

FOREWORD

[An unabridged version of my foreword from Hatim Kanaaneh's A Doctor in Galilee: The Life and Struggle of a Palestinian in Israel, Pluto Press, 2008]

In September 1976 the Israeli media published a lengthy and confidential memorandum that had been presented six months earlier to the prime minister of the day, Yitzhak Rabin. It was from Israel Koenig, a senior Interior Ministry official who held the post of Commissioner of the Northern District. His job was to oversee the Galilee, a region dominated by a non-Jewish population officially referred to as "Israel's Arabs",¹ or sometimes simply as "the minorities". These terms, it was perhaps hoped, might conceal the fact both from the international community and from successive generations of "Israel's Arabs" themselves that they were the last remnants of the Palestinian population living on their own land inside Israel.

Palestine had been effectively "wiped off the map" in 1948 during a war that carved out the new borders of a Jewish state. The Jewish community called it their War of Independence; for the Palestinians, it was the *Nakba*, or Catastrophe. Israel emerged from the fighting the sovereign ruler of 78 per cent of Palestine, with the rest – the West Bank and Gaza – occupied by Jordan and Egypt respectively. Later, during the Six-Day War of 1967, Israel would defeat its Arab neighbours and occupy all of historic Palestine. Through its vigorous settlement programme it would also erase the Green Line, the internationally recognised border separating the lands conquered in 1948 from those seized in 1967.

The road to the Palestinians' dispossession, however, had been paved much earlier, in 1917, when the British government pledged in the Balfour Declaration to create in Palestine a "national home for the Jewish people"; at the time, the Jewish community comprised only 10 per cent of the local population. Shortly afterwards, when Britain received a mandate to rule Palestine from the League of Nations, Jewish immigrants began to pour into the country over the protests of the native population, culminating in 1936 in a three-year popular uprising – the very first *intifada* – known as the Arab Revolt. By late 1947, as British colonial rule neared its end, the United Nations stepped in with a Partition Plan to create two states in Palestine: the Jewish minority of 600,000, most of them recently arrived immigrants, were offered 55 per cent of Palestine,

including the important coastal plain, while the 1.3 million indigenous Palestinians were to have what was left. The Palestinians refused, and simmering tensions rapidly erupted into low-level war. When British forces departed on 14 May 1948, the Jewish leadership unilaterally declared statehood and put into effect a programme of ethnic cleansing known as Plan Dalet.² By the end of the year, Israeli forces had expanded the Jewish state well beyond the proposed UN borders and expelled or terrorised into flight some 750,000 Palestinians – the overwhelming majority of the 900,000 Palestinians living inside the new borders.

Of the 150,000 Palestinians who remained, most were to be found in the central Galilee, a region that had been assigned to the future Arab state under the UN Plan. Smaller concentrations of Palestinians lived in the Little Triangle, a strip of land hugging the north-west corner of the West Bank, and in the Negev desert region in the south. There were also pockets of Palestinians inside some of the larger cities, such as Haifa, Jaffa, Acre, Lid and Ramle. Israel's early census figures, using religion as the main criterion for determining its citizens' identity, showed that of the non-Jewish population 70 per cent were Muslims, 20 per cent Christians and 10 per cent Druze.

The Palestinian minority was unwelcome from the outset. Although the state moved quickly to erase any traces of the Palestinian refugees by demolishing their hundreds of villages, the Palestinians left behind, nearly a fifth of the Israeli population, could not be so easily ignored. Their continuing presence threatened to expose as hollow Israel's carefully crafted image as a state that was both Jewish and democratic; and it served as a lingering reminder that such a state stood on the ruins of Palestinian society.

In addition, these remaining Palestinians, supposedly equal citizens in the new Jewish state, were the legal owners of large tracts of prime agricultural land, particularly in the Galilee, that the state craved for the development of the Jewish economy and for housing the Jewish immigrants it hoped to attract. Dispossessing the Palestinian minority of what little was left of its homeland would be one of the state's first tasks. To avoid tarnishing its image, Israel contracted out enforcement of many of its most discriminatory policies to international Zionist organisations like the Jewish Agency and Jewish National Fund, bodies that pre-existed Israel's establishment and that were accountable to world Jewry rather than Israel's mixed population.

Problematic as the Palestinian presence was, early Israeli governments hoped that, with the floodgates open to Jewish immigration, the Israeli Arabs would soon be overwhelmed by waves of incomers. That way the state's "Jewishness" could be guaranteed. But as the years passed, the task proved more difficult than expected. With a birth rate far higher than that of the Jewish community, the Palestinians inside Israel held steady at nearly 20 per cent of the population. Officials agonised about the demographic danger this posed long-term to Israel's future as a Jewish state, particularly as the destinations of choice for Jews fleeing persecution were invariably the United States or Europe, not Israel. And more generally, Israel worried that a substantial Palestinian minority might one day become a bridgehead for either the Arab nationalism of Nasser or the Palestinian nationalism of the PLO. Decades of quiescence by Israel's Palestinian citizens would do nothing to allay such concerns.

In Koenig's shadow

In early 1976, as Israel Koenig was completing the draft of his memorandum, Hatim Kanaaneh, the author of this important memoir, was resolving to leave Israel and his village of Arrabeh in the Galilee for a second time. After living many years in the United States, and studying medicine at Harvard, he was appalled by the endemic discrimination faced by the Palestinian minority. Two years later, the pull of his home village would bring him and his family back to the Galilee, where he would record the discrimination in regular diary entries. The shadow of the Koenig Memorandum hangs constantly over Kanaaneh's account of his frustrations as a Palestinian physician struggling to raise the standard of health care and sanitation in his village to that of Jewish communities, and of his experiences working for the bureaucracy of a Health Ministry that could barely conceal the superior value it placed on the lives of the country's Jews.

The post of Northern District Commissioner was a legacy of British rule, when its holder, it may be assumed, tried to demonstrate some even-handedness in his dealings with the rival communities of Jews and Palestinians. But no such limitations were in place on the Commissioner in a Jewish state. Koenig, himself an immigrant from Poland, was there to enforce the inferior status of the Palestinian minority, then numbering half a million. His main tasks were registering births, deaths and marriages, enforcing planning laws, and controlling the budgets of local authorities. In this latter role he rewarded compliant leaders of Palestinian communities with small favours in municipal allocations but ensured overall that their towns and villages were starved of the funds available to Jewish communities. In 1974, in an attempt to

improve their budgets, most of the Arab mayors formed the National Committee for the Heads of Arab Local Authorities, a body that worked strenuously to prove its loyalty to the state.³

Zionism's central tenet – the need to create a sanctuary in the form of a pure Jewish state – counted neither assimilation nor integration of the Palestinian minority into Israeli society as desirable. Instead official policy pursued the opposite principle: by ensuring Palestinian citizens were kept separate from Jewish citizens, and forced to struggle to make ends meet and to compete with each other for the support of the authorities, they would not have the opportunities or incentive to make use of the democratic institutions that were available to Jews. Palestinians inside Israel faced a classic policy of “divide and rule”, not from a colonial ruler like Britain but from their very own, supposedly democratic government. Koenig was the lynchpin of this policy.

Ian Lustick, a scholar who published an influential book on Israel's Palestinian citizens in 1980, argued that the unexpected quiescence of the minority, given their oppression, could be explained only by the state's development of a complex system of absolute control over them. The system depended on three inter-related policies: the isolation and fragmentation of the Palestinian minority into a series of ghettos; Palestinian citizens' complete dependence on the Jewish economy for their livelihoods; and the co-option of Palestinian elites inside Israel by denying them alternative avenues for advancement. Using this system, pointed out Lustick,

“it has been possible for the Israeli regime and the Jewish majority which it represents to manipulate the Arab minority, to prevent it from organizing on an independent basis, and to extract from it resources required for the development of the Jewish sector – all this at very low cost to the regime in terms of resources expended, overt violent repression, and unfavorable international publicity”.⁴

The ultimate goal of this system of control was to crush the Palestinian minority's fledgling struggle for equality. By the 1970s, as Lustick noted, the minority's leadership had begun thinking less in terms of waiting for the far-off day of Palestine's liberation and more in terms of demanding what Lustick called “Israelization”: “to make of Israel a liberal, secular democratic state with full equality of Arabs and Jews”.⁵ In other words, Palestinians were increasingly willing to accept an Israeli identity, but only as long as it involved genuine integration on a civic

basis, not exclusion on an ethnic one. Hatim Kanaaneh, as his own account makes clear, shared such hopes, though his experiences on his return to Israel soon taught him that real coexistence was impossible in a state that defined itself in ethnic terms.

Faced with growing demands for equality, Koenig, the Jewish official in closest daily contact with Israel's Palestinian citizens, had reached the conclusion that the system of control was in danger of breaking down. In his detailed memorandum to Rabin, he noted that the difficulties associated with controlling Israel's Palestinian citizens had been growing since the dismantling of the military government that once ruled over them. From 1948 until 1966, "Israel's Arabs" had been governed entirely separately from Jewish citizens. Three military regions had been created to imprison the Palestinian minority in its heartlands of the Galilee, Triangle and Negev. Each military governor was responsible for cultivating loyal "notables", usually elderly clan leaders, whose support would ensure the backing of their younger followers.

Martial law, based on emergency regulations inherited from the British, severely limited the freedoms of Palestinian "citizens". Travel between their villages, or to places of work, was only possible with permits issued by military officials, invariably in return for favours or promises of collaboration; independent political parties, newspapers and organised protests were banned; and community activists who rejected Zionist orthodoxy were blacklisted and often put in detention without charge. While the leaders of Israel's Palestinian minority were being bribed, hounded, silenced and punished, state officials confiscated the lands on which their villages depended for agriculture. Designated as "closed military zones", the lands would later be transferred to Jewish farming collectives like the kibbutz and moshav.⁶ The records are not public, but the best estimates suggest that within two decades about three-quarters of the land belonging to the Palestinian minority had been taken by the state and "nationalised" on behalf of world Jewry.⁷

As a result, most Palestinian workers quickly found themselves being transformed from independent farmers and landholders into landless casual labourers, commuting to Jewish areas to service the construction, quarrying and agricultural industries of a Jewish economy. An investigation by the Central Bureau of Statistics found that by 1963 half of all Palestinian workers were travelling to work.⁸ Those who managed to continue farming found a series of further obstacles placed in their way, including limited access to national markets, reduced prices for their goods and only a fraction of the water allowance.⁹ In consequence,

farming became unprofitable for many, giving them additional reason to sell their land to the state or the Jewish National Fund.

