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The Internal Displaced in South Africa and Palestine from 1948-1966

Zarefa Ali

1. Introduction:

The period following World War II can be imprinted as the era of segregation, whereby the ethnicity or color of a certain group gave them the ‘sacred’ right to dominate, segregate and displace the indigenous of the land who were allegedly of lower status. In 1948 the state of Israel was established and in South Africa the National Party governed the country, subsequently these two countries strove to implement discerning policies so as to separate the indigenous of the land from the colonial powers. By using the term indigenous I mean the rightful owners of the land rather than the autochthonic inhabitants. Hence during 1948 one of the most drastic events took place in the Middle East and was to shape the past, present and future of the Palestinians. On May 1948 the Zionist forces occupied Palestine, destroyed numerous villages, perpetrated massacres and displaced Palestinians. Thus hundreds of thousands of the indigenous population fled the country and some remained and became internally displaced in their own lands. These internally displaced Palestinians were subjugated to a biased Military Government which deprived them from their lands, rights and freedom. The emphasis of this study would be on the internal displaced in Israel who were confronted with an agitating and distinctive situation.

Moreover, in 1948 South Africa was governed by the National Party which executed cruel, racist and degraded laws against the black population. This government allocated ten areas for the
Blacks which are known as the homelands, and the Black population was compelled to situate in these fragmented areas. In order to perpetuate and systemize apartheid, the National Party government deployed its racist ideology into regulations restricting Blacks from their rights and displacing them in their own lands. The period from 1948 until 1994 was stigmatized as the apartheid epoch in which the purpose behind the imposition of these racist regulations was to separate the Whites from the non-Whites, and anyone who did not fall under the category of White was deprived of his/her human rights and was imprisoned in the so-called homelands.

The internally displaced in both Israel and South Africa were forced to submit to hegemonic powers whom strived to take control of the entirety of the lands and whom impinged to execute intolerable policies in order to pressure the native population to leave. The aim of this research is to compare the status of the internal displaced Palestinians in Israel and the internal displaced population in South African from 1948 until 1966. The doctrine of both the Israeli and the Afrikaner determination to rule can be interpreted from a colonialist perspective, where the occupier is entitled to rule because he/she is more civilized than the backward barbaric indigenous who is ostensibly incapable of self-determination.

2. **Research question:**

To what extent did the Israeli and Nationalist government apply racist policies in separating between the internal displaced persons in South Africa and Israel from the whites and Jews?

3. **Hypothesis:**
The policy of the Israeli government and the South African, ever since the foundation of both, was based on Apartheid and this policy swiftly roamed the land from which the colonizers claim to be the ‘inherent’ owners of. Thus all means were justified in ensuring their dominance over the majority of the population, and both authoritative governments contemplated on the idea of depriving the indigenous of the land from their sacred rights and imposed segregation in all aspects of life. The implementation and usage of the term Apartheid is different from that in Israel. In South Africa Apartheid was based on skin color and in Israel Apartheid was based on identity rather than color. Thus some question whether the term Apartheid can actually apply to Israel, however Israel’s apparatus is discriminating against its Palestinian citizens justifies the usage and adaptation of the term. While comparing the status of both the internal displaced persons(IDPs) in Israel and South Africa, it is crucial to point out that the aim of this study is not to undermine the status of one and amplify the other, but rather to reveal the uniqueness of the position of the IDPs in both countries. Despite the fact that the systematic way in which segregation was employed amidst the IDPs in Israel and South Africa differ, yet the ultimate goal of both governments is shockingly equivalent.

Before shedding light on the situation of the IDPs in both Israel and South Africa it is vital to present a brief summary as to how they became internally displaced.

4. Overview of the 1948 Catastrophe:

In November 1917, Foreign Secretary Arthur Balfour declared Britain's support for a “Jewish National Home in Palestine ... it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done to prejudice the civil and religious rights of the existing non-Jewish communities”(Atran1989, 271). Nevertheless what actually took place in Palestine before, during, and even after 1948
was the total opposite. The British Empire seized to take control over Palestine as a means of ensuring their so-called declaration to the Jews, and subsequently the British mandate over Palestine began in 1922. And when the British mandate over Palestine ended in May 1948, simultaneously on 14th May 1948 the state of Israel was created as a result of the 1948 war known to the Israelis as the war of independence, and is known to Palestinians as the Nakba. This war led the creation of the state of Israel on 78 percent of historic Palestine, had a formidable cause in the destruction of much of the Palestinian society and landscape. The war crimes in destructing and acquiring lands and slaughtering the aboriginals were perpetrated by the Zionist Yishuv- a predominantly European settler community migrated to Palestine from 1882 and 1948- (Masalha 2005, 1). While these forces relentlessly occupied Palestine, dispossessed its inhabitants and perpetrated inhuman acts upon them, the Arab counties decided to send their troops under the lead of the All-Arab Volunteer Army(ALA). However the imbalance of power between the Zionist forces and the ALA was excruciating to the extent that they formed no real threat to the advanced Zionist forces. The war on 15May 1948 took place between a well trained, organized and equipped Zionist army against an ALA that lacked coordination, motivation, military training and weapons (Pappe 2007, 129). The inevitability of this war led to the creation of a massive refugee problem in which hundreds of thousands were displaced and were forced to flee to neighboring Arab countries, wherein they were allocated in refugee camps.

