

https://dspace.org/

Apartheid: ancient, past and present

Bathish, Nisreen; Löwstedt, Anthony, 1961-

1999-06-11T11:14:30Z
http://hdl.handle.net/10539/7619

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

BATHISH

Apartheid: Ancient, Past and Present[1]

By Nisreen Bathish and Anthony Löwstedt (Webster University, Vienna)

I. *Introduction*

The Afrikaans term *apartheid*, which originally means 'apartness' or 'separateness', has become a globally used, household word for ethnic and ethnicist oppression. There is some irony in this, since South Africa's National Party, which ruled the country from 1948 until 1994, itself coined the term to veil or mask the oppressive elements of its policies and practices. The concept of separateness in itself does not imply any group being favored over any other. Segregation *per se* of ethnic entities, after all, was supported by some South African Blacks[2]. Now in common usage all over the world, *apartheid* has drifted away from its original lexical meaning to denote physically repressive, economically exploitative and ideologically racist or ethnicist segregation. This paper focuses on three *apartheid* societies, Graeco-Roman Egypt, South Africa and Israel, and offers conceptual reflections on possible frameworks for future Truth and Reconciliation Commissions, especially with regard to present day Israel.

Apartheid in comparative focus

Throughout this century, the unique developments in South Africa have often confounded political theorists by proving to be exceptions from otherwise global trends. For instance, whilst race in *apartheid* South Africa became more decisive than economic class, Marxism's central tenet of class struggle was suspended. Ever since the repeal of the *apartheid* laws in this decade, however, Marxism could be said to have been vindicated "in the last resort". From that perspective, the highly artificially racist society of South Africa is now being replaced by a "conventionally" capitalist class society.[3]

The same Marxist analysis in this regard could be applied to the USA from 1865 (abolition of slavery) and 1964 (legislation against segregation), respectively. The US laws of segregation between Blacks and Whites, the non-violent struggle against them and the violent White backlash and reaction to that struggle in themselves manifest strong parallels to South African developments, especially as many formative events in this regard took place around the same time, in the 1950's and the 1960's. Albert Luthuli could indeed be compared to Martin Luther King whilst Robert Sobukwe and Nelson Mandela could be likened with Malcolm X (the latter two at least with regard to strategies of resistance). Blacks in the USA and in the preceding North American colonies, however, were always a minority, as opposed to South Africa.

---

[1] We are indebted to the Austrian Ministry of Science and Traffic (Österreichisches Bundesministerium für Wissenschaft und Verkehr) and to VOEST-ALPINE Industrieanlagenbau GmbH., Linz, for grants sponsoring the presentation of this paper at the conference, "The TRC: Commissioning the Past", jointly organized by the History Workshop at the University of the Witwatersrand and the Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation, in Johannesburg, June 11-14, 1999.

[2] Lester, Alan: From Colonization to Democracy: A new historical geography of South Africa. London & New York: Tauris Academic Studies, 1996: 87ff. Without segregation, many South African Blacks may indeed not have been able to keep so many of their cultural traditions - including language - and proud resistant attitudes in defiance of Whites and their cultures. Of course, this was not part of the Whites' plan. The indigenous culture was supposed to just fade away, due merely to being in the proximity of 'superior' White culture. Cf., for instance, Jaspers, Karl: Vom Ursprung und Ziel der Geschichte, Zürich, 1949: 69, 88. Similarly, the physical separation of races was favored by a Black US emancipationist like Malcolm X, and it still is today by Louis Farrakhan.

[3] Lester 1996: 2ff

AWS 12

Along with Australia and New Zealand, South Africa also stands out as a prominent exception to the "North-South Divide" of rich and poor countries, respectively. It is, for example, an often forgotten fact that the electric power station in Johannesburg in 1914 was the largest and most modern one in the world.[4] Ever since the industrialization of South Africa, it has been one of the richest and technologically most advanced countries in the world. The first ever open heart surgery on a human patient was performed there in 1967. Only a few years later, the NP government procured the country's first nuclear weapons, less than 30 years after the USA.

Other comparative attempts to make sense of South African political developments have included comparisons with Nazi Germany, on the one hand, and the Soviet Union, on the other. The National Party (NP) had close ties with the Nazis and openly supported them, but the former were not yet in power when the World War II broke out. The slightly less racist Union Party formed the government at the time, and South Africa joined the war on the allied side. After the war, however, the NP unexpectedly won the 1948 (all-White) elections – they were to stay in government until 1994. Already in their first few years in power, the NP rehabilitated South African Nazi supporters and introduced racist laws and covert operations reminiscent of Hitler's "master race" policies.[5] Ideology was also similar in these cases: The centuries-old Afrikaner idea of being "God's Chosen People"[6] (which of course goes back to the millennia-old Jewish idea) was mirrored in the Nazi notion of Aryans or Germans being "Nature's Chosen People", the be-all and end-all of natural selection. Especially anthropology and biology were misused to a great extent in order for Whites in Germany and South Africa to attempt to prove these ideas.

The parallel with the Soviet Union could also be argued convincingly. Both *apartheid* South Africa and the Soviet Union created a giant state apparatus and undertook massive social engineering programs, including large, forced removals of millions of people, whole segments of the population. These costly adventures – in financial as well as human terms – were made possible only by industrialization, the advent of which nearly coincided in the two countries at the beginning of this century. Yet, both states, it has been argued, were rendered obsolete by further industrialization. The further development of globalized capitalism demanded a state with less expenditure and less market intervention and control.[7] Indeed, only half a year lies between the demise of the *apartheid* state and the end of the Soviet Union. The two countries are at present also facing similar restructuring problems manifesting themselves primarily as high unemployment and high crime-rates.

Apartheid in an historically wide sense

In this paper, we will compare the South African *apartheid* system as well as the oppressive structures which preceded and influenced it, with Egypt under Greek and Roman rule, from 332 BC continuously until AD 642, on the one hand, and with modern Palestine under Israeli rule since 1948, on the other. Both of these societies have repeatedly been compared to *apartheid* South Africa in sweeping terms. What we wish to do here is to provide an analysis to match those generalizations, without shying away from the differences. What the parallels of Graeco-Roman Egypt and modern Israel[8] (until the late 1970's, when the Jews

[4] Iliffe, John: Africans: The History of a Continent, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995: 274

[5] Mandela, Nelson: Long Walk to Freedom, The Autobiography of Nelson Mandela, Boston: Back Bay Books/ Little, Brown and Company, 1995 (1994): 110ff

[6] Ibid: 111. In Graeco-Roman Egypt, the qualification "divine" was reserved for the royal families who were absolute rulers. A general trend in Egypt during this era was the "de-secularization" of society, which could be linked causally to the increasing degree of oppression. Assmann, Jan: Ma'at. Gerechtigkeit und Unsterblichkeit im Alten Ägypten. München: Beck. 1995 (1990): 9, 287f. Gehrke, Hans-Joachim: Geschichte des Hellenismus. München: Oldenbourg, 1990: 78ff

[7] Iliffe 1995: 282ff

[8] As opposed to, for instance, Nazi Germany, USA, Australia, New Zealand and the Soviet Union. Nevertheless, Whites were once a minority in the USA, Australia and New Zealand, too; that is, in comparison to the

started outnumbering the Palestinians[9]) pre-eminently share with South Africa, is the presence of an oppressive ethnic *minority*.[10] This is not to say that oppressive ethnic *majorities* do not act in similar ways to the way an *apartheid regime* does.[11] Yet, we believe that the three foci of our investigation share this and certain other basic traits that systematically set them apart from cases of majoritarian oppression.

Our working definition of an *apartheid* society is a society where an oppressive, economically exploitative and ideologically racist minority is in power, with or without the rule of law. The latter condition is important, since it enables us to extend the concept of *apartheid* to practices which go back to the first White settlements in South Africa. As Nelson Mandela says in his autobiography: "*Apartheid* was a new term but an old idea. . . .What had been more or less de facto was to become relentlessly de jure."[12] Our definition would include most colonies in world history, but there are some additional characteristics that our three examples share. They are all, at least during parts of the long time periods studied here, independent states.[13] Moreover, in our three chosen examples the oppressors came to the country to stay, they came to see it as *their* home country. Unlike most European colonies in Africa, the colonizers were not just waiting to be posted somewhere else. Next, our three examples of *apartheid* were among the world's leaders in different fields of military technology.[14] Lastly, in all of our cases, the oppressors came from Europe, the Jews in Israel presenting but a qualified and limited exception, since only few non-Ashkenazy Jews ever made it into the elites.

Most of the main differences between our points of comparison are of a quantitative nature. Egypt was an *apartheid* society for 1,000 years, South Africa for 350 years, and Israel, so far, for 50 years. This accounts for a number of peculiarities with each case. Only in Egypt do we observe a kind of cultural genocide without a trace of physical genocide. The Egyptian language, religion and culture (in a fairly wide sense) were all gone by the end of the Roman period. In South Africa there was, in effect, physical genocide of Khoisan peoples. To what extent it was intended, however, is hard to ascertain. As in the Americas, diseases brought along by the Whites were at least as fatal as "ethnic cleansing".[15] Geographical conditions helped make South Africa an example among many for "genocide". The indigenous populations of many Southern Hemisphere outposts suffered extinction or near-extinction from European conquest, e.g. Tierra del Fuego, Patagonia, Tasmania. Egyptians and Palestinians, on the other hand, were resistant to diseases due to their "continental crossroads" location. Population density, moreover, was decisive for the establishment of a slave-labor-

---

indigenous populations. During these early periods of colonization, we believe, the oppressive behavior of Whites would be essentially similar to the oppressive minorities studied here. With regards to Blacks however, the Whites were always a majority in the Western European colonies on the North American mainland as well as in the independent USA.