The cruelties of this period have been well documented in English in two studies of the military government by Palestinian citizens who suffered under it: Fouzi el-Asmar's *To Be an Arab in Israel* and Sabri Jiryis's *The Arabs in Israel*. Published in 1975 and 1976 respectively, these books end where Hatim Kanaaneh's story begins. His is the first account in English of the Koenig era and its legacy for Israel's Palestinian citizens, making it a key text for scholars, diplomats and journalists. But it is also a lively, insightful and troubling memoir, accessible to a much wider readership, of a period when Israel was being feted as "the only democracy in the Middle East". While many analysts have publicly doubted the legitimacy of Israel's rule over the Palestinians in the territories of the West Bank and Gaza occupied in 1967, few have dared question Israel's democratic pretensions inside its recognised borders. Kanaaneh's account makes no such equivocations, revealing the striking parallels between Israel's treatment of Palestinians in the occupied territories and those officially classed as having citizenship in a Jewish state.

The Jewish 'national interest'

In a sense, Koenig's task as Northern District Commissioner was to fill the void left by the ending of the military regime: he was the civilian reincarnation of the military governor, as unaccountable as his predecessor, though less powerful. And this perhaps is the primary source of Koenig's unease. The end of military rule, he observed, had "enabled the younger generation [of Palestinian citizens] to feel the power that had come into its hands in a democratic society" and "exposed the state as a target for [its] struggle" – a struggle for equal rights that Koenig regarded as entirely negative. The "Jewish national interest", he argued, required "a long-term plan for the creation of a loyal Arab citizen", one who would accept his or her inferior status.¹⁰

Koenig, however, had a further, and even deeper, concern. Israel's Palestinian citizens were concentrated in the Galilee, a large and fertile region that bordered Lebanon and Syria, most of which had been assigned to the Arab state under the UN Partition Plan. With the rapid growth of the Palestinian population there, and the reluctance of Jews to move to the northern periphery from the centre of the country, close by Tel Aviv and Jerusalem, Koenig was worried that the demographic arithmetic was turning against the Jews. Such concerns were not new. David Ben Gurion, Israel's first prime minister, had declared shortly after

the state's birth that the proportion of Palestinians in the population should never exceed 15 per cent, though his successors raised the figure to 20 per cent.¹¹ But in parts of the Galilee, Koenig noted, Israeli Arabs were as much as 67 per cent of the population. "In 1974 only 759 Jews were added to the population of the northern district while the Arab population increased by 9,035."

His fear was that over time the Jewish state might lose its ability to hold on to the Galilee, particularly if a "nationalistic momentum" developed among the the Palestinian minority. That had become more likely since the 1967 war, when Israel occupied the West Bank and Gaza and made it possible for Palestinians inside Israel to meet their kin in the occupied territories. Koenig perceived two separate threats: if the Palestinian minority organised and made its voice heard, Israel might be forced to give autonomy to the Galilee's Palestinians; or if the neighbouring Arab states attacked as successfully as they had in the recent Yom Kippur War of 1973, they might be able to recruit the Palestinians of the Galilee to assist in an invasion. The minority's demographic increase "will endanger our control of the area and will create possibilities for military forces from the north to infiltrate into that area in proportion to the acceleration of the nationalistic process among Israeli Arabs and their willingness to help". Similar fears had haunted Israel's founders. When Ben Gurion visited the north in the early 1950s, he observed with dismay: "Whoever tours the Galilee gets the feeling that it is not part of Israel."¹²

Koenig proposed several policies, designed either to rein in the aspirations of the country's Palestinian minority for equality or to reverse what he termed the "demographic problem" they posed to the Jewish state. His solutions took as their racist premise the idea that Israeli Arabs, like all Arabs, were distinguished by a "superficial" character and an imagination that "tends to exceed rationality". The implication was that they could be controlled as long as they were treated no different from wayward children – with an iron hand. What he was suggesting was a set of policies to quietly reinvent the military government so that Israel's democratic image not be damaged.

In terms of leadership, Koenig noted that the loss of the minority's agricultural self-sufficiency and its proletarianisation as a labour-force had led to the breakdown of Arab society's traditional hierarchical structures. Clan leaders, who until then had been favoured by the regime, were rapidly losing status and authority. As a result, the younger generation's rebellion against its elders was threatening to "become a

struggle against the establishment and the state”. In particular, Koenig feared the further rise of Rakah, the joint Jewish and Arab Communist party and the only non-Zionist party free to stand in national elections. Opposed to the ethnic privileges promoted by the state, the Communists were taking a growing share of the Palestinian minority’s vote away from the Zionist parties, which for many years had run separate “Arab lists” of loyal representatives from the minority. Koenig proposed that the government: distance itself from the traditional Arab leadership; create new charismatic leaders who were loyal to the state and assist them by establishing an Arab party; appoint a team charged with digging up dirt on Rakah’s leaders; and take undefined “steps” against “negative personalities” among the minority.

As for the economy, Koenig pointed out that the principle of “Hebrew labour” on which the Zionist movement in Palestine was founded – and which required Jewish businesses to hire only other Jews – was being eroded. Employers needed a large pool of cheap manual labour and, given the reluctance of most Jews to do such work, Palestinian citizens faced little threat of unemployment. This, he feared, gave them a “feeling of power” and had allowed families to accumulate “large sums of cash” that were being “hidden from the various tax authorities”. “This social and economic security that relieves the individual and family of economic worries and day-to-day pressures grants them, consciously and sub-consciously, leisure for ‘social-nationalist’ thought.” Also, given the country’s dependence on Israeli Arab labour, strikes and non-cooperation could be used by them to cause “serious damage to the economy and to the state”. Koenig therefore suggested that: the number of Arab employees in any business not exceed 20 per cent; the authorities “intensify” their efforts at collecting tax from Arab employees; Jewish businesses be promoted over Arab ones; and welfare payments to Palestinian citizens be ended by transferring responsibility from the government’s National Insurance Institute to unaccountable Zionist organisations such as the Jewish Agency. The last policy had also been recommended by Ben Gurion two decades earlier.¹³

Regarding education, Koenig overlooked the role of schools in controlling the Palestinian minority, presumably because the state had already established a separate and much deprived education system for Palestinian pupils. Also, the domestic security service, the Shin Bet, had long before infiltrated Israel’s Arab schools to create a network of collaborators both among the teaching staff and pupils. Instead, Koenig concentrated on developments in higher education, noting that, despite discrimination, Palestinian students were gaining increasing access to

universities. This had “created a large population of frustrated ‘intelligentsia’” whose resentment was “directed against the Israeli establishment of the state”. Unless checked, members of this disillusioned elite might become leaders of the minority. Koenig proposed that: Arab students be encouraged into subjects such as the physical and natural sciences because such “studies leave less time for dabbling in nationalism and the dropout rate is higher”; emigration be encouraged by making study trips abroad easier “while making the return and employment more difficult”; college administrations crack down harshly on any signs of protest or dissent by Palestinian students; and a small number of loyal students be helped and cultivated as leaders.

And finally, Koenig considered the “demographic problem” of the Palestinian minority. His major concern was over birth rates: the Palestinian population was growing at 5.9 per cent a year, whereas the Jewish population was rising by only 1.5 per cent. Not only were Palestinian citizens becoming more numerous and threatening to outnumber Jews in the Galilee, they were also exhibiting an increasing political and ideological confidence. Koenig noted that: nationalist slogans were being shouted at demonstrations; protests were directed at visiting officials; support was growing for the Communists in elections, particularly in the largest Arab town, Nazareth; and calls had been made for a general strike against the continuing confiscation by the state of land from Palestinian communities. The push for confrontation, argued Koenig, reflected “the wish of a clear majority of these people to demonstrate against the establishment and the Israeli authorities”. Given time, Palestinian activists might start to adopt “methods that were in use by the Jewish community in the ‘prestate era’”, he warned, referring to the earlier campaign of terrorism waged by Jewish militias against the British Mandate rulers and the Palestinian community.

To counter these trends, Koenig proposed containing Palestinian communities to prevent them from merging and becoming more powerful. He was particularly concerned by the Galilean towns of Nazareth and Acre, the only potential urban spaces still available to Palestinian citizens and ones that had as a result been the subject of intensive government programmes to “Judaize” them (or make them more Jewish). Nazareth, for example, the effective capital of the Palestinians inside Israel, had been contained since 1957 by the establishment of a Jewish town, Upper Nazareth, on its confiscated lands. Koenig, himself a resident of Upper Nazareth from 1962, was worried by “indications of organised activity” by Nazarenes who, unable to build in their own city because of the loss of land, were seeking to buy homes in the

neighbouring Jewish town. “There is ground for serious apprehensions that within the next decade an Arab political and demographic takeover of the Acre and Nazareth areas will occur.” This could best be prevented with efforts to “expand and deepen Jewish settlement” in Palestinian areas, as well as by considering ways of “diluting existing Arab population concentrations”. “Judaisation programmes”, based on further confiscation of Palestinian land, should, in Koenig’s opinion, focus on northern border areas and on Nazareth. The state should also continue blocking the establishment of any new Palestinian communities by strictly enforcing planning laws designed to criminalise most Palestinian house-building.

Land Day and its aftermath

Koenig presented his memorandum on 1 March 1976. Within weeks, the Israeli authorities were facing the largest confrontation with the country’s Palestinian population in the country’s short history. The minority had called its first ever, one-day general strike for 30 March to protest against the continuing expropriation of its land, particularly in the Galilee, usually on the pretext that it was needed as green belt or for military training. Invariably afterwards, however, the land would be turned over to developers to build Jewish settlements, both small farming communes and large development towns. As already noted, this had happened with the creation of Upper Nazareth in 1957, but it continued into the 1960s with the establishment of towns like Maalot, close to the border with Lebanon, and Karmiel, in the central Galilee.

In the 1970s, a new wave of confiscations began in areas densely populated with Palestinian citizens. In particular, three neighbouring villages of Sakhnin, Deir Hanna and Arrabeh, the latter home to Hatim Kanaaneh’s family, faced confiscation by the state of large swaths of agricultural land, land that had decades ago been declared a “closed military zone” to create a firing range. The loss came on top of the earlier loss of 750 acres of farmland to build the National Water Carrier.¹⁴ In response, a newly established Committee for the Defence of Arab Lands called the strike. The prime minister, Yitzhak Rabin, ordered the army to enforce a general curfew on Palestinian villages, and sent the army into the three villages at the centre of confrontation. The use of the army, rather the police, was a clear signal that the authorities still regarded the minority as an enemy rather than as proper citizens. In his memoir Kanaaneh expresses shock and disgust at seeing tanks on the streets of his village. The military government may have ended but the mentality behind it remained unchanged. During the course of the strike, the army opened fire on unarmed demonstrators in Arrabeh and Sakhnin, killing

six of them. Each year since the day is commemorated by Palestinians around the world as Land Day.