Moreover, from the territory occupied by the Zionist forces in 1948, about 90 percent of the Palestinians were driven out, many by military pressure and a very large number of them left at gunpoint, also by psychological warfare including massacres. The war provided the opportunity and necessary background for the foundation of a Jewish state, in which the Zionist’s main concern was to de-Arabise the area as much as possible thus ending with the dispossession of the Palestinian people. In 1948, the minority of Palestinians who remained behind are
estimated about 160,000 many of them became internally displaced in their own lands. These internally displaced persons became second class citizens of the state of Israel, and were subordinated to a system of military administration by a government that had confiscated the bulk of their lands (Masalha 2005, 1). Beyond the borders of the new state, Israel also refused to permit the internally displaced Palestinians to return to their homes and villages (Boqa’il 2005, 73). Anyone who dared try to return to his/her land and village was cold-bloodedly shot at, thus the tactic of intimidation was enforced against the refugees who strove to return to their homes.

From all of the above, it is clear that many Palestinians who remained in what became the state of Israel became IDPs in what used to be their lands (Masalha 2005, 1). Although until today the exact number of the internally displaced Palestinians in Israel during 1948 is unknown, the Israeli scheme in undermining their status and perceiving them as a demographic catastrophe to the state of Israel is vivid.

5. Overview of the colonization of South Africa:

Before mentioning the segregation policy adopted by the South African Government, it is essential to refer to the colonization of South Africa. Apartheid was not a distinctive ideology which came forth with the appearance of the Afrikaner nationalist, but rather emerged from the accumulation of segregationist policy from the early period of colonization.

South Africa was colonized by the Dutch and English in the seventeenth century, as a result the Cape Town colony was founded in 1652 in order to supply Dutch ships with food and water as
they continued their journey to West Indies. It was to maintain this colonial character for centuries, and this colony was to bring upon the indigenous societies of South Africa the constant pressure of the rapid encroachment of the European world (Moerdijk 1981, 17). For instance, after the foundation of the Cape colony Dutch, French, and German inhabitants migrated to South Africa, and the descendants of these groups became known as the Boers. Following the first British occupation in 1795 they have dispossessed many of the indigenous inhabitants, and when the British annexed the Cape of Good-hope in (1806), several Dutch, French and German dissidents moved inland to the Transvaal and Orange Free State (Gailey, “Afrikaners” www.autocww.colorado.edu).

In addition, invigorating racial discrimination characterized colonial society from the late eighteenth century onwards. The whites in South Africa throughout centuries enslaved the indigenous of the lands and by the turn of the 18th century race had become one of the most critical factors in determining separation within the society thus creating new social tension. The emancipation of the slaves in 1838, led the colonial authorities to take extra measurements so as to implement a new order of domination. By the 1870s, during the industrialization of South Africa, the whites had become so accustomed to domination and privilege to the extent that they excluded blacks from the state, church and even in some residential areas (Gilimoeo and Schlemmer 1989, 2-10). Following the British Colonization many Afrikaners refused to live under British rule, hence a series of migrations in the 1830s and 1840s erupted, and this became known as the Great Trek. These migrants established the Orange Free State and the South African Republic (the Transvaal) which were independent republics. With the discovery of gold and diamond the British were determined to seize the land from the Boers, and this attempt resulted in the Boer War which lasted for 3 years (1899-1902). The outcome of the war was the defeat of the Afrikaners and as a result the Afrikaner republics were absorbed by the British-controlled Union of South Africa in 1910. However, British control over South Africa did
not last and the Afrikaners were able to rule the government of South Africa between 1910 and 1994. In 1948 with the emergence of the National Party on the arena they began to enact the policy of apartheid, and more than four million Blacks were forced to leave their lands in areas which were designated for the Whites. With the emergence of this government the tactic of designating the blacks into ten homelands, or what became known as Bantustans, was applied (Gailey, “Afrikaners” www.autocww.colorado.edu). From all that was said, it is clear that apartheid did not emerge with the appearance of the National Party, but rather was accumulated throughout centuries wherein Blacks were enslaved, dispossessed and marginalized. And in 1948 the Nationalist government strived to implement their doctrine of race superiority over the non-Whites and with the execution of the policy of forced removals many of the native population became internally displaced and were compelled to live in the homelands.