[9] If one counts all the Palestinian refugees in refugee camps in Palestinian "autonomous" areas, in the adjoining countries Lebanon, Syria and Jordan, together with the Israeli Arabs and the Palestinian non-refugees in this area, then the Israeli Jews are still an ethnic *minority*. Within the geographical context of the mainly Arab and Muslim Middle East, the Israelis are, of course, a tiny minority, comparable to South African Whites in the Southern African region or to late antiquity Greeks and Romans in the Northeastern African region.

[10] Another contemporary example of an oppressive ethnic minority, albeit in a region without state- or even provincial status, would be the Serbs under Milosevic's leadership in Kosovo, and previously also Serbs in Bosnia. See F.F.: Die Etablierung eines Apartheid-Systems: Im Kosovo wenden die Serben die gleiche Strategie an wie zuvor in Bosnien, in Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, April 1, 1999

[11] Cf. Massey, Douglas S. & Denton, Nancy A.: American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass, Cambridge/Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1993

[12] Mandela 1995 (1994): 111

[13] South Africa or parts of it were Dutch and then British colonies during most of the time since Whites started settling there in 1652. Egypt was a Roman province from 30 BC until AD 642. Israel was independent throughout the period under investigation here.

[14] Thus, a country like Rhodesia does not rate with the countries we decided to study.

[15] Iliffe 1995: 124

based economy in the Cape Colony. Such an economy would never have worked in Egypt or Israel, as we shall see.

The conclusions and parallels offered here could become useful in case an institutional search for truth and reconciliation with regard to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict could be initiated. The uses of studying oppression in late antiquity are less tangible. We find Egypt a particularly interesting case in point since the colonizers came from the two leading military powers of their age, European powers, and the oppressed ethnic majority was African, as in South Africa. Although more than a millennium lies between these two societies, several of the contingent parallels are striking in their similarity. We do not believe, however, that this has any deeper anthropological significance to the effect that "Europeans" should be considered automatically oppressive or even that they invented oppression. For any kind of scientific anthropology, 2,500 years is but a moment in the development of such a deeply rooted and complex phenomenon as oppression. As we shall see, certain Europeans may have invented slave-labor-based economies – which play important roles for Graeco-Roman Egypt as well as for South Africa – but to say that they also invented *all* the basic phenomena that make up *apartheid*, would be to go too far with the available facts. Nevertheless, the extension of the label *apartheid* to an ancient society is certainly significant for the purpose of understanding oppression.

Another reason for choosing Graeco-Roman Egypt as a point of comparison is the enormous influence that Greek and Roman culture have exerted upon European and World culture in general. Usually, this influence has been evaluated in positive terms, but what we wish to do here is to draw attention to elitist, ethnocentric and other violent aspects of these civilizations.[16] South Africa's *apartheid* system is, of course, historically unique, but here we will attempt to point to indications suggesting that it is not structurally unique.

1. Graeco-Roman Egypt

Egypt was added to the Macedonian-Greek Empire in 332 BC by Alexander the Great and his forces peacefully. At first, the Macedonians were seen by the Egyptians as liberators, casting off the yoke of Persian occupying forces who had ruled Egypt, with intervals, since 525. After the death of Alexander in 323, one of his top generals, Ptolemy, a Macedonian like Alexander, instated himself as god-king, divine ruler over Egypt and in one stroke declared all the land to be crown land. His dynasty then ruled the country without interruption until 30 BC. This period in the history of Egypt is usually referred to as the Ptolemaic period, and it manifests what has been termed 'the most exploitative of all known systems of oppression throughout antiquity'.[17]

The Ptolemaic state was something in between an absolute monarchy and a military dictatorship,[18] but there was also a small free space for well-off Greek men, which could be described as an open society.[19] In the multi-layered and stiff class society of Ptolemaic Egypt, privilege was based mainly on ethnicity.[20] Just like in South Africa, immigration from the European mother country was encouraged and subsidized. There were some poor Greeks, too, like the White underclass in South Africa or the Eastern European and Ethiopian Jews in Israel.

A small difference to South Africa was constituted by the fact that the Greeks did allow some – but only very few – exceptions to their version of *apartheid*. Yet, contacts

---

[16] Cf. Bernal, Martin: Black Athena: The Afro-Asiatic Roots of Classical Civilization, Vol 1: The Fabrication of Ancient Greece 1785-1985, London: Free Association Books, 1987, for a critique of ideological aspects of the Graeco-Roman civilization becoming the model for European culture.

[17] Koch, Klaus: Geschichte der ägyptischen Religion, Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1993: 488

[18] Weber, Gregor: Dichtung und höfische Gesellschaft: Die Rezeption von Zeitgeschichte am Hof der ersten drei Ptolemäer, Stuttgart: Steiner, 1993: 4

[19] Walbank, Frank: Die hellenistische Welt, München: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, [4]1994 (1981): 255

[20] Weber 1993: 22ff

between the physically segregated ethnic groups were closely regulated and controlled.[21] The few Egyptians who did make careers under the Ptolemies were already 'de-egyptianized' to a great extent; they used the Greek language instead of Egyptian, and many of them bore Greek names.[22] Visible differences between Greeks and Egyptians were of course not as great as those between Blacks and Whites in South Africa, and that made *apartheid* a slightly more pliable and flexible system in Egypt. Yet, this made no difference for the vast majority of the inhabitants.

> "Though later...a certain degree of low-level acculturation took place, in the fourth and third centuries imperial racism was rampant among the Greeks and Macedonians...and never entirely died out."[23]

The "low-level acculturation" refers to the occasional, yet slowly increasing rate of, Greek-Egyptian marriages and other contacts, which took place almost entirely on the lowest income levels, a fact which we shall return to. In Roman Egypt, interethnic marriage was partly banned. In general, *apartheid* – in the wide sense, proposed above – is no exaggeration when applied to Egypt under Macedonian rule.

> "Ptolemaic Egypt...remained throughout its history a land of two cultures which did coexist but, for the most part, did not coalesce or blend. . . . We discern the manifestations of the two discrete cultures in every aspect of their coexistence. . . . It would be difficult...to exaggerate the significance of the fact that, except for some local designations of places, measures, and so on, no native Egyptian word made its way into Greek usage in the thousand years that Greek endured as the language of Ptolemaic, Roman and Byzantine Egypt."[24]

In fact, none of the words that we use today to describe ancient Egypt are Egyptian themselves, e.g. *pyramid, sphinx, pharaoh, Egypt, hieroglyph*. Even the Gods and all the major cities were given Greek names. This kind of cultural dispossession is common with colonialism and it repeated itself in South Africa, one difference being that Egyptian, the language of the entire majority, was wiped out under Greek (and to a lesser extent, Latin) domination. In comparison, Khoisan languages, with some exceptions, were annihilated in South Africa, but the Bantu languages persevered.[25]

The Whites in South Africa now seem to have progressed further than the Europeans in Egypt in acculturation by starting to use certain African words like *ubuntu*, *sangoma* or

---

[21] Weber 1993: 78, 154. One of the earliest proponents of the idea of Graeco-Roman Egypt as an *apartheid* society was a classical archaeologist at the University of the Witwatersrand; Davis, Simon: Race-Relations in Ancient Egypt: Greek, Egyptian, Hebrew, Roman. London: Methuen, 1951: esp. 41ff. The idea gained ground in the middle of this century and has now become a "new orthodoxy" according to R. Bagnall: Egypt in Late Antiquity, Princeton: Princeton U.P., 1993: 231. Bagnall is apparently unhappy with this view. In the same vein, Goudriaan, Koen: Ethnicity in Ptolemaic Egypt, Amsterdam: Gieben, Dutch monographs on ancient history and archaeology: vol. 5, 1988, proclaims "...there was no "apartheid" in Ptolemaic Egypt...", referring to the fact that we do not know of any Ptolemaic *laws* of oppressive segregation, although he has some doubts as well and definitely considers Roman Egypt an *apartheid* society, ibid: Preface and 119.

[22] "Any Egyptian who wanted to get anywhere under the Ptolemies had to speak and preferably also write *koine* Greek." (*Koine* Greek was the *lingua franca* that was used around the Eastern Mediterranean at the time.) Green, Peter: Alexander to Actium, The Historical Evolution of the Hellenistic Age, Berkeley, Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1990: 313, see also Weber 1993: 388ff

[23] Green 1990: ibid.

[24] Lewis, Naphtali: Greeks in Ptolemaic Egypt: Case Studies in the Social History of the Hellenic World, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986: 154f, cf. Green 1990: 5. Byzantine Egypt (AD 330-642) was ruled by East Rome (Constantinople), which continued Roman policies in Egypt.

[25] Lester 1996: 10

impimpi.[26] Yet, it should not be forgotten that *apartheid* is now formally absent from South African politics. Therefore, this linguistic comparison with Greek-speaking Egypt is, strictly speaking, already an anachronism. (In the final analysis, however, one should not underestimate economical, social and cultural *apartheid*, which are still factors in today's South African society.)

The Roman Empire took over Egypt after Cleopatra VII, the last Ptolemy, committed suicide in 30 BC. The Romans had for long been envious of the excellent harvests in Egypt and they, too, economically exploited the Egyptians more than they did any other of the many people they conquered.[27] Thus, they left the social structure of Ptolemaic Egypt intact, with the exception of political power and additional "...repressive provisions...amounting to a veritable ancient apartheid".[28] The Greeks remained an upper class with all their previous (especially economic) privileges except the possibility of ruling, which now passed directly to the hands of the emperor in Rome and the bureaucracy of the (Roman) governor and his (Roman) occupying army. If *apartheid* is no exaggeration when applied to Ptolemaic Egypt, it is some respects even an understatement when applied to Roman Egypt.