The events were seen in simple terms by Koenig. As far as he and other Zionists were concerned, land in Israel was a “national resource”, meaning that it should be exclusively owned by and for Jews – whatever the title deeds might state. In consequence, any resistance by the Palestinian minority to the nationalisation of land was seen as an attack on the state itself, as subversion. In Koenig’s assessment, Land Day was the first time “the Arab population has identified openly and cognizantly – contrary to the government’s request – with an Arab extremist-nationalist demand”. Although Koenig mostly blamed the Communist Rakah party, he pointed out that most Palestinian citizens “justify those who rioted and attacked the defense forces”. The strike organisers, he believed, wanted as many demonstrators injured as possible “to arouse ambitions of revenge within the Arab population” and “to create reaction in the world about the tension in Israel and the suppressing of the Arab population”. If they succeeded in recruiting more of those “still hesitant about joining the struggle” or won the backing of the PLO, the organisers might in the long run “cause Israel to disintegrate from within and bring about the Palestinianization of the state”.

Although Koenig’s memorandum departed strongly from the official discourse of encouraging democratic coexistence between Jews and Arabs inside Israel, there are strong grounds for assuming that his racist views were widely shared in the political and security establishments, and that they have continued to shape policy towards the Palestinian minority to this day. Certainly, no action was taken against Koenig when the memo’s contents were leaked six months later. As Ahmad Sa’di, a politics professor at Ben Gurion University in the Negev, has noted, subsequent debates about the Koenig memorandum have “mostly centered on the limits of freedom of expression (and racism) that civil servants ought to observe, instead of dealing with the premises of the State policy towards the minority.”¹⁵

After the leak, the Interior Minister of the day, Yosef Burg, was reported to have declared his complete faith in his Commissioner. The *Yediot Aharonot* newspaper, meanwhile, reported that officials close to Rabin attached great importance to the memo.¹⁶ One of Koenig’s advisers on drafting the document, Tzvi Alderoty, the mayor of the Jewish town of Migdal Haemek, near Nazareth, was soon afterwards nominated by Rabin for the job of director of the Labor party’s Arab department.¹⁷ In the end Koenig held the post of Commissioner for a total of 26 years, and

apparently never renounced his views. In 1992 he left the Galilee for Jerusalem, citing as a reason the fact that Upper Nazareth was losing its “Jewish character” as more Palestinian citizens moved there.¹⁸ A decade later he told an interviewer from the daily *Haaretz* newspaper that Israeli Arabs “only want to suck the best out of us”. He also proudly recounted his success in persuading a Christian Arab from Nazareth to emigrate to Canada, having told him: “Your children will never have it good here.”¹⁹

Evidence that at least some of Koenig’s ideas were put into practice is not difficult to find. In fact, his proposals were really only a refashioning of the approach towards the Palestinian minority developed earlier, during the military government. The most important, and related, goals of the military regime were containing Palestinian communities through the nationalisation of their land and then “Judaising” it by settling it with Jews. Today 93 per cent of Israel’s territory is nationalised for the benefit of Jews, with the rest privately owned. About 3 per cent of the total land in Israel belongs to Palestinian communities or to Palestinian landowners.

During the period of the military government Israel devised a range of laws to make the wholesale confiscation of Palestinian land possible. Sabri Jiryis enumerates five pieces of legislation that justified such confiscation, including declaring areas “closed military zones” and requisitioning agricultural land on the grounds that it was “fallow”. But the most effective legislation was the 1950 Absentee Property Law, according to which all the refugees from the 1948 war were to be treated not only as having abandoned their property but also as having forfeited their right to ownership.²⁰ Included by Israel as refugees were a large number of Palestinians who had been internally displaced (that is, remained inside the borders of Israel) and received citizenship. Under the Absentee Law, the authorities could classify anyone who had left their property for as little as a day from the date of the UN Partition Plan (that is, before the outbreak of war) as a “present absentee” – present in Israel, but absent from his property. Such citizens lost all rights to their homes, lands and bank accounts, which were seized by the state with the same ruthlessness as faced by the refugees outside Israel. Although there are no precise figures available, it is believed that today as many as one in four Palestinian citizens is either a present absentee or descended from one.

A further justification for land confiscation was introduced later, with the passage of the Planning and Building Law in 1965. This legislation detailed every location in the country where a community had been recognised by the newly established planning authorities. These

planning bodies, staffed by Jews, tightly confined the permitted development area of Palestinian communities, making any natural growth impossible and justifying a harsh policy of enforcing house demolitions against Palestinian citizens. Today, tens of thousands of Palestinian-owned homes and buildings are subject to demolition orders.²¹ Jewish communities were, of course, treated very differently. In 1971-72 the Housing Ministry announced plans to build more than 19,000 apartments, of which only 250 were intended to be made available to non-Jews.²²

An indication of the planning bodies' approach was offered in 1986 when the National Council for Planning and Building issued its master plan for the northern district. In language that could have come from Koenig's own mouth, the Council warned of the threat posed by the large Palestinian population in the Galilee: "The taking control of [the northern district] by Arab elements is a fact that the State of Israel is not dealing with as it should and this will cause distress for future generations." The goal of the master plan, it added, was "preserving the lands of the nation and Judaizing the Galilee".²³

In addition, the Planning and Building Law recognised only 124 Palestinian communities, thereby "unrecognising" dozens more – mainly Bedouin villages in the Negev and the Galilee – that predated Israel's creation. The inhabitants of these unrecognised villages were effectively criminalised: public companies were banned from supplying their homes with water, sewerage and electricity services; no schools or medical clinics were allowed, however large the village; and all homes inside the community were subject to automatic demolition orders. The goal was to make conditions unbearable for the residents so that they would move off their land and into overcrowded but recognised Palestinian communities. The state could then expropriate their land and property. As a result, as many as 80,000 Bedouin in the Negev have relocated to "planned townships", deprived communities at the bottom of every socio-economic index. But as many again have refused to move. Today, a tenth of the Palestinian minority live in appalling conditions in unrecognised villages, under the constant threat of house demolition.

Once land had been taken by the state, it needed to be "Judaised" – other terms favoured by officials included "redeemed" and "developed", though the intention was the same.²⁴ One way was to pass it on to the so-called "national institutions", international Zionist organisations such as the Jewish Agency and the Jewish National Fund. Today the JNF owns 13 per cent of the land in Israel after most of it was sold to the organisation by the state in its early years. Both the Jewish Agency and

the JNF have been allowed to implement many racist policies related to land and Jewish settlement. According to the JNF's charter, only Jews are allowed to live on its land – most of the habitable land in Israel, it should be noted.²⁵ The JNF and the Jewish Agency also oversee admission committees vetting candidates to join the 700 or so rural communities that control most of the nationalised land in Israel, thereby ensuring all applications from Palestinian citizens are blocked. In this way, a rigid geographic separation in the living spaces of Jews and Palestinians – a form of apartheid – has been maintained, with Palestinian citizens confined to ghettos. Although these two Zionist organisations enjoy a quasi-governmental status, neither is subject to the anti-discrimination legislation that exists in Israel (though is rarely enforced). They represent the interests of world Jewry, not Israel's population, and can therefore entirely ignore the Palestinian minority in their decision-making.

In the case of other state land, officials at first concentrated on multiplying the Jewish farming cooperatives, the kibbutzim and moshavim, across the Galilee, not least because they were land hungry. But in an attempt to bring in significant numbers of poorer Jews too, especially new immigrants from Arab countries, the authorities built a series of development towns across the north during the 1950s and 1960s. By the time Koenig was writing his memorandum, however, the Judaisation programme was running out of steam. Few new Jewish immigrants wanted to endure the hardships of life on a kibbutz, and the development towns were already becoming economic blackspots whose appeal was further tarnished by their proximity to Palestinian communities. As Koenig argued in his memo, Judaisation needed a new lease of life, and found it a short time later.

In 1977, Ariel Sharon, the Agriculture Minister in a new rightwing Likud government, expressed the meaning of Judaisation in much clearer language than his Labor predecessors when he warned: “We talk of Judaising the Galilee while the region is again the Galilee of the gentiles [ie Palestinians]. I've begun intensive activity ... to prevent control of state lands by foreigners.”²⁶ The next year he established the first of what would become over the following decade 50 small Jewish communities called mitzpim (or “lookouts”) scattered over the hilltops of the Galilee. (Sharon would also build a series of similar Jewish communities along the Green Line, known as “star points”, to erase the distinction between Israel proper and the occupied West Bank.)

The mitzpim were designed to attract a new kind of settler – mainly middle-class, often leftish, professionals who were very different

from the dedicated pioneers of the pre-state era. The mitzpim offered their inhabitants a move out of the cities and overcrowded centre of the country. Unlike the rigid conformity of commune life on a kibbutz, each mitzpe was marketed for its distinctiveness and individual character. Whether built to be environmentally friendly, practise the arts of alternative healing or specialise in small-scale, hi-tech industry, all the mitzpim offered “quality of life”: rural solitude, clean air and breathtaking views. Although the inhabitants of the mitzpim were small in number, their power was great. Once established, individual mitzpim were merged into regional councils that were given jurisdiction over vast swaths of the surrounding countryside, invariably much of it owned by neighbouring Palestinian communities. In this way, a significant portion of the 3 per cent of land in Israel owned by Palestinians was effectively taken out of their control.

The three neighbouring Palestinian communities in the centre of the Galilee – Sakhnin, Arrabeh and Deir Hanna – faced particularly intensive mitzpim building on the hills around them. Not unconnected was the fact that all three had been at the centre of the Land Day strike, when the state tried to take most of their agricultural land. Their resistance eventually forced the government to back down. But it also encouraged the authorities to devise a new method for physically containing these three large villages and other Palestinian communities. Today 29 mitzpim, collectively known as Misgav Regional Council, have seized control of almost all of the returned land belonging to Sakhnin, Arrabeh and Deir Hanna. The borders of the Regional Council have been drawn in such a way as to bring the villages’ farmland under its jurisdiction. In effect, Misgav decides what is to be done with their lands, even though the villages’ inhabitants have no voice on the council. In addition, the Jewish doctors, bank managers and teachers in these mitzpim – or “look-outs” – have been turned into unwitting spies, watching over their Palestinian neighbours and ensuring no “illegal expansion” of Sakhnin or Arrabeh occurs.