In essence, while comparing between the IDPs in Israel and South Africa it is eloquent that the history and status of both differ in addition to the systematic way in which separatism was practiced, nonetheless the contemplation of Zionism and Apartheid in separating the indigenous of the land from the whites or Jews appears to prevail and this will be the focus of this study.

6. Aliens in their own lands:

In 1948 many of the indigenous of the land were detached from their properties and were forced to live in unequal and intolerable circumstances as they watched the Whites and Israelis persistently exploit their lands and resources. As the hegemonic authorities impinged to reflect or implement their policy in restricting landownership from the indigenous into legislations, this
was only one of the numerous means perpetrated in accomplishing their master plan in cleansing the land, therefore transforming the native population into aliens in their own lands.

During the end of the 1948 war, those who remained in what became Israel were turned into a minority in their own homeland. These Palestinians fall under the category of ‘internally displaced’ and internal displacement was dependent on the destruction of villages, armed conflicts as well as on legislation. If one left his/her village for a brief time during the 1948 catastrophe one was marked as ‘absentee’ and one’s property was termed ‘absentee property’, indicating that rights to return to home and land were gone. Ever since the foundation of the state of Israel these internally displaced Palestinians lived in Israel under military rule until 1966 (Schulz and Hammer 2003, 74-75). Despite the fact that these Palestinians have gained Israeli citizenship they were deprived of their basic and equal rights in comparison with the Jewish Israelis citizens, and the internal displaced Israeli-Arab citizens were perceived as a striking threat to Israelis demographic security and ethnic domination (Masalha 2003, 43). Hence it is clear that the newly formed state of Israel thrust to accomplish the Zionist project in displacing the majority (and if possible all) of the indigenous of the land. The mere fact that the rightful and legitimate owners of the land were turned in to a minority and were discriminated albeit withholding Israeli citizenship, depicts the anxiety of the former to pressure the latter to flee.

An amalgamation of military strategic, demographic-land settlement and Zionist ideological contemplations governed Israel’s land policy after the Nakba concerning the Palestinian citizens of Israel, including the internally displaced. The property of the internally displaced Palestinians constituted of about 300,000 dunums. Post to the 1948 war, the Israeli authorities confiscated the majority of these lands, and this left the internally displaced subjugated to regulations and
laws that ostensibly deprived them of most of their lands. The land was annexed by the authority of law submitted by the Israeli parliament, and transmitted into Jewish ownership. One of the most well known cases of internal displacement involved the inhabitants of the two villages Kafr Bir‘im and Iqrit, who were forced to leave by Israeli army in November 1948 and were never allowed to return. As a result the villagers of Kafr Bir‘im filed a claim in the High Court of Justice requesting the return to their lands, the Court’s verdict was that the villagers would need permits to return to their lands which the military refused to issue. The Israeli military destroyed every house in these villages and confiscated the lands (Jiryis 1976, 23-25). This case epitomizes one of the numerous villages destroyed by the Israeli forces, and it also shows the Israeli scheme in separating the Jewish citizens from the internally displaced Palestinians and depriving them from their own lands. This strategy forms the cornerstone of the biased policy of the Military Administration, which compellingly banned the IDPs from retrieving their lands.

In comparison, the Africans in South Africa were also subordinated to legislative laws depriving them of their lands and thus resulting in their dispossession. For instance, the Afrikaners pushed the Black South Africans into specific lands which were allegedly ‘reserved for them’ (Stevens and Elmessiri 1977, 27). The government of South Africa has decided unilaterally that its black population includes a group of nations and each of which is entitled to a homeland. The Homelands are projected to detain the Africans into 13 per cent of the land, not surprisingly the least fertile, located in scattered units on the borders of the industrialized areas. Subsequently the Nationalist government has designated ten rural areas as homelands which were located in very limited and diminutive space, while the government controlled 87% of the land. Despite the fact that 80 percent of the people in South Africa are blacks comprising significant ethnic diversities, they were forced to situate in only 13% of the land, and neither size of the population nor cultural identity has been taken in consideration in locating
homelands. For instance, the Pedi and North Ndebele are combined in Lebowa, also the Tsonga and Shangaan are combined in Gazankulu. Therefore the location, size and fragmentation of the homelands are results of the accumulation of the South African frontier during the nineteenth century and their legislative confirmation in the twentieth century particularly in 1948 (Butler and Adams 1999, 1-7). The basis of apartheid in South Africa depended on the actual separation between the ‘whites’ and the non whites, consequently they were forced to leave their lands and were allocated in scattered, remote and restricted areas designated for them so as not to interact or in other words ‘corrupt’ the white superior race.

