just and realistic solution to the refugee problem, and a solution for Jerusalem that takes into account the religious and political concerns of the two sides (Aruri 2003: 142). However, American new imitative faced adamant Israeli qualifications that culminated in G.W. Bush acceptance of Sharon’s own definition of an acceptable solution to the conflict; in their meeting in April 2004 Bush introduced a new unprecedented American position assuring Israel that the borders of 1967 are not the reference for achieving peace and that Israeli settlements are facts that have to be taken into account for any agreement.
The Palestinian interregnum

On the morning of March 3, 2012 Palestinians in the big cities of the West Bank (Nablus, Jineen, Tulkarm, and Ramallah) were surprised with an advertisement on billboards at main city entrances; huge signs calling for a one state solution. “One Democratic state for 5 million Arabs and 6 million Jews”, the advertisement stated, and signed by an anonymous called “a-Ttakamul (integration) for the one-state solution”. The same night and the following morning groups of Palestinian activists, self-identified as Fateh members and/or ‘youth for Palestine’, brought them down, torn them apart and stepped on them. The angry youngsters chanted slogans against what they depicted as “normalization” with Israel and denounced those stand behind the stickers. The party/s responsible for the advertisement remained unknown until the moment. Without reading too much into such an event, the fact that no official statement was made by the PLO or the PA on the slogan, and that Fateh Youth Organization (Al-Shabibah) took the initiative to remove the stickers indicates the dilemma that the Palestinian polity endure. After almost two decades of negotiations and countless rounds of talks and several agreements the Palestinians gained nothing but geographically fractured zones of nominal autonomy; engineered enclaves that have no viability. Furthermore, the reaction to the advertisement, hints to a profound chasm between two distinct ethno-national identities, the Palestinian and the Israeli Jewish: for the Palestinians, Israeli domination and its geographical, territorial and spatial aggrandizement is seen as an existential threat. The dynamics of territorial-national politics for a threatened and subjugated majority (Palestinians in the...
generated a rigid national identity that seeks separation and ultimate national expression; national self-determination.

The reaction abovementioned is a snapshot of the new structure of domination Israel established during the last twenty years. Israel’s type of apartheid in the OPT raised Palestinian public fears of a future similar to that of Native Americans. The Palestinians are facing an impending reality of a one Jewish state where they constitute a minority subordinated and oppressed by a powerful regime of segregation and enclavization. Indeed, Israel’s settlement grid in the OPT and other methods and means of strangulation is similar to the “American ‘winning’ of the Native American territory across North America, as indigenous populations were surrounded, boxed in and in effect suffocated and subjugated” (Falah 2007). Turning Palestinian main cities into isolated and suffocated enclaves ala South African apartheid Bantustans while expanding the spatial and territorial control of the Jewish settler existence almost shattered the spatial and territorial base for the Palestinian state and any attempt to escape this logic by invoking the idea of one-state solution would be considered as sell-out and a formula for perpetual subjugation. The answer to Israel’s ethno-territorial hegemony in the OPT wouldn’t be less exclusive and self-protecting than asserting Palestinian national-territorial distinctiveness. Clearly the dynamics of Israeli ‘regimes of territorial legitimation’ shaped the properties of the conflict once and again and climaxed in the 2000.

‘Regimes of territorial legitimation’ examined

In essence, the conditions prevailed during the peace process show the plausibility of the theoretical accounts we presented in our conceptual framework: Murphy (2002)
notices that the outcome of ethno-national territorial conflicts depends on state “forces against which minority and stateless movements are struggling”, namely, the national territorial ideologies of the state in power. The means through which they articulate the linkages between their senses of people- hood and their senses of territoriality is a decisive element. Israel ‘regimes of territorial legitimation’ (institutions, practices, and discourses that discussed in chapter II) especially in the after the first intifada of 1987 and more intensely after 2000 invoke the three ideological arguments that Murphy identifies as the framework of territorial- ideology that designed to give legitimacy to territorial aggrandizement and spatial control of the OPT: that the Land of Israel (Eretz Israel) is a manifestation of the historic homeland of the Jewish people as an ethno-cultural group; and the Land of Israel is a distinctive physical-environmental unit that is indivisible; and that Israel, as the Jewish state that embody these ideologies is the modern incarnation of a long standing political territorial entity. Indeed, once more as we discussed in the conceptual framework, at the moment Israel joined the modern state-nation system it was defined and indentified with ethno-territorial exclusivism ideologically and legally. Its longstanding territorial legitimating regimes ever since it was established invoke and construct the Jewish ethno-territoriality as a state system of a peculiar apartheid regime. As the following statement made by Shulamit Aloni, former Israeli Knesset member depicts, Israel has established its own type of apartheid in the OPT.

“On one occasion I witnessed such an encounter between a driver and a soldier who was taking down the details before confiscating the vehicle and sending its owner away. ‘Why?’ I asked the soldier. ‘It’s an order—this is a Jews-only road,’ he replied. I inquired as to where was the sign indicating this fact and instructing [other] drivers not to use it. His answer was nothing short of amazing. ‘It is his responsibility to know it, and besides, what do you want us to
do, put up a sign here and let some anti-Semitic reporter or journalist take a photo so that can show the world apartheid exists here?”

Theory of ‘state contraction’ provides us with a very useful tool to understand the territorial imperatives of Israel’s domination system in the OPT. Although Lustick, writing at the early 1990s, accounts for Israeli redeployment in limited areas in the OPT as an action of state contraction, the years that followed show that this action was a tactic to gain hold on most of the OPT. The set of institutions, practices, and discourse Israel established granted the OPT a meaning that goes beyond the ‘ideological threshold’ at which state contraction turns devastating to state’s own political coherency. Israeli state, as an institution has become defined and determined by its presence in the entire territory of Palestine, the Jewish homeland. Israel’s imagined and institutionalized correspondence to the OPT stands as the major obstacle to Israel’s withdrawal and the establishment of a Palestinian state. Indeed, Israel’s limited territorial contraction is best captured by the concept of ‘outsourcing the occupation’: a redeployment of military forces and allowing for a certain level of autonomy can only be understood as a component of a broader strategy of state expansion rather than contraction. Not less significant is the challenging group’s capabilities and chance to control the territory and its belief in the legitimacy of its cause.