According to a sympathetic study published in 2004 by Haifa University, the objectives of the mitzpim were exactly as Koenig had envisioned in his own proposed “Judaisation” programme. First, they were supposed to “increase the area of the land held by the Jewish population and contain the Arab population’s takeover of state lands by increasing the Jewish presence in Galilee”. Second, they were designed to “drive wedges between the blocs of Arab settlements, in order to block their ability to create a territorial continuity that would make possible trends toward demands for autonomy in the future”. Misgav council’s

“special boundaries”, noted the study, were intended “to create a clear buffer against the possibility of creating a continuity of Arab settlement” in Sakhnin, Arrabeh and Deir Hanna. And third, by “attaching” the farmland of the three villages to the Regional Council, Misgav benefited from the land taxes levied on the Palestinian farmers rather than their own local councils.²⁷

Exclusion as state policy

The state’s methods of controlling the Palestinian minority did not, of course, end with the confiscation of land. Many other policies, including those advocated by Koenig, have been pursued, with several goals in mind:

- * marginalising or excluding Palestinian leaders who threatened to resist the system of control;
- * recruiting those leaders who were cooptable or could be persuaded to cooperate;
- * and keeping the wider Palestinian community isolated, poor, uneducated and feuding so that its members could not fill the leadership vacuum or make alliances with sympathetic Jews.

Coopting potential leaders of the Palestinian minority was one of the key early tasks facing the state, as Hatim Kanaaneh admits he gradually began to appreciate during his time at the Health Ministry. Village elders, or the heads of large clans (*hamulas*), could often be recruited with small and inexpensive favours: official recognition as the *mukhtar* (local leader);²⁸ the appointment of a young relative to a teaching post; the turning of a blind eye to the construction of an illegal building; and so on. In 1974 Yoram Katz, a government adviser on the Palestinian minority, believed much the same approach could be taken with the next generation:

When we notice young Arab extremists condemning the government and engaging in some kind of political organization or agitation, we don’t automatically put them on a blacklist. We always want to talk to them, to understand their problems, to understand what’s really bothering them. Very often it’s something very simple. Sometimes we have to pay them with a job of some kind, sometimes other sorts of favors are more appropriate. There is a danger here, however, that by giving things to such “troublemakers” we will encourage other Arabs to engage in similar activities so that they too will receive favors ... A certain equilibrium is needed.²⁹

The coopted Palestinian elite, as Ian Lustick notes, became the bedrock of Israel's success at projecting an image of itself as an enlightened democratic state:

For foreign dignitaries or reporters anxious to learn what *Arab* Israelis think of their country, the government can ... arrange interviews with noncommunist Arab members of the Knesset, young proteges of the Histadrut [trade union federation] Arab Department, Moslem religious dignitaries, government-hired Arab radio and television personalities, or prosperous and cooperative local council chairmen.³⁰

It is worth examining the many and remarkably consistent ways in which Palestinian citizens have been excluded from life inside a Jewish state to make them either weak, or encourage their collaboration or emigration. Perhaps most notable is the fact that until today the country's Palestinian leadership has been almost entirely excluded from positions of influence in the government, state bureaucracy and major organisations.

An important public body, the Histadrut, the country's trade union federation, has worked relentlessly to exclude the Palestinian minority from having a voice in workers' issues. Continuing the tradition of "Hebrew labour", the Histadrut only allowed Palestinian citizens to join in 1959, a decade after Israel's establishment, but even then they had to participate in a separate "Arab department" in the union. In the zero-sum politics of ethnic labour relations inside Israel, the Histadrut has rarely lobbied on behalf of Palestinian workers or considered their interests when they have collided with those of Jewish workers. The federation, for example, supported the imposition of severe movement restrictions on the minority during the military government as a way to prevent Palestinian workers competing for jobs.³¹ And, as Hatim Kanaaneh notes, when a million Russians arrived in Israel in the 1990s following the collapse of the Soviet Union, the Histadrut turned a blind eye as businesses and government bodies fired Palestinian workers, including doctors, to make room for the recent immigrants.

The Histadrut's willingness to protect Palestinian workers' rights has been further compromised by its position as a major employer. Until the 1990s and a wave of privatisations, the Histadrut ran many of Israel's biggest firms, including a newspaper, the country's largest bank, a construction firm, the national bus company Egged, and a dairy production company. When Hatim Kanaaneh returned from the US in the

late 1970s, the Histadrut was the second largest employer in the country after the government. However, there was not a single Histadrut-owned firm or factory in an Arab community, nor were there any Palestinian managers in its 600 industries.³² As Shmuel Toledano, a former adviser on Arab affairs to the prime minister, observed in 1977: “All the economic positions in this country are filled by Jews, the Jews control all the banks, all the corporations. In politics and the Histadrut, they have all the power.”³³ Things have barely improved since. Almost no industry has been established in Palestinian communities, both because of a lack space following land confiscations by the state and because the government has encouraged businesses to locate to Jewish areas through special development grants.

Asad Ghanem, an academic at Haifa University, has noted that over time many Palestinian villages have grown to the point where technically they are considered towns but they continue to lack any economic base. “These conditions underline the near total subordination of the Arab economy to the Jewish economy.”³⁴ The average monthly income for a Palestinian family is today about 60 per cent of that of a Jewish family, even though a Palestinian family is typically larger than a Jewish one.³⁵ A predictable consequence is that poverty rates are also far higher. Every other Palestinian citizen is classified as poor, compared with less than a fifth of Israeli Jews; and 60 per cent of all Palestinian children are living below the poverty line, compared with a quarter of Jewish children.³⁶

The state bureaucracy has treated the Palestinian minority little better than the Histadrut. In 1976 there were only 26 Palestinian citizens among the 1,860 officials listed as working in government ministries.³⁷ The situation has barely improved, despite the passage of legislation in 2000 requiring affirmative action in the civil service. In 2005, less than 5 per cent of the country’s 56,000 civil servants were Arab, and most worked in ministries that have separate sections dealing with the Palestinian minority, such as education and health. Despite repeated promises to rectify this discrimination, the hiring of civil servants in 2004 showed that only 3 per cent of new employees were Palestinian.³⁸ According to a 2003 study by an Israeli watchdog group, Sikkuy, 94 per cent of Palestinian civil servants worked in only six of the government’s 19 ministries. And a report by the Civil Service Commission a year later revealed that the Finance Ministry had only three Palestinian citizens on its staff of 743, while the Foreign Ministry employed seven out of a staff of nearly 1,000. Most were in low-level positions.³⁹

The under-representation is even worse in the state monopolies, such as the telecoms company Bezeq and the Israeli Electricity Corporation. Nachman Tal, a former senior adviser in the “Arab section” of the domestic security service, the Shin Bet, reports that in 2004 there were only six Palestinian citizens among the 13,000 staff of the electricity company.⁴⁰ The Bank of Israel, after threats of legal action, finally recruited a single Palestinian employee to its staff of 800 in 2007.⁴¹ Palestinian workers are almost never employed in Israel’s vast “security-related” public industries, such as the Rafael Armaments factories, the El Al national carrier and the water company Mekorot.

Despite Israel’s self-definition as an ethnic state, most observers assume it is a democracy because its Palestinian citizens have the vote. However, political participation has never been as free or open as it appears. During the early decades, the political choices facing Palestinian citizens were severely circumscribed. All the parties standing for election were Zionist ones, apart from the Rakah Communist party. Even then there were strong pressures on the Palestinian minority not to vote for Rakah. Under the military government, voting Communist was grounds for a Palestinian citizen to lose his job or have a travel permit revoked, the only way for many to see relatives or find work. Instead most in the Palestinian population voted for one of the “loyal” Arab candidates from lists drawn up by the various Zionist parties; in return, voters were promised minor benefits for their communities. That explains why throughout the 1950s and 1960s at least two-thirds of the Palestinian electorate supported the Zionist parties. Nonetheless, the Arab Knesset members were all but ignored by their Zionist sponsors, except when they were needed as voting fodder for legislation. In 1966 Yehoshua Palmon, an adviser on Arab affairs to the prime minister of the time, admitted that the Arab legislators had been effectively recruited to a “struggle carried on by the Jews in the name of the Arabs, for the benefit of the Jews.”⁴²

Efforts to establish independent Palestinian parties for the Knesset elections were stymied for many years. A group of intellectuals known as the Ard movement formed in the late 1950s, espousing Arab nationalism. Its members suffered constant harassment from the military authorities and, when al-Ard finally put up a list of candidates for the 1965 elections, the movement was outlawed. It was not until the early 1980s that the first Arab parties were able to stand for election. They were far from the loyal mouthpieces for Zionist orthodoxy hoped for by Koenig. Nonetheless, independent parties have faced many obstacles to political influence. Significantly, all Knesset members are expected to operate within a political framework that is an entirely Jewish, Zionist one. Israel’s self-

definition as a “Jewish and democratic state” means that Palestinian parties are skating close to illegality when they campaign for Israel’s democratisation by ending its Jewish character. This has forced Arab parties either to compromise their political agenda or resolve, as has the main Islamic party, not to stand in national elections. Those who have campaigned for constitutional reform from the platform of the Knesset – particularly one nationalist party led until recently by Azmi Bishara, which demands that Israel become a “state of all its citizens” – have been hounded mercilessly by the security services.⁴³

There is also an unshakeable consensus among the Zionist parties dominating the Knesset that Arab parties should have no voice in government. Although every Israeli government in the country’s history has been a coalition of several parties, including small ones, no Arab party has ever been invited to participate. Even when Yitzhak Rabin needed the support of the Arab Knesset members to push through the Oslo legislation in the mid-1990s, he refused to let them join the coalition. Israel’s Zionist parties have also been opposed to allowing Palestinians, even ‘loyal’ ones belonging to their own factions, to wield the power of a government ministry. The first Palestinian minister, Ghaleb Majadele of the Labor party, took up the marginal portfolio of Science, Culture and Sport in 2007.⁴⁴ Even then his appointment caused widespread protest.