Furthermore, blacks were restricted or even deprived of land ownership, and as Israel, this was enacted by legislations for instance, the Development Trust and Land Act No. 18 of 1936 expanded the reserves to a total of 13,6 percent of the land in South Africa and authorized the Department of Bantu Administration and development to eliminate blacks ownership of land. The South African Development Trust was established and could, in terms of the act, acquire land in each of the provinces for black settlement. The act was further adopted by the Nationalist government and wasn’t abolished until 1991. The adaptation of this law led to forced removals of people living in ‘wrong’ areas, for example blacks living in District Six in Cape Town were forced to flee and were situated in the homelands (Glücksmann 2010, 14). This poignantly shows how the new government justifies all means in order to expropriate as much land as possible regardless of the outcome, and this left the Blacks, the rightful owners of the land, internally displaced. In order to ensure Afrikaner domination and hegemony over the republic of South Africa, the Nationalist government posed regulations restricting Bantu ownership(by Bantu I mean the Black population that were situated in the Homelands) and confiscated their lands. Based on color identification one was either allowed or banned from land ownership, in addition the indigenous population were expelled from their lands and transformed into aliens in their own lands.
The degeneracy of apartheid and Zionism in depriving the native population of their lands and displacing them, illustrates the dependency of both on race and biological superiority in which the Blacks and the non-Jews were subjugated to forced removals and were marked as strangers in their own lands. Despite the fact that Apartheid has been internationally denounced, paradoxically Israel and South Africa purposefully inflicted their policy of segregation as a means of ensuring their nefarious control over the land.

7. The Legislative Framework of Segregation:

Whether in Israel or in South Africa the legislative framework and political regime was based on race and ethnic distinction, in which Blacks and Palestinians were not given equal rights as to the Whites and Israelis. Therefore racism was reflected in all aspects of life, and as a result those oppressed were deprived from their human rights and were treated as inferiors. The attempt to legitimize apartheid envisages the vigorous Occidental attitude in which ones color or ethnicity gives one the right to rule, dominate and even degrade those of allegedly lower capabilities. Segregation was practically the cornerstone of the legislative system in which the dogma of separation between two ethnicities or races was legitimatized by law and constitution, and this highly manifests the contradictoriness of the legal system which is supposedly based upon equality and justice, rather than segregation and discrimination.

In Israel according to Noam Chomsky, “The Jewish dream is to construct a state which is Jewish as England is English and France is French. At the same time, this state is to be a democracy to the Western model. Evidently, these goals are incompatible.”(Jiryis 1976, xi). The Israeli attempt in minimizing the number of the non Jewish population (IDPs) and ensuring the
Judaization of Israel is primarily the pillar of the Military Administration, and in order to fully grasp the military rule in Israel it is crucial to refer to its foundation. The Israeli Emergency (Security Zone) Regulations 5709 established in 1949 had its legal foundation in the British Mandatory Defense Emergency regulation established in the country in 1945. The history of the Regulation goes back to the Arab Revolt in Palestine from 1936-1939. During the revolt Palestinians were brought to be trailed in the military courts in which the High Commissioner gave verdicts which ranged from detention, expulsion, banishment from land, seizure and control of property. Ironically the Jewish settlers opposed to the military court and one Jewish lawyer commented that these laws threaten every Jewish settler, and give the military and administrative authorities absolute power (Jiryis 1976, 11). After the foundation of the state of Israel in 1948 one would have expected the abolishment of the military administration, yet what appeared was an even more oppressive military administration.

The Palestinian citizens inside Israel, including the internally displaced, were subjected to an oppressive Military Administration which was established from 1948 and lasted until 1966. The imposition of martial law and military administrations between this period had a massive impact on the internally displaced Palestinians in Israel. Paradoxically in 1948, the Israeli Provisional State council, in look for international recognition for the newly formed state, integrated in the “Independence Charter” a promise that, “The Jewish state would uphold the full social and political equality of all its citizens, without distinction of religion, race, and sex” (Masalha 2005, 26). However what took place in reality seems to surpass this charter, in fact it was the total opposite that was practiced. The Israeli deceitfulness in spreading internationally that its charter is entirely egalitarian and that Palestinian citizens in Israel uphold equal rights as to the Jewish citizens appears to overshadow the deteriorating status of the internal refugees in Israel.
Regardless of the official structure of the law in Israel, which seems highly committed to “equality”, and the absence of dual system or legally based apartheid as implemented in the South African law, Israel’s legal system tends to foster selective political dominance over the Palestinian population in Israel including the IDPs (Koan 1999, 215). After the foundation of the state of Israel it treated the Palestinians in the state as foreigners. It swiftly impinged a military administration in areas populated by Palestinians, confiscated over half of the lands of the ‘non-Jewish’ population, and followed numerous methods of demographic containment, political rule and systematic discrimination in all aspects of life (Masalha 2005, 27). Despite the fact that Israel was careful in the formation of its legal system and ‘officially’ announced the basis of equality as its cornerstone, conversely its treatment of the internal displaced Palestinians proves that Israel tends to violate its own charter.