2. South Africa

With their *apartheid* system, the White minority of South Africa dominated the Blacks and the Coloreds (the non-White and non-Black population) with a set of legalized inequalities. This included the restriction of non-Whites from entering certain areas unless they possessed a certain document permitting them into these areas, for reasons such as work. The concept of "separateness", although it no longer accurately defines *apartheid*, is still a key notion describing this system, since racial segregation, of both public and private facilities, played a vital role in the White practice of oppression (to the extent that many public benches, toilets and other facilities were restricted to "Whites only"). Sexual relations and marriage between the races were also banned.[29]

Separateness in South Africa can be traced back to the 17th century, when the Dutch East India Company, VOC (*Vereenigde Nederlandsche Ge-Octroyeerde Oost Indische Compagnie*), actively separated the Cape settlers from the Khoisan (pastoralist Khoikhoi and hunter-gatherer San) peoples. The system of slavery that was practiced in the late 18th century generated the first passes for non-Whites. These passes were issued to slaves and Khoisan by their employers to provide proof that they had not run away from prison or from work. Other features of *apartheid* were also present already in the early Cape Colony, such as the banning of intermarriage between races, restrictions on land ownership for Blacks, and most of the officials, and all of the top officials, appointed were White.

During *apartheid* and the preceding periods of White domination, it seemed almost impossible for this racist and oppressive system to ever end. Non-Whites did not have the vote, and therefore, any essential change was ruled out. (Colored people were allowed to participate in voting after 1983).[30] Other "illegal" practices (assuming that separateness was legal) took place, helping the White minority to all privileges, while leaving the rest, especially the Black population, in a very disadvantaged situation, where their income, employment and education opportunities, health and living standards were regarded as "less important" issues.

---

[26] Zulu for humanism, healer/diviner and traitor, respectively, see Glossary in Krog, Antjie: Country of My Skull. Johannesburg: Random House, 1998: 282-286

[27] Lewis Naphtali: Life in Egypt under Roman Rule. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983: 33

[28] Lewis 1983: 34. Also Koch 1993: 589

[29] Roman Egypt, similarly, restricted or prohibited marriage between Egyptians and Europeans. Ibid: 32f

[30] Robertson, David: Dictionary of Politics. London: Penguin Books, 1993: 19

3. Israel

The Israeli occupation of Palestine, even though it is not generally regarded as a system of *apartheid*, resembles the White racist practices against the non-Whites of South Africa between 1948-1991, with the Israeli government playing the role of the White South African government, the non-Jews corresponding to the non-Whites and the Palestinians corresponding to the Blacks. As Abdel Rahman, special envoy to the Palestinian president Yassir Arafat, once stated: "...The Palestinian people have much in common with South Africans anti-*apartheid* movement...but [they] are still under a colonial *apartheid* system."[31]

To begin with, the concept of *apartheid* mirrors the current situation in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip quite accurately. Ever since the beginning of the so-called "peace process" with 1993 Oslo accord, which led to a division of the entire region, the Palestinians living in the West Bank and Gaza may not enter the rest of the country – many Palestinians work in Israel - without special permits, issued by the Israeli government, allowing for their entry. These permits are issued for a short period of time (sometimes as little as two hours). At the same time, segregation exists in practice in other parts of the country, such as in East and West Jerusalem, where the West is for the Israelis and the East is predominantly Arab with the exception of the Old City of Jerusalem, which is divided between Arabs (Christian and Muslim), Armenians, and Jews. Although there is no *apartheid* law demanding separation within Israeli territory, people from these different ethnic groups do not mix much in practice.[32] Even Jews of different origins tend to stick together and live separately from other Jews. Especially the Russian and Ethiopian Jews have a difficult relationship, and European Jews and Yemeni Jews also tend to separate from each other.[33] Apart from the issue of separateness, there are other aspects of oppression and discrimination against the Palestinians, as with the South African *apartheid* system, of different wages, living standards (especially among the Palestinian refugees) and rights to property, as Edward Said describes it:

> "...minute by minute, hour by hour, day after day, [the Palestinians] are losing more Palestinian land to the Israelis. Scarcely a road, or a highway, or a village that...hasn't witnessed the daily tragedy of land expropriated: field bulldozed; trees, plants and crops uprooted; houses demolished . . . Jews can build, but never Palestinians. This is Apartheid."[34]

In South Africa, the Blacks in the 1980s owned 14% of the land only.[35] Apart from the fact that the majority of the population owns the smallest amount of land, it is also the least desirable area of land, where "...soil erosion and the overworking of the soil make it impossible for them to live properly off the land."[36] These are some of the various measures which the Blacks and non-Whites of South Africa had to face for almost 350 years and which the Palestinians are still facing today.

Today's volatile situation in Palestine and present-day Israel is characterized by a vicious circle of land confiscations by the Jews and terrorist acts by Palestinian extremists. This goes back at least to the end of the British mandate in the 1940's.

---

[31] N.N.: Arafat Aide asks S. Africa to Promote Mideast Peace, Reuters, February 9, 1998. Of course modern Israel was never a colonial power in the strict sense. Yet, the predominance of European and North American Jews in Israel has in many ways made it an outpost of a North Atlantic hegemonic system.

[32] A qualified exception to this would be the way some Israeli Arabs and Jews mix in the pre-1967 areas.

[33] Eaves, Elisabeth: Ethiopian Jews struggle to adapt in Israel, Reuters, August 30, 1998

[34] Said, Edward: An Orphaned People, Nation, May 4, 1998, 266 (16): 18-20

[35] Mandela, Nelson, The Struggle is My Life. New York: Pathfinder, [3]1990 (1978): 13

[36] Mandela [3]1990 (1978): 177

II. *Gross Human Rights Violations*

The creation of an *apartheid* state in South Africa, the creation of the Ptolemaic state and an Imperial Roman province in Egypt and the creation of the modern state of Israel (via the occupation of Palestine) each led to a "State of War" in John Locke's sense[37], since these states did maintain or have maintained rule for decades (in the first cases: for centuries), with engineered racial and ethnic inequalities, tension and violence, where the indigenous people, the majority of the citizens, had no superior authority to turn to for protection and relief. In hindsight, the role of the international community in bringing about peace in South Africa and Israel must be said to have been a minor, though not entirely negligible one (so far).

A. Physical Violence

1. Graeco-Roman Egypt

There were several armed uprisings by the Egyptians, both under Greek and Roman rule, but they were all suppressed in bloody clampdowns. The most famous revolt took place in 207 BC, when all of Upper Egypt (Egypt south of the Nile delta) was liberated until 186 BC. This was the only proclaimed and widely acknowledged Egyptian-led state-like structure during the thousand years of Graeco-Roman dominance. Nonetheless, Greeks and Romans failed to ever achieve complete control. Throughout the ten centuries of their rule, lawless bands persisted, especially in Upper Egypt. Hold-ups and robberies were never stamped out: "...brigandage remained endemic in Roman Egypt, inveterate and ineradicable in good times, a menace increasing to near crisis proportions in bad."[38]

In terms of physical violence, Graeco-Roman Egypt and South Africa have more in common than what first, perhaps, comes to mind: the millennium that lies between the Arab conquest of Roman Egypt and the establishment of the Cape Colony.

In both cases, two European military superpowers shared resources and power in a rich, subtropical part of Africa. The first waves of Europeans – the Greeks and the Dutch, respectively – declared independence from their European mother countries. Throughout the period of oppression, they also remained the majority of European settlers. The colonizers fought one short major war between each other, the end of which established the new, even smaller, minority as rulers. The subjugation of a great majority of indigenous Africans provoked several armed uprisings, all of which were suppressed by physical violence.

The respective differences in military technology are also similar. The Egyptian army used mainly bronze weapons, they enjoyed no access to iron ore, nor to fuel (firewood) to smelt it. The Greeks – like the Assyrians and the Persians (earlier conquerors of Egypt) before them – had superior weapons and armaments made of iron.

Black South Africans also had iron weapons, notably spears, with which the Zulu nation was able to repel an invading British army consisting of 8,000 soldiers as late as 1879. Already in 1882, however, the British returned victoriously to KwaZulu, this time with machine guns.

The British, like the Dutch (and the Afrikaners), always had firearms in South Africa. Thus, they were one step ahead of the Africans they subjugated in terms of military technology, again corresponding to Graeco-Roman military superiority over the Egyptians.[39] During the centuries that these societies lasted, the respective armies were leading the world,

---

[37] "Force, or a declared design of force upon the Person of another, where there is no common superior on Earth to appeal to for relief, is the State of War." (John Locke: Second Treatise of Government, 3.19)

[38] Lewis 1983: 203f

[39] Oliver, Roland: The African Experience, London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1991: 169. McEvedy, Colin: The Penguin Atlas of African History, London: Penguin, 1995 (1980): 109

or nearly so, in terms of military technology.[40] This is something they also both share with modern Israel.

2. South Africa

The pattern of physical violence in South Africa under *apartheid* is only currently being investigated. Because of the suffering during the *apartheid* period and as a negotiating chip in the phased handover of power to democratic majority rule, the Truth and Reconciliation Commission was created in order to allow the victims of these gross human violations learn the truth about their suffering. It was believed that by finding out the truth, compensating victims and granting amnesty to those who committed gross human rights violations out of political motives, reconciliation and improved historical knowledge would result, and to a considerable extent, this has proven to be the case.

Due to political pressures and limited time and money, the Commission was designed to question the gross violations of human rights which took place during the most violent phase of *apartheid*, from 1960 until 1994. By doing so, the commission examines the reasons and factors which led to such violations, as well as taking into consideration those who were affected by these acts (whether the victims themselves or their relatives) by compensating them with small, mainly symbolic, sums of money. Those who committed the violations would be granted amnesty only if they qualify as politically motivated, and tell the full story why and how they committed their crime. The victims and the perpetrators are of all groups and races.