Israel has marginalized and intimidated another potential source of leaders, those heading civil society organizations. Hatim Kanaaneh helped found one of the first and most important, the Galilee Society, in 1981, dedicated to improving the health and socio-economic conditions of the Palestinian minority. His struggles are detailed in his memoir, but similar problems continue today for non-governmental organizations (NGOs). With international funders treating Israel as a first-world country, Arab NGOs inside Israel are rarely eligible for the development grants their community’s actual socio-economic conditions should warrant. Instead they are dependent on a few progressive Zionist American-Jewish foundations, which either demand apolitical activity or severely circumscribe the nature of the work the NGOs can undertake. In addition, the authorities scrutinize the every move of Arab NGOs, threatening legal action, and denying them permits to recruit overseas volunteers. The most important Arab NGO, a legal organization called Adalah (Justice), which has mounted many challenges to state-sponsored discrimination in the courts, has been subject to regular investigations and campaigns against it in the Hebrew media.

Local government, despite its many formal powers, has been unable to reverse the minority's political marginalisation. In fact, in the state's first decades, most Palestinian communities were deprived of any municipal representation, thereby preventing them from developing their communities by issuing master plans, building roads, supplying water and electricity, organising schools and health care, licensing shops and workplaces, levying local taxes and applying for government loans and grants. Although by the end of the 1948 war virtually every Jewish community had a local authority, only three of more than 100 Palestinian communities were represented at the local level. Even by the early 1970s, 60 per cent of Palestinian towns and villages were still without representation.⁴⁵ In communities that elected councils disapproved of by the national government, strenuous efforts were made to weaken the local authority by denying it loans and assistance, or it was simply dissolved. That was the fate in 1974 of the local authority in Hatim Kanaaneh's own village of Arrabeh, which was replaced by a committee of three Jewish officials.⁴⁶

Today dozens of mainly Bedouin villages are still not represented because, as has been mentioned, they were permanently unrecognised by the Planning and Building Law of 1965. As also pointed out, other local authorities have lost large tracts of agricultural land – and the taxes that can be levied on such land – to the jurisdiction of Jewish regional councils. In addition, Palestinian local authorities, unlike their Jewish counterparts, can rarely depend on business taxes because they have no industrial or commercial base.

Without a local authority, most Palestinian communities were successfully deprived of basic services for many years after Israel's establishment. Hatim Kanaaneh discusses these problems in relation to Arrabeh, particularly the obstacles he faced trying to get a sewerage system installed in his village. Such difficulties were widespread: in 1976 only one Palestinian village had a sewerage system.⁴⁷ Similarly, half of all Palestinian communities were without electricity at that time. The situation was even more dire in relation to roads and public transport, as councils needed the cooperation of government officials.⁴⁸ Although Palestinian villages had to raise considerable sums of money from taxation on their residents to install basic infrastructure, Jewish communities were almost always established with such infrastructure already in place, often paid for by Zionist organisations like the Jewish Agency. Or as Ian Lustick pointed out in 1979: "While Arab local councils must use their much lower tax revenues for the installation of basic services and facilities, their Jewish counterparts are free to spend

their tax monies on, among other things, better schools and university scholarships.”⁴⁹

The hardships have yet to end for some Palestinian communities, particularly the unrecognised villages. Figures show that more than 60 per cent of Palestinian citizens in the Negev, some 90,000 people, still do not have electricity.⁵⁰ The Israeli media have reported the deaths of several sick Bedouin children after the state and the courts refused to connect their homes to the electricity grid. The families were therefore unable to run vital medical equipment needed to keep their children alive.⁵¹

Aggravating the deprivation suffered by Palestinian communities have been unequal budgetary allocations from central government. Figures from the mid-1970s show that Palestinian local councils were receiving far less from central government, usually about a tenth of what Jewish councils were allotted. To make up the shortfall, Arab municipalities were forced to levy higher taxes on their residents, even though they were generally poorer than Israeli Jews.⁵² Differentials on this vast scale have been reduced, but they are still significant. Most government ministries allocate less than 7 per cent of their municipal budgets to Palestinian local authorities, even though Palestinian citizens are 20 per cent of the population. In 2003, for example, only 3 per cent of the budgets set aside by the Education and Infrastructure Ministries for local authorities went to Palestinian communities.⁵³ With far lower allocations from central government and almost no business revenues to rely on, it is not surprising that in 2002 more than 95 per cent of Palestinian local authorities were in deficit, with two-thirds in permanent deep financial crisis.⁵⁴

A further blow has been dealt to Palestinian local authorities by Israel's establishment of development priority zones. Special budgets have been set aside for peripheral or economically deprived regions as a way to attract industry and tourism. Even though Palestinian communities are at the bottom of all of Israel's socio-economic tables, they have been almost entirely overlooked. The careful way the development zones have been gerrymandered to benefit Jewish communities was illustrated in the 1970s by the treatment of Nazareth and Upper Nazareth, with the border drawn so that only the Jewish town received benefits. Despite reforms introduced by the Rabin government of the early 1990s, only seven Palestinian regions were classified as a top priority for development, out of a total of 867 regions. Similarly, figures for 2005 show that government investment in Palestinian industrial zones was \$2 million,

compared with nearly \$400 million for industry in Jewish areas – in other words, the local Palestinian economy received 0.5 per cent of the total budget.⁵⁵ The government finally promised in 2006 to define all recognised Palestinian communities as priority regions, though, given the authorities' repeated failures to honour such pledges, judgment must be reserved until actual changes are seen.⁵⁶

Separate and unequal

Underpinning these policies of exclusion, and of preventing later interaction between Jewish and Palestinian citizens, has been the development of a separate and much inferior Arab education system. Paradoxically, Israel has often justified the segregation of Palestinian and Jewish children on the grounds that the minority's language and culture can best be protected in this way. That argument might be persuasive had Israel invested in Arab education. Instead the minority's schools have always been a pale shadow of Jewish schools, with severe shortages of teachers, classrooms and books, and government interference in the development of the curriculum so as to marginalise Arab culture. In the late 1970s there was a shortage of thousands of classrooms in the Arab education system, and most schools lacked libraries and basic facilities.⁵⁷ In the same period, there was also a severe lack of training of Arab teachers, with more than half of all elementary school staff unqualified. The government, however, did nothing to rectify the problem: there were 350 Palestinian students at teacher training college in 1971, compared with more than 5,000 Jewish students.⁵⁸

The funding of Arab and Jewish education continues to be starkly different, as was revealed in a Central Bureau of Statistics survey from 2001 that was published three years later. It found that, aside from teachers' salaries, the money set aside for the education of each Arab student was a less than quarter of that for a Jewish student in a secular state school. The differential was even higher when the comparison was with a Jewish student in a state religious school: he or she received twelve times more than the Arab student.⁵⁹ Underfunding on such a scale may explain why the picture in Arab schools remains little changed from the 1970s. A report in *Haaretz* noted in 2005: "There is still a shortage of 1,500-1,700 classrooms, 4,000 trained teachers, computers, laboratories and gyms."⁶⁰ A report by Human Rights Watch in 2001 identified continuing and systematic discrimination against Arab schools in resources in all areas: bigger class sizes; fewer and inferior textbooks; reliance on inadequate, temporary and sometimes dangerous buildings; a widespread lack of kindergartens, vocational programs and remedial

classes; and a virtually non-existent special education programme for disabled children.⁶¹

A study in 1968 found that the curriculum in Arab schools dedicated twice as much time to Jewish and Zionist history as Arab history, and Palestinian history was excluded from the syllabus.⁶² Little improvement has been achieved here either. The literature curriculum has not been updated since 1981, and most major figures in Arabic and Palestinian literature, such as the poet Mahmoud Darwish, are banned (though Darwish can be taught, even if he rarely is, in Jewish schools). Referring to the exclusion from the Arab curriculum of world classics such as Shakespeare and Kafka, Dr Mahmud Ghanayim, head of Arabic Language at Tel Aviv University, suggested it signalled “the government’s attempt to create an Arab student who is not open to the world”.⁶³ Attempts by the occasional left-wing Education Minister to temper the staunchly Zionist tone of the history curriculum have resulted in uproar, and usually produced no significant change. In 2007 Yuli Tamir’s decision to allow textbooks in Arab schools to mention that Palestinians referred to their dispossession in 1948 as the *Nakba*, or “Catastrophe”, was widely condemned.⁶⁴ Meanwhile, an investigation by *Haaretz* in 2004 showed that, although technically it was now possible to study some Palestinian history in Arab schools, it almost never was because the Education Ministry had not made the relevant textbooks available.⁶⁵

The careful manipulation of the curriculum by Jewish officials is mirrored by the keen interest the domestic security service, the Shin Bet, has taken in controlling the educational environment in Arab schools. It has long been an open secret that the Shin Bet recruits spies from among both Arab teachers and pupils, and that all appointments are vetted by a Shin Bet official in the Education Department. As one former head teacher observed: “In fact, the better you do as a teacher in an Arab school, the more tainted you become in the eyes of the other teachers and the pupils.”⁶⁶

Hatim Kanaanah noted these problems from his own brief experience as a teacher in the 1950s. Successive governments, however, denied that any interference by the Shin Bet took place. This deception slowly unravelled. In 2004 a senior official told *Haaretz*: “The Shin Bet not only determined and intervened in the appointment of principals and teachers, but even decided who the custodians and janitors that clean the bathrooms in the Arab schools would be.”⁶⁷ A year later the head of the Education Ministry, Ronit Tirosh, promised that the Shin Bet official in

her department would leave his post and that future appointments would be made according to professional criteria.⁶⁸ It is unclear, however, whether the Shin Bet has simply found other ways to vet appointments.