The regulations of the Military Administration epitomizes traditional imperialist attitude in terms of dealing with the indigenous population of a colony. The authorities were given excessive and rigorous rule; hence their encroachment led to nearly the complete loss of the Palestinians freedoms and property rights. The discriminatory policies were imposed over every aspect of life, from control over movement, freedom of speech, means of transportation and the press to the expropriation of land (Abu-Sa’ad 2005, 117). Also the military government established the Employment service law banning all unorganized workers, and the majority of the Palestinians were not registered in any working union. Or more specifically the Histadrut—the general federation of Jewish labor founded in 1920 persistently refused to register Arab workers into this labor union, and as a result many Palestinians were working illegally with low payment (Jiryis 1976, 219-222). The purpose behind this distinction was to separate the Israeli-Jewish citizens from the Palestinians, and to keep the Arabs ‘reserved’ in villages and away from Israeli areas. Thus all privileged rights were given to the former and deprived from the latter.
During the Military Administration the enormous amount of pressure perpetrated against the internally displaced Palestinians in Israel was in order pressure them to leave the country.

Nonetheless, unlike Israel, in South Africa separatism was vigorously and overtly implemented into the legal system after the triumph of the National Party in 1948 and lasted until 1994. This new government moved rapidly to enact a severe policy of segregation, in which apartheid was written into regulations. The numerous forms of racial policies in which the government imposed towards the blacks, particularly towards IDPs are all unquestionably types of segregation. For instance, in 1949 apartheid was one of the most crucial policies in the Malan regime, which aimed at implementing the separateness of the population groups, such as separate development and multinational development. Meanwhile in 1959, The Promotion of Bantu Self-Government Act No. 46 allowed the transformation of reserves into “fully-fledged independent Bantustan”. It also resulted in the abolition of parliamentary representation for Blacks. Blacks were classified into eight ethnic groups and each group had a Commissioner-General who was entrusted with the development of a homeland for each, which would be allowed to govern itself independently without White interference. Therefore the establishment of Transkei Constitution Act No. 48 of 1963 created the first of South Africa's semi-independence such as Bophuthatswana, Ciskei and Lebowa (Glücksmann 2010, 20). The aim of this amendment was to fully prevent Blacks from entering the parliament of South Africa and the legislator of which thought that through declaring the independence of some of the homelands such as Bophuthatswana, the Blacks would be content with semi- self governing in the homelands.

The South African authorities were given extra powers to evict Africans from their lands (Sachs 1973, 165). In order to elevate this policy the National Party government established
regulations prohibiting the blacks and colored from certain areas such as, the Group Areas Act No. 41 of 1950 which called for the forced physical separation between races by creating different residential areas for different races (Glücksmann 2010, 14). The internally displaced in South Africa were submitted to a separatist legislation which was established based on apartheid and the Nationalist government was committed to prohibiting any aspect of interaction amidst the blacks and the whites. Furthermore, what makes the South Africa's apartheid era distinguished from other countries is the systematic way in which the National Party formalized it through the legislative system for instance, the Prohibition of Mixed Marriages Act No. 55 of 1949 prohibited marriages between white people and people of other races. The Native Labor Settlement of Disputes Act No. 48 of 1953 introduced an official system of racially segregated trade unions and efficiently made strikes by Africans illegal in all circumstances, in addition to Land Acts of 1954 and 1955 which restricted nonwhite residence to particular areas. These laws exacerbated the already limited rights of black Africans to own land, and ensuring the white minority's control over South African. Also the South African Citizenship Act No. 44 of 1949 renounced common citizenship arrangements existing among members of the Commonwealth and poised the mechanical granting of citizenship to immigrants from the member nations. Citizenship by registration resulted to the utmost controversy as it affected recent immigrants. The interior minister reserved the right to grant or hold back citizenship without resorting to the courts. (Glücksmann 2010, 13-14). From all these regulations which obviously aim at enforcing racial distinction in all aspects of life and through implementing apartheid into the jurisdiction of the country, the South African government thrived to legitimize its discriminatory policy towards the blacks. The internally displaced population were not only forced to situate in homelands, but were also subordinated to an unfair legislative system which is main concern was to fully separate the Whites from the Blacks. The obstinacy of this government is depicted in its attempt in relentlessly inflecting apartheid into regulations.
8. The Enactment of Separatism:

In culturally plural societies, particularly those dominated by minorities, the perpetuation of that dominance, and thus of privilege is inextricably associated with the designation of distinction (Butler and Adams 1999, 24). The apartheid regime and the Israeli Military government enforced various methods in separating the internal displaced population from the Whites and Jews. Although the systematization of these methods differ, the ultimate goal was to minimize if not prohibit any interaction whatsoever between the dominant powers and the so called “others”. Hence apartheid was embedded in all aspects of life whether educationally, socially, politically or economically the internal displaced persons were restricted from obtaining opportunities which were allocated to those of suitable pigmentation. However it is important to highlight that in South Africa there was more than one type of Apartheid, and this was nefariously hierarchal.

Beginning with South Africa, the apartheid system imposed countless techniques in perpetuating segregation. Consequently the apartheid regime was constituted based on the following: labor regulation, communal apartheid, separate development and political control and privileges. After 1948 the new government purposefully introduced apartheid’s stationary groups and enforced residential segregation, following the swift economic integration of South Africa, the National Party government was immediately confronted with the predicament of devising a system which would guarantee and ensure sufficient African labor without seriously undermining Afrikaner and formidable white supremacy. The Afrikaners wanted the land of South Africa for themselves, yet they needed the labor of the indigenous population. Black workers were forced to live in “townships” or labor camps and earn only a small portion of the
wages paid to White workers. As a result the Nationalist government controlled the movement of the Black people by making them carry passes which determined where they could live, travel and work. If they were found in the “wrong place,” they would be detained (“Apartheid from South Africa to Israel”, p:4.www.odsg.org). Furthermore, in the 1950s and 1960s white trade unions reinforced the color bar by defining which jobs should be prohibited from blacks, thus African labor remained fragmented, unorganized and poorly paid (Giliomee and Schlemmer 1989, 64-74). By restricting blacks from working in the cities and from certain jobs, the government sought to diminish African residence in the white areas and particular attention was given to the cities. The National Party government contemplated on the idea of relocating them in the homelands, and through the policy of forming a boundary line based on color the racist government strived to compel them to leave. The inequality of wages and the exploitation of the black labor force, envisages the white’s imperial perception of the blacks, wherein they are treated as inferior beings whose only reason of existence is to serve, subject and yield to the White.

The matter of African labor controls emerged so enormously that many analysts considered the regulation and reproduction of cheap Black labor to be the cornerstone of apartheid. The impudence of apartheid was stringently enacted by legislation; consequently under the National party control two amendments were established to preserve labor separation. For instance, the 1952 Act together the 1957 amendment, invigorated a strict division of labor between the low paying prime sector and other sectors of economy (Giliomee and Schlemmer 1989, 64-66). Apparently in South Africa job opportunities were allocated based on color rather than proficiency, thus exacerbating the already unbearable circumstances under which the internally displaced persons are forced to tolerate. It is evident from the amendments above that some jobs were appropriate for the Whites and simultaneously were denied to the Blacks and coloreds, and this illuminates the distinctiveness of the apartheid regime in South Africa in
which racism was implicitly normalized and overly reflected into regulations which ostensibly deprived blacks from certain jobs.

In addition, the Nationalist government not only passed racist laws restricting blacks, in particular the IDPs from the homelands from certain jobs, but also in all aspects of life. For instance, segregation notices appeared on buses, trains, taxis, ambulances, parks, benches, sports, beaches, libraries, universities, museums, zoos etc. Also interracial marriage was prohibited and anyone who violated this was imprisoned. The sick were treated in separate hospitals and the dead were interred in separate burial grounds (Sachs 1973, 166). Apartheid was so embellished in the South African regime to the extent that it was also inflicted upon the dead, and apparently no one was spared from its malevolence.

Moreover, the surface area of the country has been systematically divided into zones for occupation by different racial groups, and vast numbers of people have been forced to depart their homes to make way for persons of appropriate pigmentation. In order to separate the population and allocate each person to his/her legally defined racial category a fundamental system of race identification has been instituted. (Sachs 1973, 11). Apparently the tactic of apartheid has been deployed amidst the internal displaced persons so enormously that one wonders if there was even one aspects of life which has not be touched by this prejudice rule.