Palestinian nationalism as the counter forces to domination and power asymmetries emerged and challenged the state of Israel on the grounds that the latter created: as an ethno-territorial national movement seeking national self-determination in a well-defined space and geography namely, the West Bank (including East Jerusalem) and Gaza Strip. These dynamics were structurally determined by Israeli systematic
destruction of the Palestinian territorial and spatial spheres twice: in 1948 and in 1967, which impedes the realization of both the two-state and the one-state solutions by entrenching the ethno-territorial rigidity of the conflict and by metamorphosing the Jewish existence in the OPT into a matter of existence for the Jewish entity as a whole. For the Palestinians, Israeli policies mean political and national annihilation, an utter politicide.

*Major patterns of Israel’s apartheid*

As noticed in the last section (Israel’s Exceptionalism), Israeli government reluctantly accepted to involve in the peace process. For Israeli ruling class, political parties and the military institution, the broader strategic gain Israel would accrue justified the minor cost it had to incur namely, accepting the creation of a Palestinian limited autonomy: limited particularly in terms of its territorial and spatial boundaries, and its political and juridical scope. The terms and conditions in which Israeli consecutive governments carried Israel’s territorial and spatial policies under the auspices of the peace process show three major patterns that were developed and consolidated since the endorsement of the Oslo Accords (DOP) in 1993: asymmetrical power relations, separation within colonial control and occupation, and the systematic destruction of Palestinian spatial and territorial spheres (segregation). We turn to these patterns and their implications one by one:
**First:** The peace process reflects, by and large the dynamics of domination relations. As Sisk (1999) argues asymmetry of power relations is a high risk to productive conflict resolution whatever the nature and goals of this process. While Israel is under less pressure than the Palestinians to make concessions and benefits much more than them from the status quo, the Palestinians find themselves under the pressure to try and reduce the power asymmetry by any means in their disposal, including violence and coercion. However, this endeavor puts Palestinians in a destructive stalemate vis-à-vis the Israelis. The latter has the power and resources to deepen the structures of domination taking advantage of the stagnant peace process. The asymmetry is evident in the formula of “land for peace”; while holding the land by Israel is tangible, peace is just a promise.

Israel has been negotiating with the PA/PLO in 2000s with the aim of annexing more than half of the OPT. Negotiating while eating up Palestinian land reflects to a large extent the dynamics of asymmetrical power relations that enables Israel to act unilaterally to change the facts on the ground in an irreversible way. In effect Israel’s unilateralism especially in the 2000s has been deployed to implement a dual strategy: unilateral separation from the Palestinian population, and territorial dismemberment and alienation (segregation). First Israel intensified and extended the regimes of segregation and separation within the OPT in a way that red Israel from direct rule of the population, the second it systematically destroyed the spatial and territorial spheres of the Palestinian entity leaving it unfit for the establishment of a functioning sovereign state.

**Second:** the dynamics of Israel’s methods of domination during the peace process namely, separation and territorial control have entrenched the ethno-territorial core of the
conflict; “original causes of the conflict persist and are exacerbated by new grievances sparked by the peace process” (Darby and MacGinty 2003: 3). Indeed, the Israeli-Palestinian peace process has changed the macro features of domination and subordination into a deeper and more invisible type. The peace process has contributed to an Israeli strategy of making occupation invisible: by suppressing the distinction between the occupied and the occupier, the powerful and the powerless the Oslo process created an unusual situation whereby the abnormal (foreign military occupation) is being normalized. The fundamental change Israel introduced to its domination system since 1993 is transforming its relationship with the Palestinians from direct military occupation into a separation system. Separating the main body of the population from Israeli Jewish settler community and from Israeli administrative control gives a sense of normalcy to the presence of military occupation outside highly populated Palestinian areas. Simultaneously, Palestinian population became dealt with on pure security basis including those who live in Palestinian enclaves called area ‘A’ under PA jurisdiction. Gordon’s (2008: 169) concept of ‘outsourcing the occupation’ captures this pattern. ‘Outsourcing’ depicts a “technique employed by power to conceal its own mechanisms” and it shows Israel’s “unwavering effort to endure and remain in control”. Thus Israeli strategy espoused to rearrange its power and domination through segregation as the sovereign power methods Israel deployed in the second before and during the first intifada failed to suppress Palestinian national aspirations or to turn the OPT into an extension of Israeli-Jewish sovereignty.
As the South African apartheid regime “sought to perpetuate a belief system based on the view that ‘good secured fences make good’ neighbors.” (Knox and Quirk 2000: 163), Israeli political ruling class invoked the motto: ‘they are there and we are her’ to mark the new strategy of unilateral disengagement from the population not from the territory. This strategy in effect implies that indeed the Palestinians ‘are there’ and Israeli Jewish ‘are here’, and there as well. Segregation in this sense doesn’t imply the withdrawal of Israeli power and domination from the OPT. Rather it means that Israel rearranged this power and domination in a way to preserve its colonization and control over the land while ceasing the management of the population except as security threat. Colonization and segregation have not excluded one another. Changing the strategy towards separation went hand in hand with intensive colonization of the land and resources that created Palestinian pauperized, deprived and clustered enclaves on the one hand and Jewish Israel expanding and prosperous colonies on the other. Antecedently, Israel never entertained the incorporation of the Palestinian population of the OPT into its political, social, and economic system.

The colonial buffer it established was created wide and institutionalized and designed primarily to exclude Palestinians. We have discussed how Israel authorities since 1976 sought to constitute the Palestinians as non-nationals and subject to its power through oppression, alienation, divisions and homogenization. Jewish colonial settlements “created a new spatial reality for the dispossessed Palestinians whose living space was dramatically circumscribed” (Gordon 2008: 34) by indiscriminate land confiscation and expropriation that turned increasing numbers of the population into
dispossesses and displaced cohorts. The process showed that Israel’s occupation was not temporary but ubiquitous and indiscriminate, which widened and deepened Palestinian national sentiments and willingness to fight; a national fight that has been focused on land protection and resistant to Israel’s colonialism and reached a peak in the Palestinian intifada of 1987. Following the intifada, as we have shown Israel introduced the separation method as means of control. Separation has been entrenched and institutionally consolidated during the long years of the peace process; the principle: “we are her and they are there” is being carried on the imperative of not going back to the pre-1967 borders.