Although higher education is not segregated, it has been an effective arena for marginalising intellectuals among the Palestinian minority and encouraging them to emigrate.⁶⁹ In the state's early decades, access to university was all but impossible for most Palestinian youngsters, however bright, with as many as 90 per cent who took their matriculation exams failing.⁷⁰ According to a *Haaretz* report in 1971, out of a total Palestinian population of 400,000, there were fewer than 500 with university degrees.⁷¹ When families could afford to, they sent their children to study abroad. Scholarships available from the Communist party meant that the most likely destinations for many were universities in the Soviet bloc. Unusually, Hatim Kanaaneh headed in a different direction: for university in the United States. He also returned. Official statistics from 1976 show some 18,000 other Palestinian citizens who left the country, many presumably to study, did not.⁷²

Despite years of intensive lobbying, no public university has been established in a Palestinian community, not even in the city of Nazareth. None of the existing universities teaches in Arabic; the main languages of instruction are Hebrew or English, one of several disadvantages Palestinian students face when competing with Jewish colleagues. Fewer than 1 per cent of academic staff are Palestinian.⁷³ Even though Palestinians of university age are quarter of that age group, they comprise only 8 per cent of the student body.⁷⁴ Obstacles to Palestinian students gaining access to higher education include the greater weighting given in the matriculation exams to Hebrew over Arabic; the use of psychometric tests that favour fluent English speakers (a third language for Palestinian students); and the cultural bias in the same tests towards Western culture. The intentional aspect to such discrimination was revealed in 2003 when the psychometric tests were briefly dropped to help what were referred to as “weaker” sections of society. That apparently did not include Palestinian students. When the Committee of University Heads heard that the number of Palestinians gaining entry to university had risen sharply after the ending of the tests, they were immediately reinstated. The university heads justified their decision on the grounds that “the admission of one population [Palestinians] comes at the expense of the other [Jews].”⁷⁵

Once in higher education, Palestinian students face a series of additional problems, including receiving official recognition for their

student organisations. Instead Palestinians must rely on the main student organisation, dominated by the Jewish student body, to represent their interests. Protests on campus, particularly at Haifa University where the largest number of Palestinian youth study, must be licensed, an unabashed attempt to prevent Palestinian student dissent. Students violating this rule can be suspended, expelled, or have their degrees withheld.⁷⁶ And Palestinian students must endure not only a heavily Zionist-slanted curriculum but also the racism of senior staff, apparently sanctioned by their universities. Leading Israeli academics, including David Bukay and Arnon Sofer at Haifa University and Raphael Israeli at Hebrew University in Jerusalem, regularly give voice to racist opinions, including in the classroom, without fear of disciplinary action. Israeli, who was called to give “expert” testimony on behalf of the state in a trial in 2004, observed that the Arab mentality was composed of “a sense of victimization”, “pathological anti-Semitism” and “a tendency to live in a world of illusions”.⁷⁷ Bukay, who lectures in political science at Haifa, has written a number of derogatory books on the “Arab mind”. A typical statement in one, apparently similar to comments he makes in the classroom, is: “There is no condemnation, no regret, no problem of conscience among Arabs and Muslims, anywhere, in any social stratum, of any social position.”⁷⁸

Another important way of oppressing the Palestinian minority, in Koenig’s view, was enforcing the law strictly in its communities. At one end of the spectrum, he suggested, for example, that the tax authorities mount extra efforts to collect taxes from Palestinian citizens. What he intended might be understood from one national institution’s long-standing practice, which came to light after an investigation by *Haaretz* in 2004. The paper’s reporter found that for many years the Israeli Broadcasting Authority had been setting up impromptu roadblocks at the entrances to Palestinian communities, staffed by off-duty policemen, and then making threats to motorists over payment of the TV licence fee. The demand for money appears to have borne no relation to whether the driver actually owed the fee. Palestinians refusing to pay risked having their car keys or driving licence confiscated or their car impounded. In this way some \$5 million had been collected.⁷⁹

The Palestinian minority has also suffered from other “special” taxes. For many years the diminishing number of Palestinian citizens who made a living farming typically faced a higher rate of income tax than their Jewish competitors. This covert discrimination was made possible by reclassifying Palestinian villages as “urban areas” when their population exceeded 5,000. The authorities could then charge tax on their

income at the higher rate levied on town-dwellers, even though the farmers were living in rural areas.⁸⁰ Another innovation has been the imposition of heavy fines against Palestinian homeowners prosecuted over illegal construction. The courts have been levying fines, sometimes for tens of thousands of dollars, against these families in lieu of enforcing house demolition orders. Such orders are possible only because of grossly discriminatory national planning policies that make building a house legally extremely difficult for Palestinian families.⁸¹

Koenig also proposed, at the other end of the spectrum, that the authorities take harsher punitive measures to crush the Palestinian minority into submission and prevent organised protests. The state's response to Land Day in 1976, by shooting dead six unarmed protesters, showed that Koenig's approach reflected the wider views of the establishment. Land Day, however, was not an isolated instance of brutality towards Palestinian citizens by the security forces. In fact, such outrages have been perpetrated once in every generation, suggesting that the purpose is to teach a general lesson, possibly that the minority's citizenship is provisional, that civil protest will not be tolerated or that emigration may be the wiser course.

The first major act of brutality occurred in 1956 when a brigade of soldiers was ordered to set up a checkpoint unannounced at the entrances to several villages close by the West Bank and, according to their orders, enforce a curfew "without sentimentality". In their later testimony, the soldiers said they were told to "make no arrests". Some 49 workers returning to the village of Kafr Qassem were executed, including seven children. A trial found several officers guilty, though all soon received pardons. The commander who ordered the killings was fined one penny.⁸² The same year began a wave of bomb scares in Palestinian communities. One explosion alone in the village of Sandaleh killed 14 schoolchildren. Over two years, nearly 1,000 such bomb alerts were recorded by the police.⁸³

There were echoes of both Kafr Qassem and Land Day in the events of October 2000, at the start of the second intifada, when the police entered Palestinian towns and villages in northern Israel. They were ordered to use extreme force to prevent protests in solidarity with Palestinians in the occupied territories, who were being killed by the army in large numbers. Some 13 unarmed demonstrators were shot dead and hundreds more injured when the police opened fire with rubber bullets and live ammunition. A lengthy state inquiry revealed evidence of a shoot-to-kill policy but failed to identify the policemen who had carried

out the killings. Evidence also pointed to the possibility that prior approval for the shootings had been given by the prime minister, Ehud Barak, though this avenue was not pursued.⁸⁴ The inquiry recommended that the police investigations unit, which had stopped its hunt for the suspected policemen early on, restart its work. However, after a series of evasions, the unit finally announced in early 2008 that no charges would be pressed against any policemen.⁸⁵ One of the officers involved, Benzi Sau, was repeatedly promoted despite a recommendation to the contrary from the inquiry.⁸⁶

The Israeli Arab ‘timebomb’

The need for overwhelming Jewish numerical superiority was the principle that guided Israel’s founders as they devised Plan Dalet, the ethnic cleansing of Palestine of its native population. Koenig’s fears too related to the rapid demographic growth of the Palestinian minority and the danger this posed long term to a Jewish state. The policies of exclusion detailed here would only work, reasoned Koenig and other Israeli officials, as long as the Palestinian community was prevented from reaching the point where it became a significant proportion of Israel’s total population. Similar concerns continue to shape official policy to this day, a development I examine in my own book *Blood and Religion*.

From the moment of Israel’s establishment, officials dedicated serious thought to finding ways of limiting the growth of the remaining Palestinian population while increasing that of the Jewish population. In 1949, for example, David Ben Gurion announced a monetary award for every “heroine mother” on the birth of her tenth child, only cancelling the prize when he realised that more Palestinian mothers were profiting from the incentive scheme than Jewish mothers.⁸⁷ With the same intention, an array of child allowances were later created to ensure that Jewish families received far more in state benefits for each baby than Palestinian families. Hatim Kanaaneh’s daughter, Rhoda, wrote a book, *Birthing the Nation*, in which she examines these demographic policies. She notes, for example, the disproportionate interest taken by the health authorities in building family planning clinics for the Palestinian minority through the 1980s.⁸⁸ The state had found a development programme where uniquely it made sense to give preference to Palestinian communities.

Initiating much of this strategy was a body known as the Demography Council, established in 1967 with a mission to increase Jewish women’s reproduction. It was abolished in the mid-1990s as waves of Jewish immigrants from the former Soviet Union offered officials a short-lived sense that the country’s Jewish majority was

assured. By the turn of the millennium, however, sources of immigration were drying up and the Palestinian minority was still a fifth of the population and growing. It was in this climate that a new prime minister, Ariel Sharon, began trying to encourage Diaspora Jews to move to Israel, risking a diplomatic incident, for example, by warning of the “wildest anti-semitism” in France.⁸⁹ At the same time, the Demography Council was reconvened, with the minister in charge using his speech at the opening ceremony to eulogise “the beauty of the Jewish family blessed with many children”.⁹⁰

An annual convention was also launched, the Herzliya Conference, bringing together the Israeli establishment in a high-profile week of policy-making on “security” matters. The subject of its first meeting in late 2000, months after the outbreak of the second intifada in the occupied territories, was the demographic threat posed by the country’s Palestinian minority. Out of this conference emerged the first of a new kind of legislative assault on the already much-compromised citizenship of the Palestinian minority. In 2003 the government passed a temporary amendment to the 1952 Nationality Law, a piece of legislation that deals with the conditions of citizenship for non-Jews – those not covered by the Law of Return. The point of the amendment was to make it impossible for a Palestinian citizen to marry and bring to Israel a spouse from the occupied territories. The strong kinship ties between Palestinians on either side of the Green Line meant that such marriages occurred frequently, a practice that officials feared might allow Palestinian citizens to use marriage as a weapon to implement the Right of Return for the Palestinian refugees “through the backdoor”. The amendment, despite being condemned as a gross violation of the rights of the Palestinian minority by international human rights groups, has been renewed annually ever since.⁹¹

It was not surprising that opinion polls were soon showing the Jewish public as concerned as state officials about the country’s Palestinian population. One large survey, conducted by the Israel Democracy Institute in 2003, typified the trends in Israeli Jewish thinking. The pollsters found that only 77 per cent of Israeli Jews believed democracy of any sort was a desirable form of government, the lowest ranking among the 35 democratic countries polled; more than half opposed equality for the Palestinian population; two-thirds objected to Arab parties joining the government; and 57 per cent thought Palestinian citizens should be encouraged to emigrate, through inducements or force.⁹² A follow-up poll by the Institute found in 2006 that the figure for Israeli Jews wanting Palestinian citizens to emigrate had risen to 62 per

cent.⁹³ Similar results have been produced by other polls. In another 2006 survey 68 per cent of Israeli Jews said they did not want to live next to a Palestinian citizen and 46 per cent did not even want an Arab to visit their home.⁹⁴

These manifestations of racism have been stoked by leading journalists, academics and politicians of the left and right, who now regularly refer in public to the Palestinian minority as a “demographic timebomb”. More worryingly, faced with a growing Palestinian population and no obvious new sources of Jewish immigration, many are also openly advocating drastic action to save the state’s Jewishness. One favoured measure is reducing the Palestinian minority through what Israelis refer to as “transfer”, or ethnic cleansing. Such talk became more acceptable after one of the country’s leading revisionist historians, Benny Morris, told an interviewer in 2004 that Israel’s first prime minister, David Ben Gurion, had made a “serious historical mistake” in not expelling all the Palestinians during the 1948 war. Morris continued:

The Israeli Arabs are a time bomb ... In both demographic and security terms they are liable to undermine the state. So that if Israel finds itself in a situation of existential threat, as in 1948, it may be forced to act as it did then.⁹⁵

It is clear from the interview that Morris’ view of the “existential threat” posed by the inclusion of a large Palestinian minority in a Jewish state – a threat that he believes may justify the response of ethnic cleansing – includes its continuing demographic growth.