One of the most well known reports is that of Steve Biko, a leader of the Black Consciousness movement, who died in prison after having been tortured brutally. The five policemen who are widely considered responsible for his death and denied any direct involvement in his killing, sought amnesty but were turned down. They told the amnesty panel of the TRC that they believe Biko's death to be an accident, an accident which took place after the prisoner was brutally beaten by the five policemen with a rubber hose, followed by 24 hours of chaining. This resulted in brain damage, yet Biko received no immediate medical treatment, since the policemen felt he was "...arrogant, aggressive and he didn't answer questions at all."[41]

Members of the African National Congress guerrilla group, Umkhonto We Sizwe (MK) also committed human rights violations. One of the TRC hearings was concerned with the gross violations which the ANC committed at their detention camp in Angola, as a result of which at least six people died during the 1970s and 1980s. Other such acts include bomb attacks throughout the 1980s. The MK planned and executed 13 attacks from 1980 to 1988, in which 23 people where killed and more than 350 were injured[42]. The deadliest attack took place in Pretoria in 1983, when a bomb took the lives of 19 people, leaving another 217 injured.[43]

It was widely assumed or known that South Africa possessed nuclear weapons from 1975.[44] The South African military's secret chemical and biological weapons programs produced weapons and poisons which were used to assassinate ANC members in South Africa and abroad. The covert army "Medical Battalion" behind the program produced lethal screw drivers, bicycle pumps, walking sticks, umbrellas and tear gas. They also produced "thallium in beer, salmonella in sugar, paraquat in whisky" and had further programs to

---

[40] This included siege towers, ramming devices and catapult artillery in Ptolemaic Egypt, which for a while was the world's undisputed leader in military technology. Walbank 1994 (1981): 198ff. The Roman Empire was by far the most formidable military power the world had ever seen. For South Africa and Israel, see below.

[41] Emma Thomasson. S. Africa's Biko left chained for 24 hours-Police. March 30, 1998, Reuters

[42] Schuettler Darren. ANC guerrilla regret deaths, seek amnesty. May 4, 1998, Reuters

[43] Schuettler 1998

[44] Saito, Tadaomi et al: The Road to the Abolition of Nuclear Weapons, Tokyo: Asahi Shimbun, 1999: 198. The nuclear arsenal of South Africa was reportedly scrapped in 1993.

spread drugs and chemicals among Blacks to pacify and even to sterilize them.[45] The knowledge of the extensive chemical and biological weapons program is due to the TRC and could be considered one of its greatest victories.

Apart from the TRC cases, there are other examples which demonstrate the brutality and often illegality of physical violence practiced or condoned by the South African ruling minority. Between 1948 and 1954, 104 Africans were killed and more than 240 wounded by the police in cases related to political demonstrations. By 1960, the estimated number had risen to over 300 killed and 500 wounded, mainly by gunfire and beatings.[46] Compared to the 204 Palestinians killed similarly in 1988 alone, this is not a great number. It is, however, enough to warrant investigations, especially since victims are still paying the price for these crimes today.

3. Israel

The problem of gross human rights violations has long existed in the Occupied Territories (Gaza and the West Bank, including East Jerusalem), mainly due to physical violence, such as indiscriminate killings, assassinations and torture. This became most visible from 1987, with the start of the *Intifada*, the Palestinian uprising. Many civilians have been killed and wounded since then, mainly whilst participating in rioting and demonstrations. A great number of these civilians were innocent of any activity that could endanger the safety and well-being of the country. However, the *Intifada* provided the Israeli army and police with pretexts to act in any way they found necessary to control and suppress civilians. At the same time, the country was under the constant threat of civil unrest, including suicide bombings and other acts, which did not involve the ordinary citizens but terrorist groups, including the armed wing of *Hamas*.

Between December 1987 and November 1988, *Al Haq*[47] alone reported 204 deaths in the West Bank. 180 of these deaths were a result of Israeli live ammunition against the Palestinians. The remaining numbers were results of tear gas, beatings, plastic bullets and other instruments, and most of the dead were between the ages of 16 to 25, (six of them were under the age of five).[48] The number of wounded is difficult to obtain, for several reasons; the first being that many of the wounded do not seek treatment in official hospitals due to fear of being arrested (if suspected of being involved in civil unrest). Secondly, it is difficult to obtain any adequate reports on the wounded in Israeli hospitals for "security" and other reasons. Yet, even when records are presented by hospitals, they vary. In 1988, former Defense Minister (later Prime Minister) Yitshak Rabin stated that in less than two years, more than 7,000 Palestinians were wounded. According to the *Jerusalem Post*, however, a total of 3,000 people were wounded between 1987 and 1988. According to the Al Haq report, finally, an estimated total of 20,000 Palestinians were wounded between 1987 and 1988 in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip.[49]

According to Rabin, the use of plastic bullets was necessitated by rubber bullets and tear gas not being sufficiently accurate to hit stone throwers 30 meters away. Plastic bullets are being used widely even by soldiers who only have "...a short course in which they were trained to use the bullets..." resulting in a "...six-fold increase in the number of Palestinian casualties in the Gaza Strip..." in the first month after the plastic bullets were introduced.[50]

The use of force in the Occupied Territories and Palestinian refugee camps occurred under: (a) Conditions which were not connected to protest activities, such as the arrest of civilians without warrant in their homes. Suspects were often taken to remote areas, where

[45] Lovell Jeremy. S. Africa truth body opens chemical warfare hearing. June 8, 1998. Reuters
[46] Mandela 1990 (1978): 125
[47] Al Haq, established in 1979, is an NGO affiliated with the International Commission of Jurists.
[48] Al Haq: Punishing a Nation, Ramallah: Al Haq, 1988: 11
[49] Ibid: 12. A Palestinian-Israeli TRC would be well advised to investigate such discrepancies.
[50] Ibid: 16

they were beaten before being released. Many beatings in general take place when the person is already under arrest, when the use of force is no longer called for. (b) Beatings were commonly aimed at the limbs, joints and the head and were implemented with the use of wooden clubs at first, which were later replaced by plastic and fiberglass truncheons, as the wooden clubs were found to break. (c) Beatings were almost always practiced by a group of soldiers. (d) Many Palestinians were victimized merely for being in groups, sometimes as small as six people, since strict limitations on the freedom of assembly were applied.[51]

There are other types of physically violent acts which are not categorized as "use of force" since they differ from the "official" uses of force, for example, soldiers demanding that people climb on electricity wires to remove stones on strings, where in many of the cases people died as a direct result of electrocution. Phosphorous grenades resembling normal tear gas grenades (in size and color) were used by the IDF, causing long term injuries. Last but not least, syringes with unidentified contents were used on Palestinians during interrogation by the Israeli Authority, in addition to different acts of physical and psychological humiliation.[52]

Between December 1987 and September 1988, only two soldiers were found guilty of murder and manslaughter. One of reasons why few trials take place is the lack of complaints because people fear the consequences of such complaints, both for the victims and the lawyers representing the victims. This is mainly the case with physical violence not resulting in death. Investigations into deaths are usually carried out by military police, and, sometimes, justice prevails. The repeated abuse of human rights during the uprising serves as a reminder that these same abuses caused the rebellion to begin with.

Israel denies making or harboring nuclear, biological and chemical weapons. A recent independent Japanese investigation, however, concludes that Israel is a *de facto* nuclear weapons state.[53] Controversy also surrounds Israel's claim of not having any biological and chemical weapons programs. Israel's High Court has recently suspended government plans to expand a top secret scientific facility, because of suspicions that it produces biological weapons. Residents (Jews) near the facility fear that it might mean safety hazards. The plant, which is hidden behind a high wall in an industrial area close to Tel Aviv, is said to have up to three hundred workers, 120 of whom are scientists.[54]

According to another report, Israel produced a clandestine nuclear weapons program already in the 1950s and has since then developed hundreds of atomic bombs. In 1973, United States military intelligence detected the first signs of Israeli nuclear-related military objects, and it believes that the country by now has many nuclear warheads.[55]

Israel, it is true, is a small state, but its military budget is comparatively large. This is mainly due to massive military aid from the US. Israel annually receives $3 billion in foreign aid from the US, more than any other country. $1,8 billion of this is military aid.[56]

The South African and Israeli "Defense" Forces display remarkable parallels with

---

[51] Ibid: 12ff

[52] Ibid: 37. An overwhelming number of incidents and cases such as these remain unpublished and unnoticed, a circumstance which further underscores the need for a Truth and Reconciliation Agency in Palestine and present-day Israel.

[53] Saito et al 1999: 198, see also 69, 75ff

[54] Goller Howard: Israel's Biological Institute plans expansion. September 23, 1998, Reuters. After the El Al cargo plane crash in Amsterdam 1992, in which at least 43 people were killed, a Dutch parliamentary commission was set up to investigate the causes of several deaths and injuries (including rescue workers'), the causes of which have yet to be determined. After an investigative newspaper article had been published, Israel admitted that components of sarin gas had been part of the cargo (190 liters). Israel claimed, however, that the material was not toxic and was to have been used to test filters that protect against chemical weapons. McBride, Janet: Dutch El Al Crash Report said to be Critical of PM, April 21, 1999, Reuters

[55] Gur-arieh Danny: Mideast Nuclear War. October 4th, 1998. Reuters

[56] Goller, Howard: U.S. asks Israel about suspected rights abuses, October 21, 1998, Reuters. A considerable portion of South Africa's military hardware and technology was imported from Israel (along with the USA, Europe and Taiwan). After the UN arms embargo on South Africa in 1977, the imports continued, mainly from Israel and Taiwan. Thompson 1990: 200

regard to physical violence. They both resorted to indiscriminate shootings of unarmed civilians, including peaceful protestors and journalists.[57] They even shot and killed unarmed children, whose only crime was to protest against being treated as second-class citizens. We do not know if similar action was perpetrated by Ptolemaic and Roman forces in Egypt, but it does not seem far-fetched to assume so.