In the Bantustans agriculture was to be modernized by a drastic reduction of the peasant and industrialization was to be enforced so as to absorb the new proletarian off the land. Hence according to ‘idealistic’ apartheid, not only will the Bantustans support their current population, they would also support black labor repatriation to them. Conversely the aim behind this policy was not to develop the agriculture of the homelands, but rather to restrict
the black mobility of workers in the cities so that they would not compete with Whites (Moerdijk 1981, 77). Most of the homelands were lies in a zone of deficient soils, low and unreliable rainfall, particularly Bophuthatswana and Kwazulu (Butler and Adams 1999, 15). Aware of this de facto the Nationalist government was only concerned with decreasing the amount of black workers in white areas, and meanwhile in these homelands the agriculture produce was to remain deficient and uncompetitive to white produce.

Also in the educational system Apartheid was deeply rooted and was implemented as a means of perpetuating segregation amidst children of different ethnicities. Schooling in South Africa is divided into four component systems, each serving members of a separate "racial" category: African, Colored, Indian, and White. Within the "racial" categories, the various "ethnic" groups are also segregated. For instance, among the Africans, Zulu, Tswana, Xhosa, and so on, attend separate schools and the Interdepartmental Committee on Native Education found reported that there was a huge disparity between the primary school standard of the white and the black pupils, where in schools for the black children were described as overcrowded classrooms, lack of staff or the shortage of facilities. The committee also remarked that, “The education of the White child prepares him for life in a dominant society and the education of the black child for a subordinate society” (Johnson 1983, 216-217). So the pedagogical system in the homelands and in South Africa in general also inflicted apartheid, in which the White children were being taught to despise and marginalize the Blacks, Indians and colored, on the other hand the Black children were being enlighten and prepared to subjugate to the White dominant society. This emphasizes that no one was spared from segregation, even the children of the internal displaced population were forced to yield and adapt to this way of life.
In addition, the internal displaced Palestinians in Israel during the Military Administration were highly segregated, although as citizens of Israel, they are not integrated into Israeli society and are discriminated against socially, educationally, politically, and economically. As Marwan Dawiry claims, "From its inception in 1948, the state of Israel has treated them [Palestinian Arab citizens of Israel] as foster citizens . . . their cultural and economic dispossession is translated into a general attitude of disrespect toward and rejection of the Palestinian-Arab citizens of Israel’s national identity and their cultural heritage on the part of the Jewish majority population" (Abu-Saad 2006, 2). The refusal of integrating the internal displaced Palestinians in Israel into the social, economic and educational arena can be interpreted as racism in all its means. Not only were the IDPs dispossessed and relocated in their own lands, but they were also severely degraded and overly marginalized.

Due to discrimination, land confiscation, exclusion, lower education, higher unemployment and lower income there has been a marginalization of Palestinians in Israel. (Schulz and Hammer 2003, 74-75). As the Nationalist Government in South Africa, the military government invigorated separatist approaches amongst the indigenous population and implemented various means of discrimination. Starting with the economic position of the IDPs in Israel, their economic status was deteriorating and this was highly due to the expropriation of Arab land and low wages given to the Arab working force. The majority of the Arab population in Israel highly depended on agriculture as their main source of income, yet the expropriation of vast areas of Arab land was the most crucial obstacle towards the development of Arab agriculture and this caused a large proportion of the IDPs to turn to wage labor. In addition to the land expropriation, the indifference of the Israeli government to Arab agriculture and their tendency to freeze its development was vivid. For instance, in the early years of the state, when Jewish agriculture had not yet taken over, and fully exploited from the land left behind by the Palestinians internal and external refugees, the monopolizing companies were not reluctant in
taking the necessary steps to delay and even block Arab agriculture until Jewish agriculture was fully attained. Not only did the Israeli government stalled Arab agriculture, but also highly differentiated between the price of the produce of the Arab and Israeli population, although this discrepancy was “officially” abolished in 1952, the difference seems to increase from year to year (Jiryis 1976, 214 -215). The harsh and predatory treatment of the Palestinian farmers during the Military Administration cannot be justified in any way, and the marginalization of the Palestinian farmers in Israel at the expense of developing Israeli agriculture is inexplicable. Through establishing the ‘present absentee’ regulation, the Military Administration aimed at depriving the Palestinian population from retrieving their lands and with taking in consideration the fact that the Palestinian society highly relied on agriculture as their primary source of income, the Israeli government exploited the Palestinians Achilles heel.