Similarly, the former Likud prime minister Binyamin Netanyahu made a speech in late 2003, as finance minister, in which he stated: “If there is a demographic problem, and there is, it is with the Israeli Arabs who will remain Israeli citizens ... We therefore need a policy that will first of all guarantee a Jewish majority.”⁹⁶ Ehud Barak, shortly after his ousting as a Labor prime minister by Ariel Sharon, supplied just such a policy. It was “not inconceivable”, he observed, that the Palestinian minority might have their citizenship transferred, though he quickly added: “I don’t recommend that government spokesmen speak of it.”⁹⁷ Despite Barak’s caution to others, it is possible to find ample examples of such ideas expressed in the cabinet and elsewhere.

Perhaps unsurprisingly, leading the charge in promoting “transfer” is Israel’s far-right. The Moledet party, led by a settler rabbi, Benny Elon, has been advocating transfer for many years. Sounding much like

Koenig, and echoing long-standing state policy, Elon explained his plan for “voluntary transfer”: “I will close the universities to you, I will make your lives difficult, until you want to leave.”⁹⁸ But the the arch-exponent of transfer on the far-right has been Avigdor Lieberman, a Moldovan immigrant and leader of the increasingly popular Yisrael Beiteinu party. Despite his extremism, Lieberman’s roots are firmly in the Likud party, of which he was once director-general. He was also head of the Prime Minister’s Office under Binyamin Netanyahu.

When Lieberman broke from Likud, he campaigned for the forcible transfer of Palestinian citizens. However, he later modified his approach to win international backing, promoting a programme he called the “Separation of Nations”. Mutual transfers of territory would be made so that Jewish settlers in the occupied territories were included inside an expanded state of Israel and the citizenship of as many Palestinians as possible would be relocated to a future Palestinian state. After Israel’s “disengagement” from Gaza, Lieberman rounded on the Palestinian minority: “Israeli Arabs must be on this agenda from the beginning, and openly. There is no point to a final status agreement if we don’t solve the problem of Israeli Arabs.”⁹⁹ He has won influential allies in Washington, including the former US Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, who wrote in 2004 of an Israeli-Palestinian land exchange: “It would be best to transfer [to a Palestinian state] territory with significant Arab populations from the northern part of Israel to improve the demographic balance.”¹⁰⁰

Lieberman’s programme has brought the idea of transfer out of the dark recesses of Zionist thinking, allowing other Israeli politicians to speak openly about it, especially as part of a potential peace agreement with the Palestinians in the occupied territories. In particular Lieberman has made respectable the idea of transferring the Little Triangle, a small area of territory in Israel close to the West Bank that is densely populated with a quarter of a million Palestinian citizens, to a future Palestinian state. He also proposes enforcing a loyalty oath on those Palestinian citizens who remain inside Israel, not to their country but to Israel as a Jewish state. In his words:

My solution consists of two parts: One, I would forfeit all of the settlements [Palestinian communities inside Israel] on the seam between us and the Palestinian Authority – Umm al-Fahm, Bahan[,] Baka al-Garbiyeh, Taibeh – and exchange them with Jewish settlements such as Ma’aleh Adumim and Gush Etzion [in the West Bank]. The second part is a new citizenship law, according to which before the individual receives an identity card,

he will sign a declaration of loyalty to the State of Israel as a Zionist Jewish state, to the flag, to the national anthem, to the Declaration of Independence, and commit to performing military service or alternative service.¹⁰¹

Polls of the Triangle's residents are overwhelmingly opposed to such a land swap, not least, it may be assumed, because they suspect that a future Palestinian state will be a prison behind concrete and steel walls, much like Gaza is today. Few Israeli politicians, however, care what Israel's Palestinian citizens think. Sharon mooted a similar land swap involving the Triangle in an article in the *Maariv* newspaper in 2004, admitting that his legal advisers were examining it.¹⁰² Later reports revealed that Sharon had been pondering the scheme since 2001.¹⁰³

Recent developments indicate how mainstream Lieberman's ideas have become. In October 2006 prime minister Ehud Olmert appointed Lieberman to his cabinet as deputy prime minister, in a newly created post of minister of strategic threats. Two months later Lieberman made one of his many trips to Washington to promote a loyalty scheme for Palestinian citizens. He told American Jewish leaders: "He who is not ready to recognise Israel as a Jewish and Zionist state cannot be a citizen in the country."¹⁰⁴ The next month, in January 2007, the government backed for the first time loyalty legislation that had been privately introduced by a rightwing legislator. Under the terms of the bill, the citizenship could be revoked of any Israeli taking part in "an act that constitutes a breach of loyalty to the state" – loyalty, that is, to Israel as a "Jewish and democratic" state. The Justice Ministry, which took the legislation under its wing for reformulation, had not released its version at the time of writing.¹⁰⁵ (Lieberman finally resigned from the coalition in January 2008, citing his unhappiness with US-promoted, though lacklustre, talks between the Israeli government and the Palestinians. The principle behind any deal, he insisted, "must be exchanges of territory and population".)¹⁰⁶

In the face on these direct challenges to their citizenship, a new breed of leaders of the Palestinian minority has dared to take a bolder approach. The party of Azmi Bishara, in particular, has been demanding constitutional and democratic reform to turn Israel into "a state of all its citizens", a political platform that has come to dominate all Israel's major Palestinian political organisations. In late 2006 and early 2007 the publication of a spate of what came to be known as "visionary" documents, drafted by various leading Palestinian groups in Israel, caused outrage among the Jewish public. All of the documents took as their

premise the idea of a two-state solution to the conflict between Israel and the Palestinians, but argued that the Palestinian minority could not have meaningful citizenship in Israel unless the country's strange hybrid of "ethnic democracy" was ended.

Following the documents' publication, the Shin Bet, backed by the Attorney-General, declared that it would use any means to foil attempts, even democratic ones, to campaign against Israel's Jewish character. Explaining that these visionary papers might "win over the masses" of Palestinian citizens, the Shin Bet stated its job was to

thwart the activity of any group or individual seeking to harm the Jewish and democratic character of the State of Israel, even if such activity is sanctioned by the law.

The Shin Bet added that it was entitled to act under "the principle of a democracy that defends itself".¹⁰⁷ Shortly afterwards, while Bishara was away on holiday with his family the Shin Bet announced that he would be arrested on charges of treason if he returned. The security services claimed that they had evidence he had helped the Lebanese militia Hizbullah during Israel's war against Lebanon in 2006. Israel's leading newspaper *Haaretz* found the Shin Bet's case against Bishara "doubtful", and no evidence has yet been presented.¹⁰⁸ However, the charges have successfully kept Bishara out of the country and intimidated much of the the rest of the Palestinian leadership in Israel into silence.

These developments have only intensified the pressure on Israel's leaders to find a way to remove once and for all the demographic threat of the Palestinian minority. It seems clear that the consensus is now behind the Lieberman approach. Shortly before the Annapolis conference in November 2007, called by the US to revive a diplomatic process between Israel and the Palestinians, Israel's foreign minister, Tzipi Livni, observed that the creation of a Palestinian state would be the "answer" to Israel's Palestinian citizens: "They cannot ask for the declaration of a Palestinian state while working against the nature of the State of Israel as home unto the Jewish people."¹⁰⁹ She set out her vision of the future:

It must be clear to everyone that the State of Israel is a national homeland for the Jewish people ... The future Palestinian state should be the response to the national aspirations of the Palestinian people wherever they are – even those who chose to be citizens with equal rights of the Jewish and democratic state that will

respect their individual rights, while their national rights will be expressed by the Palestinian state.¹¹⁰

Earlier, in August 2007, the veteran Labor politician Shimon Peres, in his new position as president, a post in which he is meant to embody the nation's unity, produced a framework for peace that, in line with Lieberman's thinking, proposed exchanging the settlement blocs in the occupied territories for Palestinian areas inside Israel. Under the plan, according to *Haaretz*, "areas in Israel heavily populated by Israeli Arabs – such as the region around Umm al-Fahm – would be transferred to the PA [Palestinian Authority]."¹¹¹

All of these ideas are in sympathy with the political instincts of prime minister Ehud Olmert. He has repeatedly stated that the goal of an agreement with the Palestinians is to create two states for two peoples, Jews and Palestinians, even if all the indications are that by "Palestinian state" Israel means a patchwork of ghettos in the West Bank and the besieged prison of Gaza.

Today, it may be that the outlook for the Palestinian minority is even bleaker than it was in Koenig's time. For those of us who wish to learn how Israel reached this point, Hatim Kanaaneh's memoir provides an invaluable insight.

Jonathan Cook
Nazareth
February 2008

¹ The more usual translation is “Israeli Arabs”, but this fails to connote the possessive quality conveyed by the original Hebrew phrase.

² For details, see Ilan Pappé’s book, *The Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine* (Oneworld, 2006).

³ Ian Lustick, *Arabs in the Jewish State* (University of Texas Press, 1980), pp. 247–8.

⁴ *Ibid*, pp. 25–6.

⁵ *Ibid*, pp. 9–10.

⁶ Sabri Jiryis, *The Arabs in Israel* (Monthly Review Press, 1976), pp. 131–4. Jiryis notes that the moshavim were created to encourage recently arrived Jews from Arab countries to farm rural areas. Less strictly collectivist than the kibbutz, the moshav allowed its residents to take a share of the profits. It also gave them the freedom to lease their lands to others, including to Palestinian citizens who formerly owned the land before its confiscation – a practice discussed by Hatim Kanaaneh in his book. Such leasing arrangements horrified the authorities and were outlawed in 1967, though enforcement was sporadic.

⁷ *Ibid*, p. 130.

⁸ *Ibid*, p. 224.

⁹ *Ibid*, pp. 215–18; Lustick, p. 167.