The other gross human rights violations

Any theoretical treatment of gross human rights violations must include more than just the occurrence of physical violence. South Africa's TRC was exemplary by pointing this out through its inclusion of business, labor, judiciary, health and media hearings. The crime of apartheid, the crime against humanity, is not just the physical violence against people, but a pervading structure which reaches into all areas of life. Unfortunately, due to the shortage of time and funds made available by the initial conditions and political pressures leading up to the TRC's formation, it was not given a chance to investigate these aspects fully. For instance, there was systematic shredding of potentially incriminating documents by security forces personnel.

Without claiming completeness, we shall divide the "other" gross human rights violations of our investigation into the following sections:

- Land confiscation, redistribution and forced removals
- Exploitation in the production process
- Different access to education and other needs
- Ideology

B. Land confiscation, redistribution and forced removals

Land dispossession and confiscation can be described as gross human rights violations, because land is not only a contributor to economic development, but also to cultural and personal development, whereby individuals and groups acquire a sense of identity and belonging.[58] Land segregation (through land confiscation) is a necessary and sufficient condition for racial segregation and difference, as it is the *physical* parameter which divides people. In all three regions that we chose to study, land was lost by the natives as a result of the occupier being more advanced militarily. Yet, the forms that the conquests took vary from case to case.

1. Graeco-Roman Egypt

All of Egypt simply became "crown land", personal property of the Ptolemaic kings, although the economic aspect of land was more complicated than that. With a mercantilistic system, an ultimately state-controlled market economy, Ptolemaic Egypt's main mode of exploitation was fiscal. In an initial, radical land reform, the king handed out farm-land to Greek soldiers, who in turn often became landlords to Egyptian tenants. This land was probably not taken directly from the Egyptians, but from the previous Persian occupiers.The Egyptian temples were the only indigenous institutions able to keep considerable portions of their previous wealth, although they too, gradually became impoverished.[59] This system was essentially carried on during the Roman era.[60]

As in South Africa, a comparatively rapid population increase among the indigenous

---

[57] Cf. above, and Goff, Peter (ed.): IPI Report. World Press Freedom Review 1998. Vienna: International Press Institute, 1999. pp.111ff. Of course, White South African and Israeli Jewish civilians were legally armed to a great extent, too, and, due to this, they carried out many further human rights violations.

[58] Cf. Lester 1996: 8ff

[59] Walbank [4]1994 (1981): 109ff

[60] Lewis 1983: 57

posed a constant threat to the European minority's privileged position in the Ptolemaic state. Although the state feverishly encouraged further immigration from Greece, the demographic trend could not be reversed. At the end of the third century BC, things came to head. In a war against the Seleucid kingdom, another Greek-led kingdom, based in Persia, King Ptolemy IV saw himself forced to arm Egyptians, for the first time, to fight in his army. 20,000 indigenous soldiers were called up in 217 BC. It was a costly war, and the economy started to sag. The first to suffer were the Egyptians, whose protests then became increasingly daring. This led to a hardened stance of the security establishment. Social unrest and several attempts at rebellion were the natural consequences, and finally a civil war broke out which led to the independence of Upper Egypt under a Nubian king for 20 years.[61]

On the whole, soldiers seem to have been a constant nuisance to the indigenous. They would simply confiscate and rearrange a house when they saw fit and usually did not bother to reinstate its original arrangement once they were ready to leave.[62]

2. South Africa

In South Africa, land dispossession started before the Khoikhoi and the San were first deprived of their land by Whites in the 1600s. Land dispossession was firstly a result of indigenous competition for grazing land and hunting and foraging grounds, but it was certainly not (in the wide sense) "genocidal" in character until the Whites showed up.

A new dimension of land dispossession in South Africa began in the 1870s after the discovery of diamonds and other minerals, when competition for land intensified. In the 1880s and 1890s, industrial development flourished following the discovery of gold, leaving small sharecroppers out of the market, which resulted in the increase of squatter areas. This was the case for both Black and White small sharecroppers, yet due to the fact that racial attitudes against the Blacks already existed, it was ensured by authorities that White squatters would live in better conditions than non-Whites. In 1913, a Land Act was established which limited Black land ownership to 7% of the entire land area, forcing many to leave their land and move into reserves. With the 1936 Land Act, the Black population was allowed to own 13% of the land, in order to sustain 66% of the population.[63] Today, still, Whites make up 13% of the population and hold more than 70% of the land.[64]

The 1923 Native (Urban areas) Act "limited" Black residence in White areas. It meant that the Black population would not be eligible to utilize White-funded urban amenities. This developed seamlessly into the *apartheid* era. In the meantime, some Blacks were allowed into White towns under the condition that they find work within two weeks. (In 1948, this was reduced to three days).[65] If they did not find work in the time given, they would be sent back to the reserves. In the years that followed, segregation, as previously mentioned, did not only include spatial divisions but economic and political ones as well. It must be noted however, that segregation was implemented differently at different locations. In Cape Town, for example, one third of the population lived in racially mixed areas (in the 1930s), whereas Durban was strictly segregated according to race. An even more rigid and racist legal framework for spatial segregation, particularly in urban areas, was thoroughly accomplished by the rise of *apartheid* in a narrow sense.

Whites not only deprived Blacks of the right to land, but also extracted South Africa's natural wealth for their own benefit, leaving the rest of the population physically and economically marginalized. Most Whites, as Van den Heever's writings demonstrate, believed that this was their right, by virtue of occupation; "Boer and soil are bound together

---

[61] Walbank ³1994 (1981): 121f, cf. Iliffe 1995: 271ff
[62] Walbank ³1994 (1981): 119
[63] Lester 1996: 59
[64] Thomasson, Emma: Southern Africa struggles to redistribute land, Reuters, February 11, 1998
[65] Lester 1996: 85

and the Boer *is* South Africa."[66] With dispossession having been so successful for the Whites by the late 1880s, it was easy for them to dominate industrialization and urbanization, as Blacks and non-Whites were weak from the outset.

Because of the racist approach to segregation, wealth and class depended primarily on race. By the beginning of the twentieth century, the South African government resettled illegal Black squatters. But, on the whole, little attention was given to the squatter areas and little was done to improve them, even after the war, when the economy was once again flourishing. This indicates that the South African government was not concerned with the poorer classes of society, regardless of their color (but it especially neglected the Black population in the squatter areas). According to Western, "...no single government has created greater Colored resentment...and sense of injustice."[67]

3. Israel

To some Israelis, the words "Palestine" and "Palestinian" never existed, so by establishing the State of Israel, no one was disregarded or dispossessed. The other people who claimed the land, the Palestinians, did not exist in the first place. Golda Meir, a founder and fourth Prime Minister of the State of Israel (1968-1974) contended that:

> "...It was not as though there was a Palestinian people and in Palestine considering itself as a Palestinian people and we came and threw them out and took their country away from them. They did not exist".[68]

Jewish immigrants established themselves in Israel, taking Palestinian land, using it for grazing, building on it, making it their own, so that by 1967 (when the rest of Palestine became Israeli land) the Palestinians became entirely landless. Many Palestinian were forced to move to neighboring Arab countries (Jordan, Syria, and Lebanon) after *"Al Nakba"*– the disaster (of Palestinian dispossession) in 1948 – whereby they became refugees. Most Palestinians became refugees after Israel invaded the West Bank and the Gaza Strip in 1967.

Confiscation of land began with the establishment of Israel, where more than 400 Palestinian villages were destroyed, depopulated and replaced by Israeli towns and settlements.[69] Land confiscation is still taking place today, after 50 years of occupation, and almost 6 years of "Arab-Israeli peace". During the *Intifada*, even more settlements were being built. By 1988, more than 70,000 Israeli settlers were living in West Bank and Gaza, acquiring 50% of the land. Yitzhak Shamir, the former Israeli prime minister, declared in 1988, that there shall never be any domestic or international force which will prevent Israelis from building settlements anywhere in the land of Israel.[70] By 1996, East Jerusalem alone had become the home of 200,000 new Jewish settlers.[71] One of Israel's goals is to acquire as much of the land as possible, to secure their dominance in the Holy Land. The main justification for the expansion has always been security. At the same time, however, it aims at minimizing Palestinian developments in the region. Large amounts of money funded by the Israeli government and others, such as the World Zionist Organization, have been spent in support of settlement expansion. Between 1968 and 1986, the capital investment reached a total of $2 billion.[72] Due to this being a governmental policy, it became legal for settlements to expand, for security and for the improvement of the inhabitants' well-being, the Israeli settlers'.

---

[66] Quoted in Lester 1996: 38
[67] Western, J.: Outcast Cape Town, London: Allen & Unwin, 1981: 310
[68] The Sunday Times, London, June 15, 1967.
[69] Palestine & The UN. 50 years of Historic Injustice, New York, Volume 3, Issue 5, Mid-May 1998. Pg. 2.
[70] Al Haq 1988: 113. The area is so densely populated that Jewish settlement expansion almost necessarily entails Palestinian land confiscation.
[71] Webb, Michael: Settlement Expansion Update, Middle East Report, October-December 1996, Vol. 201, No. 4: Israel and Palestine: Two States, Bantustans or Binationalism?, pg. 26
[72] Al Haq 1988: 114

Palestinians from Jerusalem do not have the right to buy land in Jerusalem from the State of Israel.[73] Those who still own land and property in Jerusalem owned it prior to the 1967 occupation. Therefore, if Palestinians wish to buy and sell land in East Jerusalem, then they do it privately. Yet, all Jerusalem Palestinians must still pay a land tax to the Israeli government, in addition to the income tax. These taxes are then almost exclusively used by the authorities for Jewish areas.

Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, after his election win in 1996, announced his full support for the right of Jewish settlers to move and live wherever they wanted to in the Palestinian territories (which were by then officially controlled by the Palestinian Authority and no longer under Israeli control). Netanyahu's government allocated NIS 900 million (approx. $300 million) for the 1997 budget to the expansion of Jewish settlements.

The peace process, initiated in 1993, achieved greater segregation, because when given self-rule in certain areas, the Palestinians from these areas were no longer permitted access to areas under Israeli rule, including Arab East Jerusalem. (The region is now divided into three parts: Israel, the West Bank and Gaza, including some areas which are still under Israeli rule, but will be returned to the Palestinians). Thus, the Palestinians living in the West Bank and Gaza are not allowed to enter Israel. Therefore, people have become isolated from the rest of the country. This does not only harm their economy (many people from the West Bank worked in Israel prior to this division but are now no longer allowed to); their freedom to move and thus to integrate the scattered self-rule areas was also compromised.

The Pass Laws present a parallel between South Africa and Israel, with the bureaucracy of segregation attaining new heights in present-day Israel. A more essential difference is contained in the fact that segregation was the chosen option of the main players in the Israeli-Palestinian "peace process".[74] In terms of the South African transition from *apartheid*, this puts current Israeli-Palestinian relations into the 1976-1981 phase, when South Africa granted "independence" to the four "Bantustans" or "Homelands". Similarly, the territories granted to the Palestinians are of little interest to the Israelis. They are widely dispersed, and they are not centres of economic development. Moreover, they are landlocked and they have no water resources of their own.

C. Exploitation in the production process

Graeco-Roman Egypt

Ptolemaic Egypt manifests the most highly exploitative of all known systems of oppression throughout antiquity[75]. During the so-called Dynastic period, ancient Egypt between *ca.* 3000 BC and 332 BC, the taxes of common peasants amounted to around 10% of their harvests, at least during the parts of the Dynastic period that we know.[76] Under Macedonian rule, however, taxes rose to at least 50%, which in practice meant that almost the entire indigenous population now had to live close to minimum subsistence levels, if not actually below them.[77] Roman rule brought no relief for the Egyptians, rather the opposite:

---

[73] They are considered 'residents', not 'citizens' of Israel, just like the "Homeland" South Africans were considered 'visitors' in their own country. Similarly, in Ptolemaic Alexandria, Egyptians were considered 'indigenous', but Greeks were 'citizens' and 'genuine Alexandrians'. Walbank ⁴1994 (1981): 115f, Davis, Simon 1951: 69f

[74] Amr. Hady: Palestinian and South African elections compared, in Middle East Report, October-December 1996, Vol. 201, No. 4: Israel and Palestine: Two States, Bantustans or Binationalism?, pg. 19-22

[75] Koch 1993: 488

[76] Iliffe 1995: 20

[77] Ibid: 26. This percentage was never again paralleled in colonial Africa, not even in the equally productive semi-slave economies during the 19th and early 20th centuries, by which time technological progress presumably would have made an even higher tax possible, cf. ibid: 196ff, and Gehrke, Hans-Joachim: Geschichte des Hellenismus, München: Oldenbourg, 1990: 66.

> "Unfortunately...the profit principle proved no less irresistible to Roman administrators, businessmen, and, all too soon, senators than it had done to the Macedonians. The tradition, after all, was well established. It had been what panhellenism was all about, as early as the fourth century: a united ethnic crusade against the East, with wealth and power as its objectives, cultural superiority (and Xerxes' long-past invasion) as its justification. That had been the whole moral basis of Alexander's expedition, of the sharing of the spoils by his successors. Material greed and racial contempt had been the fuel that maintained Macedonians in power..." [78]

After the Romans had established themselves as rulers, Egyptian farm labor had two upper classes to supply aside from delivering the largest share of food for the city of Rome itself.

> "The bulk of the tax fell on the poorest of the population, with Roman citizens and the citizens of the three Greek cities exempt. Priests of the major temples were also spared, though in general the temples came under increasing state control. . . . The weight of taxation became so oppressive that there are appeals by the collectors to their supervisors that whole villages have fled or been so impoverished they can no longer pay. . . . At times of crisis the tendency was to increase the oppression of the poor. The second century physician Galen, writing on how disease spread among the poor, mentions in passing that at times of famine the city dwellers would strip the local countryside of its food, bringing starvation to its inhabitants."[79]

The exploitation of the indigenous African population took place in partly different ways in Egypt and South Africa, respectively. In Graeco-Roman Egypt, it was imposed mainly by means of taxation and land-rent, in modern South Africa mainly through wage policies. Black railroad workers in the last century earned half as much as Whites for the same work.[80] Towards the end of the 19th century, Black miners in the diamond fields at Kimberley only received a fifth of the salary of their White colleagues. In the gold mines on the Witwatersrand, finally, the difference was even greater. From 1898 until 1971, Blacks on average earned a mere tenth of what White workers did. This was only partly because Whites had a monopoly on jobs officially labeled "skilled" by the Chamber of Mines.[81]

Thus, we have another curious parallel between South Africa and Ptolemaic Egypt: On the one hand a mean wage difference of five to one to the sole benefit of Europeans, and on the other an apparent average five to one tax increase to the sole benefit of Europeans.

With regard to slavery, the Dutch Cape Colony and the first decades of the British Cape Colony were similar to Rome before Augustus' conquest of Egypt and to ancient Greece before Alexander. All four of these societies were based on slavery, either ideologically, like the ancient Greek states, or both ideologically and economically, as in the other three states. To be based on slavery ideologically simply means that the elite *wants* the economy to be based on slave labor and is working towards realizing it. The ancient Greek city-states just did not have the military means to bring this about. Greece and Rome are the first known slave societies in history in these two senses. When and where slavery began, on the other hand, is not known.[82]

---

[78] Green 1990: 648. Xerxes was a Persian ruler who attempted but failed to conquer Greece in the fifth century.
[79] Freeman, C.: Egypt, Greece and Rome: civilizations of the Mediterranean. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1996:439
[80] Iliffe 1995: 180
[81] Ibid: 272
[82] Hall, J.A.: Powers & Liberties. The Causes and Consequences of the Rise of the West. London: Penguin, 1992 (1985): 31. Along with Ancient Greece and Rome and the Cape Colonies, all other known slave-labor-based

According to Marxism, slavery is the most primitive kind of systematic oppression. We do not share this view unconditionally[83], but it will do for practical purposes in this context. The economic aspect of oppression in the Cape Colony, especially, took its beginnings in massive land appropriation, genocide and enslavement: "The Cape Colony was one of the most rigid and oppressive slave societies in history."[84] The enslavement of indigenous Khoisan survivors was disguised under a nomenclature which termed them "servants", whereas the term "slave" was reserved for imported slaves from Asia, Madagascar and Mozambique. These slaves rapidly became a majority in the Cape Colony's population.[85]

In Graeco-Roman Egypt, this background of economic exploitation was also important, since slavery continued to exist as an important part of the economy. Yet, it was no longer as basic as it had been and remained both in Greece and in Rome. The Macedonians took over the forms of fiscal exploitation that the Persians and ultimately, the Egyptians themselves had already established in Egypt, centuries before Alexander's conquests.[86] Only, they sharpened it to an extent thus far unseen. Additionally, economic exploitation under the Greeks and Romans– in interaction with new forms of productive forces, including at times even steam engines – developed a hitherto unknown form of exploitation. Proto-capitalist structures, with a population density higher than most industrialized states today,[87] appeared alongside feudal forms and mainly domestic slavery.

The economic parallel to that does not turn up in South Africa until the mid-19th century. Until then, South Africa under White rule was overwhelmingly an agricultural producer based on slave labor with low population density. Israel, on the other hand, is a relatively small country with high population density, that is, not unlike Egypt.

Dynastic Egypt had possibly had the lowest rate of slavery of all known societies in Antiquity. The standard explanation for this is, again, the high population density in Egypt. Already in the fourth millennium BC, it is estimated to have reached 200 people per square mile. Additionally, however, a general humanist ethics is likely to have played a significant role, as well.[88] Slave-labor-based economies, it is true, seem only to appear in advanced agricultural societies where there is a perceived shortage of laborers, but an often forgotten, additional prerequisite is a basic disregard among decision-makers for human welfare and human rights. Ancient Greece and Rome did not become the first slave societies out of economical and political necessities and pressures alone, but also out of a deeply entrenched and widespread elitist and ethnocentric system of values.[89]

South Africa

After 1948, the economy relied heavily on wage laborers for the industries in South African cities, such as Durban and in Cape Town. By then, Black South Africans were only allowed to stay in the "European cities" as long as they offered their labor. Agriculture became more commercial and mechanized after 1948 as demand for Black labor decreased,

---

economies in world history were run by either Europeans or descendants of Europeans, they were: the Caribbean, Brazil, the ante-bellum South in North America and the Third Reich 1942-1945. Ibid., Fleck, Fiona: Bonn says WW2 slave labour claims are obsolete. October 30, 1997, Reuters

[83] Cf. Löwstedt, Anthony: Kultur oder Evolution? Eine Anthropologische Philosophie, Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang Verlag, 1995: 81ff

[84] Iliffe 1995: 124

[85] Lester 1996: 23ff

[86] It would indeed have been stupid to try to impose their own slave society on the Egyptians. Walbank ⁴1994 (1983): 105ff