The Oslo process was based on the logic of separation and control; outsourcings the responsibility over the population for the PA while controlling and colonizing the land and space. Dividing the OPT in the Oslo agreement into A, B, and C areas in the WB; H1 and H2 in the city of Hebron; and Yellow and White areas in Gaza strip created internal borders of domination and control that institutionalized separation. Separation in this sense embodies a creeping apartheid system under which Israel has established a legal and institutional hierarchy of rights and obligations based on ethnic affiliation and location. A Palestinian whether lives in the OPT or in the Israeli proper is being confined and dealt with on the bases of his ethno-nationality and the place where she lives; the set of discriminatory and racial laws and legislation enacted by the Israeli Knesset against Israel’s Palestinian citizens withstanding especially after the those took to the streets in solidarity with their brethren in the OPT during the second intifada.
One might argue that during the 2000s Israel was not merely separating Palestinians and segregating them. Rather, Erik Sharon’s unilateral ‘disengagement’ from Gaza Strip and the evacuation of two small and geographically isolated colonies in the Northern part of the WB is a step towards contraction and partition. Reading Sharon’s plans from the perspective of ‘regime of territorial legitimation’ and ethno-territorial control, the plan is a package that includes the entrenchment of Israel’s colonization of most the West Bank. Primarily, the plan aimed at cutting off all discussion on the Palestinian state that was the currency of diplomatic efforts at the time including U.S.A. It aimed at extending the stalemate under which it is much easier to strengthen Israel’s hold on the WB. As Dov Wiesglass, Sharon’s senior advisor puts it:

the significant of the disengagement plan is the freezing of the peace process...to prevent a discussion on the refugees, the borders, and Jerusalem. Effectively, this whole package called the Palestinian state, with all that it entails, has been removed indefinitely from our agenda...All with U.S permission [president and congress] (Quoted in Yiftachel 2005:128).

American administration’s endorsement to Sharon’s plan was an explicit legitimation of Israel’s unilateralism and indeed permission for Israel to preserve its colonial control over most of the West Bank.

Sharon took the American endorsement to its extreme logical extent by asserting that Israel will never go back to pre-1967 borders and that Israel will hold in perpetuity over “territory which is essential to our [Israeli] existence...if we do not want to be pushed back to the 1967 lines, the territory should be divided”, as Sharon stated in the Knesset. In another speech he gave later he clarified: “Israel will strengthen its control over those same areas in the Land of Israel which will constitute an inseparable part of
the state of Israel in any future agreement” (Quoted in Falah, 2007:1348). As a matter of fact the ‘disengagement’ plan turned Gaza Strip into an officially demarcated Bantustan formally sealing a process of dismemberment of the Strip that started in early 1990s. The implications of Sharon’s plan in particular and Israel’s separation strategy and apartheid become more striking when looked upon from the perspective of the systematic destruction of the Palestinian space and territorial terrain.

**Third**: The years of the peace process have given Israel the opportunity to consolidate its control over the Palestinians territory while culminating a long process of territorial and spatial fragmentation of the Palestinian terrain. The strategy of separation and colonization is coupled with dynamics of strangulation and dismemberment that destroyed the base of the two-state solution. Spatial and territorial engineering that Israel launched since early 1970s has turned the OPT into segregated enclaves and reserves that are dependent economically on Israel and subjugated politically to Israel’s power. The Bantustanization of the OPT has been in the making since 1976 as Israeli authorities sought to ‘manage’ the inevitable; the Palestinian demographic dominance in the OPT. Thus the foundation of the structural territorial and spatial fragmentation was found in 1977; instead of segregating Palestinians at this early stage Israel sought to annul Palestinian existence as an ethno-national group through the establishment of colonies, land confiscation, and other means of domination that we discussed earlier. Israel’s main goal was the integration of Palestinian territory to the Israeli proper while excluding the population and exploiting the resources and economy of the OPT through military orders.
The first Palestinian intifada, as we noticed, had change the geopolitics of the conflict by focusing the struggle on the green line as the ethno-territorial divide, which Israel realized as threat to its efforts to control and extend its ethnocratic regime to the OPT. Israel’s strategy in the 1990s focused on answering the dilemma of colonizing a populated territory. The question for Israel became: if Israel recognizes ‘pragmatically’ that at the present Jews will not be able to settle throughout the OPT territory for demographical and geographical reasons and therefore the full redemption of the Jewish land cannot be achieved, then what would be the most prudent and expedient strategy that would preserve Jewish sovereignty over the largest portion of the Land of Israel while sustaining the core Zionist belief of Greater Land of Israel? Confining the Palestinians to enclaves segregated from each other and depriving these enclaves from spatial, territorial, social, and economic correspondence is the answer. Enclavization and Bantunization in this respect refer to the process of institutionalization of cutting off spatial interflow and heightening [territorial] control. It also has the effect of sundering enclaved space from other spatial areas, thus confining and drastically weakening the population economically, politically and socially-in effect ‘neutralizing its challenge as a potential opponent’ (Falah 2007: 1344).

This process was intensified and extended in the 1980s and entered a phase of consolidation n 1990s mainly through settlement expansion, bypass roads, territorial zoning and gerrymandering. Ultimately it aimed at consolidating territorial and spatial dismemberment in order to expand a state with undetermined territorial boundaries. The fragmentation of the OPT has been the mechanism through which Israel can tame the
sources of Palestinian opposition to its regimes of territorial legitmation based on expansionism.

Oslo agreements paved the way for the Bantustanization and enclavization of the OPT; in effect it provided the answer for the Israeli dilemma above-mentioned by bridging the contradictory between Israel’s territorial integration of the OPT and its social and political separation (Farsakh, 2005: 238). Indeed the Oslo process founded the legal and structural bases for fragmenting the OPT and giving Israel the final say on the future of most of the OPT: First, the agreements failed to include any provisions that guarantee Israeli withdrawal from the OPT and ending the occupation; second by dividing the OPT into separate areas each of which subject to different territorial-legal treatment; and third by not affirming the supremacy of international law and conventions pertaining to the conflict. Thus the Oslo process has institutionalized the already established demarcations between Palestinian reserves.