¹⁰ All the quotes from the Koenig Memorandum are taken from *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Vol. 6, No. 1 (Autumn 1976), pp. 190–200.

¹¹ Simha Flapan, “The Palestinian exodus of 1948”, *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Vol. 16, No. 4 (Summer 1987), p. 16.

¹² Nur Masalha, *A Land without a People* (Faber, 1997), pp. xviii–xix.

¹³ Reinhard Wiemer, “Zionism and the Arabs after the Establishment of the State of Israel”, in Alexander Scholch (ed.), *Palestinians over the Green Line*, cited in Rhoda Kanaaneh, *Birthing the Nation* (University of California Press, 2002), p. 35.

¹⁴ Jiryis, p. 262; Lustick, p. 177.

¹⁵ “The Koenig report and Israeli policy towards the Palestinian minority, 1965–1976: old wine in new bottles”, *Arab Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 25, June 2003.

¹⁶ From the minutes of a debate in the United Nations Security Council, 1 November 1976, available at:

<http://domino.un.org/unispal.NSF/eed216406b50bf6485256ce10072f637/f67d4d633a025cf685256fd3006449ca!OpenDocument>

¹⁷ Masalha, p. 151.

¹⁸ Personal correspondence with Israeli historian Hillel Cohen.

¹⁹ “The other Israelis”, *Haaretz*, 5 July 2002.

²⁰ Jiryis, Chapter 4.

²¹ The report of the Gazit Committee in 2000 found some 30,000 illegal “structures” in Palestinian communities, mostly because of a lack of master plans to legalise them. The committee recommended harsh enforcement of demolition orders. Hussein Abu Hussein and Fiona McKay, *Access Denied* (Zed Books, 2003), p. 270.

²² Lustick, p. 291.

²³ *Adalah Newsletter*, Vol. 43, December 2007.

²⁴ Jiryis, p. 104.

²⁵ “In Watershed, Israel Deems Land-use Rules of Zionist Icon ‘Discriminatory’”, *Forward*, 4 February 2005.

²⁶ Lustick, p. 317–18.

²⁷ “Unacceptable norms”, *Haaretz*, 26 September 2004.

-
- ²⁸ Jiryis notes that the system of the *mukhtar*, introduced by the Turks, was rarely used in Palestine until the establishment of Israel. Seeing the chance to create a class of collaborators, the government created 100 mukhtars in the state's first years (p. 251).
- ²⁹ Lustick, p. 225.
- ³⁰ Ibid, p. 230.
- ³¹ Jiryis, p. 219–21.
- ³² Lustick, pp. 96–7.
- ³³ Ibid, p. 263.
- ³⁴ Ibn Khaldun, *Civic Developments Among the Palestinians in Israel*, November 2006, pp. 20–1.
- ³⁵ Ibid, p. 17.
- ³⁶ “Government report: 1.65 million Israelis living below poverty line”, *Haaretz*, 5 September 2007.
- ³⁷ Lustick, p. 90.
- ³⁸ Ibn Khaldun (2006), p. 25.
- ³⁹ Ilam, *Alternative News Digest*, No. 18, 2 December 2005.
- ⁴⁰ “Even the Shin Bet is against discrimination”, *Haaretz*, 25 May 2004.
- ⁴¹ “Bank of Israel has 1 Arab employee”, *Ynet*, 10 April 2007.
- ⁴² Jiryis, p. 163.
- ⁴³ Arab Association for Human Rights, *Silencing Dissent*, October 2002; and my “The Shin Bet and the Persecution of Azmi Bishara”, *Counterpunch*, 5 June 2007.
- ⁴⁴ “Cabinet okays appointment of Majadele as first Arab minister”, *Haaretz*, 28 January 2007.
- ⁴⁵ Jiryis, pp. 227–8.
- ⁴⁶ Lustick, pp. 141–3.
- ⁴⁷ Ibid, p. 191.
- ⁴⁸ Jiryis, pp. 228–9.
- ⁴⁹ Lustick, p. 168.
- ⁵⁰ Ibn Khaldun (2006), p. 17.
- ⁵¹ Ilam, *Alternative News Digest*, No. 18, 2 December 2005.
- ⁵² Lustick, pp. 188–9.
- ⁵³ Mossawa, *The Arab Citizens of Israel*, 2003, pp. 13–14.
- ⁵⁴ Ibn Khaldun, *Civic Developments Among the Palestinian-Arab Minority in Israel*, June 2004, pp. 35–7.
- ⁵⁵ Ibn Khaldun (2006), p. 22.
- ⁵⁶ “Financial benefits for Arab communities”, *Ynet*, 10 July 2006.
- ⁵⁷ Lustick, p. 191.
- ⁵⁸ Jiryis, pp. 205–10.
- ⁵⁹ “Report: Haredi school spending twice as much per pupil as state schools”, *Haaretz*, 6 August 2005.
- ⁶⁰ “Shin Bet will no longer scrutinize Arab educators”, *Haaretz*, 6 January 2005.
- ⁶¹ HRW, *Second Class: Discrimination Against Palestinian Arab Children in Israel's Schools*, September 2001.
- ⁶² Lustick, pp. 135–6.
- ⁶³ “The Palestinian literature vanished on the way to the classroom”, *Haaretz*, 25 May 2004.
- ⁶⁴ “Education Ministry approves text referring to 1948 as ‘Nakba’”, *Haaretz*, 22 July 2007.

-
- ⁶⁵ “The Palestinian literature vanished”, *Haaretz*.
- ⁶⁶ Susan Nathan, *The Other Side of Israel* (HarperCollins, 2005), p. 89.
- ⁶⁷ “The Palestinian literature vanished”, *Haaretz*.
- ⁶⁸ “Shin Bet will no longer scrutinize”, *Haaretz*.
- ⁶⁹ “The great brain drain”, *Haaretz*, 25 May 2004.
- ⁷⁰ Lustick, p. 23.
- ⁷¹ Jiryis, p. 209–10.
- ⁷² Lustick, p. 280n.
- ⁷³ “Know thy neighbor – but don't hire him”, *Haaretz*, 12 July 2001.
- ⁷⁴ Ilam, *Alternative News Briefing*, No. 25, 7 September 2006.
- ⁷⁵ “Numerus clausus”, *Haaretz*, 16 December 2003.
- ⁷⁶ See, for example, “Haifa U. suspends students for protesting”, *Haaretz*, 1 November 2001; and “Student Union bans Arab activity on campus, citing pro-terror stand”, *Haaretz*, 12 April 2002.
- ⁷⁷ Mada, *Israel and the Palestinian Minority: 2004*, p. 102.
- ⁷⁸ “In the name of truth”, *Haaretz*, 28 April 2005.
- ⁷⁹ “IBA illegally confiscated papers of Arabs”, *Haaretz*, 1 June 2004.
- ⁸⁰ Lustick, p. 234.
- ⁸¹ For a case study, see my “Apartheid targets Palestinian home-owners inside Israel”, *Electronic Intifada*, 10 March 2005.
- ⁸² Jiryis, Chapter 6.
- ⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. 155.
- ⁸⁴ For more on the Or Commission, see my *Blood and Religion: The Unmasking of the Jewish and Democratic State* (Pluto Press, 2006), Chapters 1 and 2.
- ⁸⁵ “AG: No charges over 13 deaths in October riots”, *Haaretz*, 28 January 2008; and my “Impunity on Both Sides of the Green Line”, *MERIP Online*, 23 November 2005.
- ⁸⁶ Ilam, *Alternative News Briefing*, No. 24, 14 June 2006.
- ⁸⁷ David Ben Gurion, *Israel: A Personal History* (New English Library, 1972), p. 839, cited in Jacqueline Rose, *The Question of Zion* (Princeton University Press, 2005), p. 51.
- ⁸⁸ *Birthing the Nation*, p. 37.
- ⁸⁹ “Sharon in anti-semitism row with France”, *Guardian*, 19 July 2004.
- ⁹⁰ “Birth of a nation”, *Haaretz*, 1 November 2001.
- ⁹¹ *Blood and Religion*, pp. 125–33.
- ⁹² “The Democracy Index: Major Findings 2003”, Israel Democracy Institute, available at: www.idi.org.il/english/catalog.asp?pdid=288&did=50
- ⁹³ “Poll: 62% want Arab emigration”, *Ynet*, 9 May 2006.
- ⁹⁴ “Poll: Israeli Jews shun Arabs”, *Ynet*, 22 March 2006.
- ⁹⁵ “Survival of the fittest”, *Haaretz*, 9 January 2004.
- ⁹⁶ “Netanyahu: Israel’s Arabs are the real demographic threat”, *Haaretz*, 18 December 2003.
- ⁹⁷ “Camp David and After: An Exchange (1. An Interview with Ehud Barak)”, *New York Review of Books*, 13 June 2002.
- ⁹⁸ “A shame for the government”, *Haaretz*, 3 February 2002.
- ⁹⁹ “A party, and everyone’s invited”, *Haaretz*, 2 September 2005.
- ¹⁰⁰ “A New Opening for Mideast Peace”, *Washington Post*, 3 December 2004.
- ¹⁰¹ “Israel Beiteinu’s Political Position on Settlements, Peace Negotiations and Jerusalem”, *Foundation for Middle East Peace*, 23 October 2006.

-
- ¹⁰² “Sharon considers placing some Arab-Israelis under PA control”, *Jerusalem Post*, 3 February 2003.
- ¹⁰³ Mada, *Israel and the Palestinian Minority: 2004*, pp. 122–3.
- ¹⁰⁴ “Lieberman: The unfaithful cannot be citizens”, *Ynet*, 10 December 2006.
- ¹⁰⁵ “Gov’t to support bill on revoking citizenship for disloyalty to state”, *Haaretz*, 7 January 2007.
- ¹⁰⁶ “Lieberman blasts Arab MKs, pulls party out of government”, *Haaretz*, 16 January 2008.
- ¹⁰⁷ “PMO to Balad: We will thwart anti-Israel activity even if legal”, *Haaretz*, 17 March 2003.
- ¹⁰⁸ “Is Bishara another Fahima?”, *Haaretz*, 27 April 2007.
- ¹⁰⁹ “FM Livni: Palestinian state should satisfy Israeli Arab national desires”, *Israel Insider*, 18 November 2007.
- ¹¹⁰ “Livni: Palestinian state will benefit Israeli Arabs”, *Haaretz*, 19 November 2007.
- ¹¹¹ “Abbas opposes exchange of populated territory with Israel”, *Haaretz*, 26 August 2007.