[87] Oliver 1991: 52, 56

[88] Karenga, Maulana: Maat, The Moral Ideal in Ancient Egypt, A Study in Classical African Ethics, Unpublished Dissertation, UMI 9601000, University of Southern California, 1995: 495ff, Assmann, Jan: Ma'at, Gerechtigkeit und Unsterblichkeit im Alten Ägypten, München: Beck, 1995 (1990): 58ff, Tyldesley, Joyce: Daughters of Isis: Women of Ancient Egypt, London: Penguin, 1995 (1994): 14f

[89] Assmann, Jan: Ägypten: Eine Sinngeschichte, München, Wien: Hanser: 174

sending the workers "back" to the reserves (where they "belonged" ethnically), even if they originally were not from there.[90]

In the meantime, the material gap between Whites and non-Whites in South Africa widened. By 1970, White manufacturers earned six times more than Africans. By 1970, the real wage of African mine workers was less than that of 1911.[91] Annual wages (in Rand) in the gold mines in 1941 were 2,312 (for Whites) and 191 (for Africans), making the ratio between White and African wages 12.1. In 1971, the White annual real wage was 4,379 compared to the average African real wage of 209 (a ratio of 21 to 1).[92] On top of this, unemployment among the Africans increased in the 1970s. In real numbers, Black unemployment doubled between 1960 (1.2 million) and 1977 (2.3 million).[93]

African farm workers were paid less than those working in the industries. Yet, they could not leave the White farms to seek more highly paid employment White farmers controlled the Africans by whipping them, placing them in debt and not providing them with passes. The passes were the most effective way of ensuring that Blacks remained on White farms, because it limited their freedom of movement. African farm laborers were barred from adapting to either traditional or modern life because they were not allowed to live in the reserves or the cities. This made them socially marginal and "victims of systematic exploitation".[94] The appropriateness of our choice of extending the concept of *apartheid* to include the entire period of White domination is perhaps best shown with the example of 20th century farm workers, whose lot was barely different from that of their slave predecessors in the 17th and 18th centuries.

From 1925, the government demanded a "poll tax" of one pound from African men aged eighteen or more and a local ten shilling tax per dwelling in the reserves. High taxation and bad harvests (due to lack of infrastructure) worsened the already poor life quality of the Africans in the reserves. Therefore, Africans (mainly males) looked for employment in White farms and towns. Though the wages at the farms and in towns were low, they became essential to sustain families living in the reserves. The Black farm workers remained on the farms as a result of that.[95]

By limiting African economic development, South Africa's market economy was harmed as well, because domestic consumption was limited.[96] South Africa's economy began to rely more heavily on its exports, mainly to neighboring African countries because they depended on South Africa's oil and electricity supply.[97] In the 1960s, South Africa's economy flourished. This partially depended on harsh African labor repression. Once the economy flourished, however, African wages improved.[98]

In the 1970s, due to modernization and the development of technology (such as in the gold mines), skilled laborers were needed to handle the more sophisticated equipment. The industries could no longer rely on unskilled, cheap African labor. The traditional *apartheid* job color bar had to be relaxed, giving some Blacks more skilled work and higher wages.

Agriculture remained traditional for a longer time. Cheap and unskilled African farm labor continued in the 1970s. Therefore, the NP guaranteed support for segregation and suppression of skilled Black laborers in the countryside more than in the cities.[99]

---

[90] Thompson 1990: 193
[91] Ibid: 195
[92] Ibid: 246
[93] Ibid: 195
[94] Ibid: 165f
[95] Ibid: 164
[96] Lester 1996: 156
[97] Thompson 1990: 230
[98] Lester 1996: 157
[99] Ibid: 155

In 1986, the government eliminated some of the segregation laws, such as the opening of business centers to Black traders in the cities. Yet, some reform still remained "White only", such as that in welfare services.[100]

The government continued removing African communities from their homes in the 1980s, especially from squatter areas around the cities. The Land Act in 1986 still excluded Africans from owning land outside the Homelands and African townships. Africans were still considered "visitors" in the cities, requiring passes for entry. The 1986 Act also prohibited Africans from sharing crops with the Whites, keeping their trade dependent on the White farmers.[101]

Israel

In many industries, the Palestinians are paid less than Israelis for doing the same jobs, creating power relationships not only between master and worker, but between the workers as well.[102] This again, as with the problem in South Africa, leaves the Palestinians in poorer living conditions than the Israelis because they can not compete with the rising living costs in the country.

The segregation initiated under the Oslo accords, mirrors South Africa's past, especially when comparing the Pass Laws forced upon people working in restricted areas. As described earlier, in South Africa, Blacks were required to carry passes to prove that they worked in predominantly White areas. From the outset, Blacks were only given a few days to find work in urban areas. If they failed, they were sent back to the reserves. Similarly, Palestinians from the West Bank need to obtain passes to enter Israeli territory. In most cases, these passes are issued to allow Palestinians to work outside the Palestine self-rule areas. Others are issued to allow the Palestinians to leave the country (because they must pass over Israeli territory in order to travel abroad). Yet, in many cases these passes are not issued at all, or they are issued for two to three hours only. This is a problem especially for Palestinian youths, since they are seen by Israel as the biggest threat to security. The Pass Laws are implemented with painstaking pedantry at the Gaza Erez crossing, where people from the ages 18 to 35 have little or no chance of ever being allowed into Israel. (Only medical doctors and a few other professionals who fall within this age group and are considered essential for Israel are at times allowed in.)

According to Edward Said:

> „There was a proliferation of over a thousand laws and regulations designed... to rub their noses in the mud, to humiliate and remind them of how they were doomed to less-than-human status... To hold meetings required a permit. Entry and exit required permits. To dig a well required a permit - one that was never given."[103]

Palestinians also suffered from economic limitations due to the Israeli-imposed closures of check-points, markets and shops. Palestinian trade depended on Israeli supervision until 1992. Since Palestinian self-rule was established in 1993, the Palestinians still lacked direct export and import access. These limitations are due to Israeli security procedures, such as check-point controls and periodic "shortages" of passes for movement, especially to residents of the West Bank and Gaza.[104] Aside from trade, Palestinian economic development still depends almost entirely on Israel; "This economic reality in Palestine is shaped by two factors: the interdependence of the Palestinian and the Israeli communities and the power

---

[100] Ibid: 227
[101] Thompson 1990: 228
[102] Lockman Z. & Beinin J. Intifada. Pg. 6-7
[103] Ibid.
[104] Palestinian Development Plan 1998-2000: Summary Document. Ramallah: Palestinian Authority, December 1997: 8

imbalance, favoring the Israelis".[105]

Since 1992, Israel employs less Palestinian workers from the West Bank and Gaza. Instead, Israel imports workers, mainly from Lebanon and Thailand. From 1992 to 1996, Palestinian labor in Israel has been reduced from 116,000 to 29,500 jobs, causing the unemployment rates to surge to 50% in the West Bank and 74% in Gaza. Israel imposes constant border closures, preventing workers (who do have employment in Israel) from reaching their job locations. Moreover, security checks hold up workers and goods deliveries for hours. Gradually, Israel is becoming less dependent on Palestinian workers, but at the same time, it limits Palestinian economic development. "Palestinians provide an emergency labor force, to be exploited by Israel, but [they are] not entitled to rights or employment stability".[106]

Palestinians are not only isolated from Israel but from each other as well. Palestinian trade is severely limited between the different autonomous areas such as between Gaza and the West Bank, mainly due to pass limitations and the lack of direct routes to the destinations (of Palestinian goods deliveries).[107]

D. Differential access

1. Graeco-Roman Egypt

Ptolemaic Egypt was very rich. Its capital, Alexandria, boasted the largest library and research institute in the world, the Museum. The most famous scientists of the era, Euclid, Archimedes, Eratosthenes and others either lived there or came there to study. Yet, science and research in the modern sense were only secondary for the Museum. It was mainly a philological center. Most of the researchers studied Greek literature, poetry and mythology. A second group studied astrology (which had been imported from Asia), astronomy and mathematics, and the smallest group dealt with applied science, mainly military technology. All of them that we know of were Greeks, with one exception, an Egyptian priest called Manetho, from whom we still have a list of all the dynasties, kings and queens in Egyptian history since the early third millennium. Manetho was active during the rule of first Greek king, Ptolemy I, and seems to have been employed for the sole purpose of getting the Greeks acquainted with a necessary minimum of Egyptian culture. From then on, the Greeks in the Museum seem to have been indifferent if not ignorant towards Egyptian culture and Egyptian people. The poets and scientists seem to have had less contact with the Egyptians than any other Greeks in the country, possibly including the royal family. The first regent to learn the Egyptian language was Cleopatra VII, the last Ptolemy. (On the other hand, she seems to have been quite a linguistic talent. She spoke at least nine languages fluently.)[108]

The extravagant and ostentatious Ptolemaic kings tried to acquire every existing book for their Museum, but the only ones that really mattered were apparently Greek books. There were some translations of foreign language texts, but not many. This goes for the whole Greek-speaking world during the Hellenistic Age:

> "...of genuine literary interpenetration between Greek and other cultures there is virtually no trace. For one thing, literary translations - as opposed to those of medical, mathematical, astronomical, or similar practical treatises... - seem to have been nonexistent, a sure sign of esthetic indifference."[109]

---

[105] Olmsted, Jennifer: Thwarting Palestinian Development. Middle East Research. 1996 op.cit., 11-13: 11
[106] Ibid: 11f
107 Exploitation through land confiscation, wage and tax policies are treated in the sections above.
[108] Walbank ⁴1994 (1981): 123, 181ff, Weber 1993: 74ff
[109] Green 1990: 316

The Hellenistic Gymnasia, schools that taught literature, rhetoric, mathematics and physical education exclusively to Greeks, were the main breeding ground for Greek ethnic chauvinism. They intensified and widened the gap between the Greeks and the Egyptians considerably.[110]