In 2000s Israel took advantage of the violence and open confrontation with the Palestinians to entrench its ethno-territorial control over land, resources, and space of the Palestinians. This dynamism applies to the Palestinians in the West Bank as well in the state of Israel. As Yiftachel (2011) remarks, Israeli governments since the eruption of the Palestinian Intifada –taking advantage of the increased anti-Arab sentiments that accompanied violence- have been involved in a massive ethnic-territorial alteration of the Palestinian space in Israel and in the OPT. As we noticed earlier Palestinian Citizens of the state of Israel are facing unprecedented discrimination as an ethno-national group including, and especially, in terms of land possession and access to resources, and
citizenship rights. Palestinian citizens of Israel, particularly in the Negev region are facing a silent deportation from their lands. Israeli governments resorted to all means to expel the Arab Bedouins of this area from the region including spraying their corps with poisonous chemicals. The Israeli official explanation to this extreme measure as aiming at preventing non-Jewish threat to the Jewish land leaves no room for speculation on the racially driven policies of Israel that have been increased in the last two decades.

*The interregnum persists*

The manipulation of ethnic geography and space with the goal of Judaizing Arab areas in the OPT has gathered unprecedented levels during 1990-2000s by imposing an overwhelming set of military, administrative, and “legal” measures. The core character of these measures is the control of the land, while dispensing with its (non-Jewish) population. There is no case for a viable nation-state that can function as segregated enclaves controlled militarily, territorially and spatially by a powerful infiltrating foreign state. Under the circumstances of spatial and territorial fragmentation no viable circulation system will be possible. With regard to social, economic, and political flows, the system of circulation is an important element in the functioning of a state (Falah 2007:1346). Palestinian state would not be more than a mockery of state unless the settlement grid and all other aspects of territorial control and systems of privileges attached to it are dismantled. This can’t be achieved until the colonial and ideological underpinnings that create this project being transformed. A cursory look at the current structural facts in the OPT makes clear that the talk about the establishment of a Palestinian state is unfounded:
• Israel is almost done with construction of the separation wall that extends to more than 700 Km (85 percent of the wall runs deep in the OPT) while intensifying Jewish settlement on both sides adjacent to the 1967 borders on both sides. For many Palestinians, including citizens of Israel, Netanyahu’s government policy in this respect de facto erases the green line and aims to prevent the geographical contiguity of Palestinian life and future state. The wall and the settlements with network of bypass roads are drawing the boundaries of the Jewish state; boundaries that are otherwise undetermined and anchored to Jewish colonial capacity in the entirety of Palestine. The power asymmetry we discussed grants Israel the capability to determine the extent of territorial and spatial expansion. Thus the green line and other boundaries established within the OPT even by the peace process are provisional from Israeli perspective and subject to the Israeli capacity to Judize and colonize territory;

• Israeli military measures (segregating and separating the OPT) are systematically destroying Palestinian economy. In the most recent estimations presented by the Palestinian Minister of Planning and Administrative Development, Ali Jirbawi Israeli restrictions have coasted the Palestinians $ 7 billion in 2010 alone, which comes close to the Palestinian GNP. The minister asserted that Israel is looting Palestinian natural resources systematically which rules out the viability of a Palestinian state;

• While Palestinians in the OPT can only use 40 per cent of their land Israeli authorities continued the policy of deportation against Palestinian communities in the Southern plains of the West Bank and the Palestinian side of the Jordan Valley. According to the Coordinator of the UN Humanitarian Mission in the OPT, Maxwell
Jilard Israeli house demolishing policy turned more than 1100 (after demolishing their 266) houses Palestinians homeless in the year 2011 alone. In the Jordan Valley Israel demolished 76 houses in 2011 displacing 113 people. Israeli depopulation of the Jordan Valley since 1976 by means of land confiscation, settlement expansion, and military measures caused a decrease of the Palestinians live in this area from over 300,000 in 1967 to little more than 50,000 in 2011 (UCHA 2012).^120 In a broader and more profound sense, these policies enabled Israel to create empty buffers along its borders with the OPT that are being occupied by Israeli Jewish settlers and became subject to Israel’s future claims in any final status negotiations.

- Depriving the Palestinians from their own natural resources is coupled with Israeli illegal overuse and extraction of these resources. In February 2012 the Israeli Higher Court of Justice ruled that Israel’s extraction and domination over the Palestinian stone quarries in the OPT is legal. The Palestinian Land Research indicates that this policy violated the Geneva Fourth Convention and deprives Palestinians from their legal rights in national resources on and under their lands. The Israeli Court ruled that these sites will keep working until the achievement of a peace agreement. The report clarified that 94 per cent of the product from these sites goes to Israeli market to cover 25 per cent of its annual demand. In his remarks responding to the Higher Court decision, Maher Ghunaim, the Palestinian Minister for Settlement Issues remarks that Israel has been illegally looting all Palestinian resources especially water. Israeli authorities extract an annual 7 million tons of gravel and stones and 800 cubic square of water (Ghunaim 2012). In a

---

^120 For a full account on the issue visit: http://www.aljazeera.net/news/pages/6e21b659-959e-48b9-94f9-05ad52b74011
recent and unique report, the Foreign Affairs Committee of the French parliament released a report in the first week of January 2012 that firmly accused Israel of implementing apartheid policies in the OPT in regard to water extraction and consumption. The report noticed that Israel is using water as a weapon in the serves of the “new apartheid” whereby Israeli military authorities deny Palestinians access to water resources.

These conditions notwithstanding the ethnocratic logic of Israel’s domination system prevails and with it unattainable neither Palestinian national self-determination nor a democratic solution in a single civic state. Taking into account Palestinians inability to practice a serious challenge to Israeli power coupled with their assertion of their own ethno-national territorial claim to the OPT and independence the status quo remains more likely. The status quo has actually turned into an interregnum that is fraught with dangerous dynamics, the least of which that the circumstances abovementioned would lead to one form or another of transfer (the euphemism of ethnic cleansing) of a significant portion of the Palestinians from the OPT. The existence of a great numbers of the Palestinians in the OPT, although being rounded up and weakened, is still the most adamant challenge to the achievement of Israel’s expansionist strategy. By neither annexing them as Israeli citizens, nor recognizing their right of national self-determination Israel’s policies minimize the options remained, transfer is a serious option.