In the working sector the Israeli authorities during the Military Administration and even until today; enormously differentiate between the Arab workers and the Israelis. For instance, most jobs in offices and others were closed to the Arabs and consequently the internally displaced Palestinians in Israel were compelled to work in unskilled, manual jobs which were exhausting and the discrepancy in wages between the Jewish and Arab populations in Israel is illuminate. Also it is crucial to demonstrate the Israeli consideration which shaped its attitude towards the internal displaced Palestinians in Israel, and the most prominent of which was security. The Military government perceived the Arab population as a threat to its security, thus the government and the system of travel permits made life extremely difficult for the internal displaced. Permits were persistently withheld from Palestinians seeking to travel to Jewish areas in search for employment. Eventually the Palestinian citizens demonstrated against this policy and consequently were fired at by the Israeli police. Furthermore, representatives of Jewish labor protested against accepting Palestinian workers within the agenda of organized labor. Even though the Israeli government paid the Palestinian workers a small proportion in
comparison with its Jewish citizens, the government also continued to withhold travel permits given to the Palestinians as a means of pressuring them and in order to diminish the competition amidst the Jewish and non-Jewish population. Also the internal displaced Palestinians were prohibited from working in Jewish areas, at a time when job opportunities in Arab areas were diminishing, and this led the Israeli government to set up employment offices in Arab communities for instance, five of the employment offices were in mixed populations: Acre, Haifa, and Jaffa. However these changes did not suffice and the Palestinian workers were forced to breach the military regulation and looked for work surreptitiously, and this made them vulnerable to wage exploitation by Jewish employers. If they were caught, these workers would be trailed in military courts and dismissed from their work for breaching employment regulation concerning ‘unorganized workers’ (Jiryis 1976, 220-221). In order to preserve the ‘security’ of the state, the Israeli government was determined not to integrate the Palestinians into Israeli economy, and the internal displaced population was struggling to seek income to the extent that they surreptitiously worked for employers with extremely low wages. According to Israeli assessment some jobs were suitable to Jews and were not for the Palestinians, including the IDPs. Whether from the unequal wages, or the allocation of unsuitable jobs and the exclusion from certain job opportunities, the Israeli government extremely embellished segregation among its Arab citizens.

Moving to the educational system which was also based on segregation, despite the fact that in 1949 the Kenesset passed a law regulating elementary education for both Arabs and Jews, nonetheless the disparity between the Arabic and Jewish schools was prevalent. According to this law the state is responsible for providing eight years of free, compulsory education to children between the ages of five and thirteen, but this law hasn’t been fully executed in all its means. The shortage of trained teacher, ineffective teaching programs, the vagueness of school curricula, and the shortage of Arabic textbook tend to overshadow schools for the Arab
population. The most crucial shortage was the lack of trained teachers, and after the foundation of the state of Israel the authorities purposefully appointed dozens of untrained teachers. As a result during 1949-1950 90 percent of the Arab teachers teaching in Arabic schools were untrained. The Israeli authorities had no desire whatsoever to amend this shortage. Furthermore in 1956 the number of teachers, who have graduated from college, surpassed the number of untrained teachers working in elementary schools. Yet the selection of teachers did not always depend upon the fitness of the candidates, but rather on the recommendation of the military government (Jiryis 1976, 204-206). Apparently during the Military Administration the government purposefully impinged inadequate educational circumstances for the internal displaced Palestinians and inclines on preserving the inefficiency of the educational system albeit improving Jewish schools. The motive behind this highly segregated policy was to deprive Palestinians from receiving a decent level of education and in order to perpetuate the deteriorating status of Arabic schools and compel students to dropout.

9. Conclusion:

Throughout this study and while comparing between the status of the internally displaced persons in South Africa and in Israel, particularly between the period 1948-1966, it is clear how both the Israeli and the South African government intentionally discriminated amidst the IDPs. Although the genesis of the term Apartheid is South African and was poignantly used during the Afrikaner regime so as to mark the epoch of racism, nonetheless the term in this study was also used to envisage the discriminatory Israeli policies towards the Internal displaced Palestinians in Israel. In South Africa Apartheid was dependent on skin color, and in Israel it was, or meticulously still is, based on identity. The social and geopolitical separatism of the IDPs in South Africa was nefariously enacted and was easy to point out, in contrast in Israel it was quite
difficult to highlight. The Israeli effort in keeping its diabolical and discriminatory policies against the Palestinian IDPs hidden from the world, unlike the marginalized Africans in South Africa whose resonate shouts calling for justice was internationally heard and recognized; embeds the difference of circumstances in both countries.

However, the demolition of apartheid in 1994 is a symbol to the Palestinians, particularly the internal and external refugees, that domination and apartheid can be overthrown. The de facto status of the internally displaced Palestinians in Israel is revolting, or as Edward Said asserts, "One must join the primordial or constituted group; or, as a subaltern other, one must accept inferior status, or one must fight to the death" (Said 1994, 311). Yet the real and challenging question is how? How can we benefit from the South African experience in order to end and overthrow the Israeli encroachment over Palestine? How can we resolve the internal and external refugee problem which hasn’t seemed to find a solution after Sixty Three years of dispersion?
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