The conditions for the emergence of a civic-democratic state as the final outcome of the conflict are being continuously obstructed by Israel’s self-identification as an ethno-territorial entity preoccupied with exclusion and colonial expansionism. Under the
conditions discussed here forging a common national identity necessary for a unitary nation-building process is dim. As a religious ethno-nationality Israeli polity is a coherent group established and crystallized around an ethnic core that diminished internal differentiations through ethnocratic nation-building based on religion, language, history and most importantly ethnic-territoriality. Thus territorial and spatial separation and exclusion was not sought as an instrumental tool for political manipulation and exploitation. Rather it is an end that is inextricably linked to close the circle of Jewish identification as a distinct people. Following 1967 the ethnic-territorial imperative of Israeli Jewish domination was reinforced and entrenched not only by deploying the structures and methods of territorial and spatial control and fragmentation but not less importantly by politically and strategically defeating its adversary; the Palestinian national movement. The latter couldn’t maintain a consistent strategy of liberation, democratization, or independence and actually is enduring a precarious position to prevent more losses. The Palestinian interregnum of the current day carries within it the dynamics of apartheid that may culminate in a struggle for civic self-determination. However, that implies defeating Israel’s colonial project politically, morally and diplomatically, which starts necessary in compelling Israel to withdraw from the OPT and recognize the Palestinians as nationals.

Meanwhile the inability of the Palestinians to shift the balance of power in their favor, and the increased strangulation of Palestinian space coupled with Israeli polity and society drift to the right the discourse of transfer is becoming increasingly prevalence; “Several Knesset members and ministers have adopted the idea, often with feeble
qualifications such as "if the need arises," or "only as a voluntary plan." (Yiftachel, 2011)

The racist transfer idea is now echoing aloud, gaining growing legitimacy among the Jewish public as well.

Yiftachel (2011) provides a panoramic survey of the extent to which transfer cheerleaders within the Israeli polity are gaining credibility. They are not any more marginal voice; rather they gain popular and electoral gains and reach the Israeli cabinet. Avigdor Lieberman; Israeli foreign minister expressed the idea most bluntly

"There is nothing undemocratic about transfer. Even in Europe millions were transferred from one place to another and it helped to bring peace... [T]he separation, like surgery, helps healing. When I see Arabs going to blow themselves up in Haifa or Nahariyya, or Arabs who donate to terrorists' families -- if it were up to me, they wouldn't have stayed here one minute, them and their families.

Cabinet member Efraim Eitam echoed the transfer discourse in a different capacity stating that “Jordan and Sinai are, in the final analysis, the territorial address for meeting the national aspirations of the Palestinians. Israel should control forever the entire territory between Jordan and sea. We should offer the Palestinians a choice between enlightened residency (with no voting rights) in Israel, or primitive Arab citizenship. The Arabs in Israel are a ticking time bomb... [T]hey resemble a cancerous growth. We shall have to consider the ability of the Israeli democracy to continue the Arabs' participation.

Both positions quoted here fall within the accepted political and ideological debates in Israel today not an odd and marginal precept. More striking is that they refer not only to the Palestinians in the OPT but as well to those live inside and hold Israeli citizenship.

Transfer calls also come from the Labor political camp. In March 2002 the minister of transportation, Labor's Efraim Sneh proposed a plan to resolve the conflict according to
which the future Palestinian state annexes “Arab localities” close to the Green Line in the Israeli proper [Israeli citizens] in return for the annexation of West Bank settlement blocs by Israel. The plan was described by its initiator as democratic and human.

No Arab will have to move from his/her home. We are offering them annexation to the Palestinian nation, with which they openly identify. All we say is: the 1967 borders are not sacred... [L]et's modify them to create a better ethnic political geography: Jews in the West Bank will be part of the Jewish state, and Arabs (who declare day and night that they are Palestinians) will become part of the Palestinian state, staying on their own lands. What is more simple?"

Moreover, the idea also penetrated ‘liberal’ Zionist circles and intellectual and academic discourse. Thus Ruth Gavison, former head of the Israeli Association of Human Rights, authors A.B. Yehoshua and Amos Oz and geographer Arnon Soffer all are leading voices express the "need" to reshape Israel's borders according to "ethnic principles." Recent surveys show that this idea is gaining popularity, reaching approval rates of 50-55 percent among Jews, and even 20-30 percent among Palestinian citizens.
Chapter X

Comparative analysis and findings

From case analysis to theory

This dissertation approached the two conflicts in South Africa and Palestine from the perspective of settler-colonial domination systems. Analyses provided aimed to achieve two interrelated objectives: First, to show the complexity and the degree of discipline of settler-colonial domination systems in terms of the dynamics and conditions that lead to transforming a settler-colonial society into an ethno-national entity in its specificity and peculiarity. This represents one way to explain the phenomenon whereby similar domination systems in a settler-colonial setting take different paths and obtain divergent ends. Second, to uncover similarities and shared as well as differences properties of these systems in order to establish a useful comparison between the two cases. This endeavor, however, focused on the differences between the Palestinian-Israeli and the Southern African conflicts to isolate the conditions (factors and forces) that account for the divergence of outcome in the two contexts.

This approach suggests that historical contexts and major structures of settler-colonialism matter and offer plausible explanations. It also recognizes the importance of
uniqueness and the role of interactions and events in the developments of each case. Contingency, in this sense represents the dialectical relationship between structures on the one hand and events and human agency on the other. Thus comparative conclusions and derivatives provided below are generalizations bound to the two contexts and contingent in so far as the broad phenomenon of ethno-national conflicts is concerned.

However, it is plausible to conclude that settler-colonial societies in general and the two cases concerned in this research in particular face three major vulnerabilities. These weak nods are inherited in the edifice of all settler-colonial ethno-national entities as externally imposed societies facing the other indigenous. Overcoming each of these weaknesses is a necessary condition for settler-colonial ethno-nationalist peoples to survive and endure. As suggested in the conceptual framework of this research linkages between “regimes of territorial legitimation” and the national-territorial nexus in the one hand and systems of domination and the responses to them on the other determine, to a large extent, the trajectory and transformation of the conflict. The three vulnerabilities illustrated below uncover the saliency of these linkages as they are dialectically linked to questions of territory, space, minority-majority dynamics, and external effects. Having achieved significant accomplishments in any of those vulnerability is a necessary but not sufficient in itself for the dominant group to overcome the uncertainties embedded in the conflict and its internal and external environments:

(A) To find a permanent solution to the problem of the existence of the indigenous people on the same territory: The solution is determined on the one hand by the nature and imperatives of the settler-colonial society: the regimes of territorial
letgitimation upon which it is established, levels and degrees of exclusion it practices, and on the other hand by indigenous national movement responses: its characteristics, its understanding and reaction to systems of territorial separation, and the ability it shows to preserve a consistent political strategy for either liberation and democratization or ethno-territorial self-determination;

In South Africa, Black Africans remained a majority that is structurally integrated in the economic system of the white economy. Segregation and territorial separation (apartheid) could not overcome this structural reality. Nor the white society was able to find a source of immigration to compensate for its minority status. As a minority, the Afrikaners relied heavily on police and oppressive methods to keep the African nationalist sentiments and actions circumscribed. The minority status of the white society allowed neither to accommodate the indigenous in the political system fearing the tyranny of the majority nor to totally expel them as they were indispensable for the economy. While white society’s weak national-territorial nexus, the divisions it endured, and its minority status weakened its hegemony and domination systems, African nationalist movement consistency in pursuing self-determination within a democratic South Africa undercut regimes ability to provide a permanent solution to the indigenous question. Thus the domination system remained starkly one of partial inclusion and exploitation before apartheid and separation and exploitation under apartheid.

By contrast, the founding principles of Zionism impeded inclusion of the indigenous at any level of social, economic, and political life. The establishment of the state of Israel was premised upon total exclusion. To overcome the dilemmas of majority-
minority dynamics Zionism and Israel resorted to ethnic cleansing that rendered the Palestinians a manageable minority inside the state. At this stage Israel overcame the question of indigenous within its territorial boundaries of 1948. After 1967, the problem of the indigenous became strikingly prevalent. The same principles and factors that enabled Zionism and Israel to maintain hegemony in 1948 were sustained in post-1967: the consolidation of the Jewish sovereignty in the Land of Israel and to control the territorial and spatial terrains of the Palestinians.

Now a majority in the entire land of Palestine Israel deployed a diverse and multi-layered system of dual domination against the indigenous amongst its own citizenry and those in the OPT. The majority status of the Israeli Jews provided for the diversity with which Israel dominated its adversary by deploying the three strands of power (disciplinary, bio, and sovereign) rather than relying mainly on oppression. The introduction of legal, administrative, military, institutional methods of domination within a claimed democratic system enabled Israel to conceal its peculiar apartheid within its own borders and in the OPT.

Domination systems Israel established in its proper and in the OPT remained ethno-territorially-based: controlling the land and space and managing the population. In the OPT, Israel partially succeeded in confining, enclavizing, and segregating the Palestinians, which fragmented their ability to challenge Israeli hegemony. This partial success encourages Israel to enact more measures to further push the Palestinians into a creeping apartheid system. Palestinian national movement ethno-territoriality contributed
to the persistent of the political-geography of the conflict as one over separated ethno-
nationally based entities.

(B) To achieve hegemony over the surrounding region or alternatively to realize normal relationships with neighboring states: white South African and Israeli regimes show a significant level of regional hegemonic propensity especially in tandem of their respective attempts to permanently resolve the question of the indigenous: after 1948 for South Africa, and starting 1967 in the Israeli case. Both regimes resorted to military aggression against their neighbors each for particularistic reasons but primarily for maintaining an edge that allow for a free hand in domestic issues. While South Africa achieved military hegemony in the region of Southern Africa and at some point deployed its military power to eliminate African nationalist threats in its surrounding, Israel resorted to a dual strategy of military aggression and diplomatic engagement. The role of the USA was pivotal in both endeavors. Thus, Israel has partially normalized its relationships with the region by reaching peace agreements with Egypt and Jordan, while partially tamed threats stemming from Lebanese borders, Syria, and beyond from Iran. Within this strategic, oversimplified depiction, the question of the Palestinian population and indeed the conflict as a whole has become less urgent for Israel to engage.

(C) To gain a certain degree of independence from a superpower or a metropolitan. Until finding answers to the first two vulnerabilities settler-colonial societies remain dependent on a metropolitan support. Both settler-colonial societies were in their rise and consolidation European in the essence of their economic system as advanced industrial societies. They possessed numerous financial resources and equipped
with technologies and expertise that the indigenous populations lacked. Depending on its own resources South Africa gained economic and military capabilities from any super power which enabled her to stand on strong grounds to bargain its interests. Even under overwhelming international sanctions and boycott campaigns the regime in South Africa established its military might and managed to survive.

South Africa’s less internationalized conflict and the high degree of independence of the regime on international support have a contradictory effect that facilitated significant international pressure on the regime on the one hand, and encouraged African national movement to sustain its political and moral high ground vis-à-vis the regime. The international community did not have any normative commitments towards the regime in South Africa, and the support it gained from western states was contingent upon the circumstances of the Cold War and the particular regional developments. Thus changes in these circumstances facilitated western countries’ change of policy toward South Africa whereby the regime was treated as a pariah state: a repressive-aggressive state that should be castigated and disciplined. The nature of the ties and relationships between the white South African regime and the international community facilitated categorizing the regime as a rogue state as its internal repressive and external aggressive conduct attested.

Israel, by contrast, gained one of main factors of success in creating and sustaining a relationship of interrelated interests and influence with an imperial or superpower sponsor. As we illustrate below, at their foundation and formation the two regimes differ significantly in regard of international involvement in conferring
legitimacy on their respective regimes of territorial legitimation. Israel has a peculiar relationship of dependence with the USA and other western countries. But at the same time Israel has developed certain mechanisms of influence on these actors’ decision-making processes, which makes it partially independent from the metropolis. This unique position enabled Israel to isolate its adversary on the international arena and to gain legitimacy for its ethno-national territorial foundations.

The persistent Palestinian-Israeli impasse

The abovementioned vulnerabilities withstanding, the ability of the South African regime to endure was primarily compromised by its internal structural contradictions that rendered regional achievements and independence vis-à-vis international superpowers insufficient for the survival of the regime. Rather, regional and international effects conversely worked against regimes intentions as internal contradictions turned violent and explicitly violated major international norms and principles. International pressure converged with internal developments towards the recreation of South Africa as a democratic state. In contrast, the durability of Israeli regime is primarily refers to its internal coherency and ability to form and transform the conflict according to its “regimes of territorial legitimation”. Thus Israel’s partial achievements on the three fronts (vulnerabilities) especially reducing the challenge of the Palestinian national movement comparing to the failure of the white regime in South Africa indicates the vitality of its ethno-national territorial system of domination, its ability to manage the demographic
aspects of the conflict, and its exceptional stand vis-à-vis the international community. In the follow I draw the comparative findings in congruent fashion with the conceptual framework of the research: (1) the complexity of settler–colonial systems in terms of their national-territorial nexus and the regimes of territorial legitimation that underlies them; (2) the nature and properties of systems of domination derived from the national-territorial imperatives and the responses they face by the challenging national movement; and (3) External effects that pertain to the acceptance or rejection of the dominant regime. The table below summarizes the findings of the research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National-territorial nexus</th>
<th>South Africa</th>
<th>Palestine</th>
<th>Contingent Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weak ethno-territorial identification</td>
<td>Religious ethno-territoriality is defining</td>
<td>Failing ethno-national constitution vs. ethno-religious nation-building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structures of Domination and Responses</td>
<td>Contextual, and adaptive Vs. consistent democratic liberation</td>
<td>Blueprint, transformative Vs. inconsistent and ethno-territorially driven</td>
<td>Staged eradication vs. endurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Legitimuation</td>
<td>Convergent in de-legitimizing the regime</td>
<td>Convergent, sponsors exceptionalism and regime legitimating</td>
<td>External contingency Vs. decisive legitimation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of civic self-determination</td>
<td>Prevalence of national self-determination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
First: The complexity of settler-colonial systems in South Africa and Palestine and their respective regimes of territorial legitimation have been decisive in determining the trajectory of each conflict and creating the conditions conducive to democratization in South Africa. The magnitude we grant to ethno-territorial nexus is justified theoretically as the defining factor that determines ‘regimes of territorial ideology’ and the spatial aspects of ethno-national conflicts. As such it also determines levels of exclusion and inclusion, and the nature of domination systems that aim at sustaining a certain ethno-territorial system of differentiation and subordination.

The foundation of the modern state in South Africa did not espouse any ethno-territorial underpinnings as we noticed and the legitimation of the state was derived from the system of social differentiation it created. For segregation before apartheid was not territorially determined and the regime sought the exploitation of the indigenous exclusion was partial. Nor the Afrikaners attempted to ethnically cleanse the Black Africans as the latter role in the economic processes was structurally intertwined with their confinement and subordination.

By contrast, exclusion of the indigenous people that characterized the Zionist movement Palestine was absolute and represented a pre-condition for the implantation of Jewish immigrants in the place of the indigenous; the expulsion of more than 700,000 Palestinians in 1947-8 outside the border of the state of Israel as it was designated by the UN Resolution 181 turned the Jewish community into a majority overnight. Zionism gained international and institutional recognition and legitimacy on the grounds of ethno-territorial definition of the state. Again, at the moment it was established the regimes of
territorial legitimation of the state of Israel embodied three interrelated ideologies: (a) that the Land of Israel (Eretz Israel) is the historical and cultural expression of the Jewish people; (b) this land is a single indivisible and distinct space; and (c) Israel is the incarnation of this unity. Israel as modern state came to carry on the objectives and goals of a movement that finds its justification within a rigid ethno-territorial ideology uplifted by religious convictions. As such Zionism and Israel succeeded in reconstructing Jewish immigrants in a single religious ethno-nationality bound to determined territorial and spatial boundaries whereas the settler-colonial state in South Africa fell short of bridging the structural chasm between two white dominant and rival groups.

The dynamics of the conflicts in both cases diverge on this condition: religious ethno-territoriality of the Zionist movement and Israel resulted in total exclusion. In effect this impeded all aspects of interpenetration of the settler and indigenous economies and societies which meant that the two remained significantly separated on physical, legal, institutional, and psychological levels. In South Africa, the economic inclusion of the indigenous Africans and the limited political accommodation of Coloureds and at some stage certain segments of Africans created structural conditions that gave the Africans a significant political leverage on the white community from within the structures of domination it established. Thus, Israel today appears committed to the territorial boundaries of its initial legitimation within the borders of 1948. On many other aspects, however, it practices virtual administrative, institutional, and sovereign powers in the whole of mandatory Palestine, which in effect reestablished Palestine as a single unit under a single hegemony: the political-geography of the conflict in this sense has
been reversed to its original boundaries whereas political, legal, and territorial/spatial properties of the conflict where transformed.

The transformation of the two conflicts at two major turning points has profound effects on the conditions that led to democratization in South Africa and the persistent of separation in the Palestinian-Israel conflicts: in the former introducing apartheid and the Bantustan policy against the reality of partial integration and the dynamics of weak ethno-territorial identification riggered a chain of events that allowed a staged decline and eclipse of the regime. In Palestine, Israel’s occupation of the OPT led to the consolidation of the religious ethno-territorial identification of the state and the Israeli Hewish society: social, economic, legal, and legislative resources have been dedicated to turn the Jewish colonial settlements in the OPT into a semi-state. This state of affairs prevents not only the establishment of a meaningful Palestinian state but it also impedes partitioning ala the ‘homeland’ policy of the South African apartheid: the ‘homeland’ or Bantustanization policy aimed at partitioning the country and the creation of pseudo-sovereign entities on the periphery of the white state. While South African apartheid sought to solve the problem of the indigenous by dismembering them with their territory from the state, Israeli apartheid is dismembering the population apart from the land, absorbing territory and occupying space while suffocating the population and eliminating the fruition of its political and national aspirations. Thus, the correspondence between geography, demographic attributes, and the ethno-national nexus of the conflict (on both sides of the divide) increases Israeli intransigence position against Palestinian rights, and it galvanizes Palestinian persistent struggle for national self-determination; a situation that
would prolong the interregnum and with it the propensity for violence and extreme measures.

**Second**: political consistency, convergence of purpose and reaction to ethno-national and regimes of territorial ideology constitute a crucial factor in shaping the properties of the conflict. I argued that these aspects develop within a dialectical relationship between the dominant state and the challenger national movement. The two cases of South Africa and Palestine show the validity of this argument: in the first place the organizational coherency and clarity of purpose play a decisive role in movement’s ability to represent a profound political challenge to the regime. Indeed, the most crucial periods of the two conflicts in 1980s show striking similarities in the organization of political militancy and mobilization that characterized the two movements in terms of their highly popular and well democratically organized uprisings. However, the counter-hegemonic social-political project of the South African national movement that embodied the convergence of a wide range of social elements within a single political front against apartheid, as we discussed in Chapter Three was not paralleled in the Palestinian case. The independent-driven Palestinian national movement was able to converge and mobilize one portion of its constituency; the Palestinians in the OPT. Objectively, this resulted from the factors of geographical fragmentation, properties of Israel’s settler-colonial enterprise after 1967 and the regional circumstances. Indeed, the nature of regime domination systems and their ethno-territorial underpinnings enabled the ANC and anti-apartheid movement to challenge the regime from within its own structures. This structural condition offered the African national movement a genuine opportunity to gain
political leverage over the regime as a democratization force. The Palestinian national movement, and the vast majority of the Palestinians were excluded from the structures of power within the state of Israel and have had to challenge it from without; the identification with a total liberation and democratization was initially stripped of its geographical and institutional base.

Eventually, the PLO, contrary of the ANC, failed to negotiate the end of Israeli occupation and rather involved in negotiating the establishment of limited autonomy under the auspices of Israeli rule. The Oslo Accords have lead to the metamorphosis of the occupation and then the increased difficulty to realize Palestinian national self-determination. Oslo agreements amounted to a political defeat for the PLO as it couldn’t maintain a consistent political strategy or sustain a well organized and mass mobilized momentum for its declared goals. By contrast, the South African National movement has shown a remarkable degree of consistency and persistence on its goals to overthrow apartheid. The ANC rejected and fought the Bantustan policy and mobilized to thwart it whereas the PLO was transformed from a national liberation movement into a kind of subordinate client to Israel, delivering gendarme services in segregated and isolated areas of the OPT. In comparison to ANC, initiatives to achieve peace had not changed the nature, goals, and role of the national liberation movements.

**Third:** international legitimation or castigation of ethno-territorial underpinnings of domination is a crucial factor that may categorize a settler-colonial system as a pariah or a rouge state based on its oppressive and aggressive essence. The effects are profound in delegitimizing the regime and to give rise to national movement’s democratic
orientation. Conversely legitimizing the regime contributes to the persistence of ethno-territoriality as an acceptable basis for political organization and rule, which cripples the democratic dynamics of the struggle for self-determination. As I discussed in the last section of Chapter Eight, in contrast to Israel, the international community did not give a soft shoulder to the South African regime while Israel enjoys unprecedented levels of support and protection from western regimes. While apartheid in South Africa was condemned as a rogue state Israel has gained the recognition of the U.S.A as a Jewish state although the definition of rogue states applies to both regimes as regimes of apartheid. The recognition of Israel as Jewish state further entrenched its exclusiveist regimes of territorial legitimation and encouraged it to extend this ideology well into the OPT.

In this respect it is important to notice that Afrikaners’ regime did not have the advantage of a supportive Diaspora that Israel and the Zionist movement have especially in North America. The support of Jewish communities Western countries has been crucial in driving the policies of these countries in regard to the conflict, as I showed. Diaspora Zionist organizations represent an important actor in Israeli domestic and international politics not just for their instrumentality in generating political, financial, and diplomatic support for Israel, but also for the state of Israel is seen as their supra-territorial homeland. “Diaspora Jews” participate in nurturing the Zionist dream of “return” and share the Israeli Jewish the same aspirations by cultural, political, and organizational efforts within their communities. Although Israeli policies in the occupied territories, and particularly settlement policy, do not have a blanket support of all Jewish
communities, a significant part does. Furthermore, the vast majority of those, even the most liberal, oppose the democratic one-state as a solution for it implies the demise of Israel as a Jewish state.

One can conclude that none of the conditions prevailed in South Africa and led to democratization are available in the Palestinian context. However, the developments of the last twenty years show that those conditions are in the making especially in the sense that Israeli policies in the OPT and discrimination against its Palestinian citizens are creating similar conditions that would culminate in conditions that trigger dynamics of democratization. Meanwhile, having circumscribed its adversary, Israel accelerated and intensified the patterns of its territorial control and the domination over the population.

The three major patterns of Israel’s domination system show the unfounded grounds for the two-state diplomacy: (a) the deepening of the asymmetrical power relationships; (b) transforming the occupation into a form of segregation and exclusive system within the OPT itself. In this sense the Palestinian threat as a strategic challenge was minimized. While enclaving the Palestinians in the OPT only strengthened their identification with their ethno-territorial aspirations their struggle is aiming the redemption of a territory and space that have been already Judized; (c) Israeli answer to the Palestinian demography turned the Palestinians into fractions of minimally connected collectivities, and narrowly linked territorially. These patterns are the structures that render any attempt to establish a Palestinian state unfounded. In fact, Israel has constructed a system of ethnic hierarchy in the entire mandatory Palestine; a system of
apartheid that works in different capacities inside Israel and in the OPT. It is based on legal, institutional and legislative measures that assign rights and obligations to people according to their ethnicity and according to their geographical location.

The persistent colonial-settler enterprise of Zionism and Israel that transformed more than 80 per cent of Palestine into a Jewish space and territorially controlled Israeli proper; the exceptional organizational and institutional capacities it deploys to achieve this end and cultivate international legitimacy for its practices; its ability to isolate and castigate the Palestinians; and the unconditional support it receives for the U.S.A and other western powers, implies that Israel is not in a position to give any significant consideration to withdraw from the OPT and allow the Palestinians to practice their right of national self-determination. Nor it allow for the emergence of unitary democratic entity. It is only in this sense that the one-state solution addresses aggressively the heart of the conflict: Israeli and Zionist politics, rather than avoiding it by separation themes. Israel’s occupation of the OPT is a manifestation of Zionist and Israel territorial ideology and therefore even the struggle for Israel’s withdrawal from these territories requires, by necessity this confrontation if we seek to have a better understanding and to realize a democratic solution to the conflict or an Israel acceptance of Palestinians national and political rights.

Israel’s settler-colonial underpinning and policies is the core of the conflict. Israel’s deeply-established links between the Jewishness of the state of Israel and the preservation of the settlement grid in the OPT renders Israeli ability to abandon the OPT or to accept the emergence of a sovereign Palestinian state unconceivable for any Israeli
leadership. In other words, state contraction under these circumstances can be costly more than the ability of any government to afford. Israel has crossed the ideological threshold in its ties with the OPT, which implies that disengagement is less likely and confronting Israel as an apartheid regime in the entire Palestine is inevitable. Challenging central Zionist doctrine of Jewish ethnic statehood; the kernel of Israeli sense of nationhood by a coherent and well organized Palestinian effort seems the only answer for the question of Palestine in the near future.
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