2. South Africa

The *apartheid* system of segregation and oppression in South Africa also secured its power through its educational systems, which were created differently for the four racial groups, White, Black, Colored and Asian. Educational systems depended primarily on race, with the White schools being the most privileged ones. The average ratio of state expenditure between White and Black students during the *apartheid* years was ten to one.[111]

From 1948, the National Party felt that it was necessary to limit the Blacks' education, perhaps mainly so that they would not become too "enlightened" and demand more rights or even revolt against White minority rule. Education in South Africa in general had the effect of radicalizing Blacks and of making *apartheid* defenders and apologists less radical.[112] Even though *apartheid* professed to aim at separate yet *equal* developments for all races, the government was spending much more attention and money on the improvement of White schools. In the 1950s and the 1960s, the number of Black students doubled, without additional governmental spending in comparison with the increase.[113] Less qualified teachers, inadequate facilities and a syllabus which was to "complement the *apartheid* model of society"[114] were forced onto the overcrowded Black schools. This was carried out mainly by the Bantu Education Act in 1953, which divided the Black population into different tribal units, resulting in each unit being isolated from the other – yet another strategy to prevent Black national consciousness from developing. The only exception to this pattern could be found in the few private Black schools, which increased in numbers between 1935 and 1956. Yet, private school pupils' enrolment dropped again from 1956.[115]

The educational system in South Africa was based on *baasskap*, which means White supremacy over all other races (implying non-White inferiority).[116] Dr. H.F. Verwoerd, the Minister of Native Affairs (and later Prime Minister) stated in the Bantu Education Bill of 1953 that racial relations could only be improved once each race knew what education they deserved. Certain areas of education, such as mathematics and science were not open to non-white students. Blacks deserved inferior education because they were 'culturally inferior' and Whites more advanced education since they were allegedly 'more advanced culturally'.

This, and the authorities' demands for more Afrikaans in the schools, sparked mass resistance in 1976 in township schools, in which two organizations launched boycotts, which by the 1980s had spread throughout the country. By 1985, 650,000 students were not receiving any education. Leaders in charge of the boycotts were arrested, harassed and some even killed. The leaders of the large Black resistance movements were not happy with the outbreak and outcome of the student revolt. They were mainly concerned with the future development of negotiations. In response to their concern, parents and leaders of Black resistance movements established a National Education Crisis Committee (NECC), with the slogan "Education for Liberation".[117] Teachers became paid by the committee and new

---

[110] Walbank ³1994 (1981): 120

[111] Fedderke J.W., de Kadt R. & Luiz, J.: Uneducating South Africa: the failure to address the need for human capital – a 1910-1993 legacy (unpublished manuscript). University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, June 1998: Fig. 9

[112] Iliffe: 1995: 283

[113] Harrison 1981: 178

[114] Lester 1996: 114

[115] Fedderke J.W., et al. 1998: 3f

[116] Mandela ³1990 (1978): 65

[117] The student slogan prior to the NECC was "Liberation before Education." Lester 1996: 199

curricula were made in response to student needs (such as English and history). However, the government did not implement any measures to change the educational system, resulting in many students staying out of school altogether. This was further reflected on by Mandela, when he told the people of Soweto:

> "The crisis in education that exists in South Africa demands special attention. The education crisis in Black school is a political crisis. It arises out of the fact that our people have no vote and therefore cannot make the government of the day responsive to their needs. *Apartheid* education is inferior and a crime against humanity."[118]

Fedderke et al also conclude that features and opportunities of White and Black schools are mainly due to race rather than class.[119]

Because of the comprehensive laws of segregation in South Africa under *apartheid*, access to necessities, utilities and just about everything else was differentiated according to race. This applies especially after introduction of the Separate Amenities Act in 1953. The discrimination goes back, however, to the forced removals, the establishment of townships and homelands before and after the introduction of *apartheid* (in the narrow sense). The physical conditions in the townships and homelands were miserable from the start, mainly because of population density. People were forced together onto land which could not conceivably support them. Largely a result of this, the Human Development Index (HDI) ranking for South Africa in 1996 was only 100th among the world's countries – 124th for Black citizens and 24th for Whites.[120]

2. Israel

Repressed education in the West Bank, Gaza, and East Jerusalem included long-term closure of schools, and prohibition of make-up classes and even home studies. On several occasions, the Israeli army raided schools, destroying property and even turning the schools into military posts. Perhaps the Israeli government had similar intentions to the South African National Party's in mind, giving students "only what they deserve", as Palestinian schools were shut down by military orders at different times and locations, for being "centers for violent protest" or as an Israeli military spokesman described them: "...hot-beds of anti-Israeli protest." The Israeli Authorities felt that, by allowing Palestinian students to schools and universities, civil unrest was more likely to occur. The justification for these spontaneous closures was therefore "security reasons". The closures of schools are intended to penalize the entire population, especially as was the case in 1988, when primary and secondary schools were closed for nine months, and universities closed for eleven months.[121] Due to this, more than 300,000 students received no primary or secondary education, and another 18,000 were barred from higher education. In South Africa, 650,000 students did not receive any education in 1985.

More than 50% of the Palestinian population was not receiving education. Thus, teachers and parents, similarly to the South African NECC, decided to offer students classes outside the schools. These classes were aimed at purely academic activities, in response to the long closure of academic institutions, yet the Israeli army felt threatened by such activities, declaring them illegal. There were several cases of Israeli raids, which resulted in greater unrest, and many students and teachers were arrested. In October 1988, the Israeli authorities announced that it will not even tolerate any attempt to encourage individual learning in

---

[118] Mandela '1990 (1978): 219
[119] Fedderke et al 1998: 10
[120] N.N.: Whites 'still far better off than Blacks in South Africa': Latest ranking by UN. Cape Argus, June 12, 1997
[121] Al Haq 1988: 296

private homes, such as giving students textbooks, which would allow them to study alone.[122]

Due to civil unrest and closures of schools, students who could not keep up with their peers were forced to repeat their academic year. This led to overcrowded class rooms, where some "students had to stand during classes because there was simply no space in the room for extra chairs."[123] As with Black South African schools, Palestinian public schools became overcrowded, and the state of Israel did not give it the attention it deserved for improvements. At the end of the 1990s, the average number of students per classroom for all educational levels is still 36.7.[124] The prolonged closure of schools also led to personal economic crises, since the teachers of public schools could not be paid during the periods of closure (sometimes lasting for nine months). Private schools also suffered from a serious economic crisis, as they were obliged to pay their staff during closure to guarantee their return once the schools reopened, yet tuition fees had ceased.

Some of the schools in the West Bank reopened for two months (from May 23 until July 21, 1988), amid increasing reports on Israeli military harassment of Palestinian students and Israeli raids on primary and secondary schools, with tear gas, rubber bullets and live ammunition. The Israeli military believed that this was in response to students holding demonstrations (such as chanting slogans against the occupation) on school grounds. The army felt threatened by such demonstrations – they may lead to violent civil unrest – and it attacked unarmed students in schools, such as the Al Hussein Secondary School in Hebron in 1988, when "more than 30 students fainted from tear gas, and at least 15 [were] wounded by rubber or aluminum bullets".[125]

Other closed schools turned into Israeli military posts. These schools were later found in poor condition, as they had been attacked by the military, who in many cases left windows, desks, chairs and laboratory equipment destroyed (cf. Graeco-Roman Egypt).

Education in South Africa and the Occupied Territories was itself the target, ensuring that military action will lead to penalizing the civilians for whom the education was designed. It appears that by oppressing education, the ruling power intends for the oppressed to give up some of their political goals, in order to ensure better education for themselves. Some of these goals which the authorities may be fearing are enhanced consciousness, independent and critical thinking and human rights recognition. By limiting education, the oppressor can guarantee that these goals will not be achieved easily. Limiting education will have a long-term effect, since it does not only punish the present generation, but future ones equally.

In the West Bank, Gaza and Israel, Palestinian residents are required to carry ID passes according to their region. Those in the West Bank carry orange passes, Gaza is green and those in the rest of Israel (including Arab East Jerusalem) are required to carry a blue ID. These IDs could be seen as ordinary residents' IDs, but, due to their differentiation, they are used by Israel as a way to maintain security. At the various check points, citizens are required to show their ID cards when crossing from one zone to another. If a person possesses an orange card and does not have a permit to entering the area, he/she will not be permitted to enter. The same method is used with vehicle plate numbers. They too differ in color according to zone, thus it is even easier for Israeli security to spot where each driver is from. As a result, this has caused great division between the residents of zones. Furthermore, this division has prevented people from access to different institutions. One major problem concerns hospitals and medical treatment which are limited in the West Bank and Gaza, especially during riots and attacks, when most hospitals in these regions are overcrowded. For example, Ramallah is only 15 km from Jerusalem, yet, if an accident takes place close to Ramallah and it has

[122] Ibid.
[123] Ibid: 298
[124] Palestinian Development Plan 1998-2000: Summary Document. Ramallah: Palestinian Authority, December 1997: 10
[125] Al Haq: 300f

overcrowded hospitals, and the ambulance which is transferring the wounded to hospital has a West Bank plate number, then the ambulance (in most cases) must seek another hospital in the West Bank (much more than 15 km away), since it is not allowed to enter Israeli territory (Jerusalem). Over 277 villages in the West Bank (14% of the population) do not have access to health facilities. In the Palestinian territories there are 12 doctors per 10,000 persons, in Israel there are 28 doctors per 10,000 persons.[126]

There are other, more repressive Israeli military practices which, according to Al Haq, have been occurring for the past 21 years.[127] For example, in December 1986, the Israeli army delayed ambulances carrying Bir Zeit university students on the way to the Ramallah hospital. There are a number of humanitarian agencies (e.g. UNRWA) who have repeatedly reported interference with their efforts to collect and transport wounded people.

In 1987 Israel prevented hospitals from increasing the number of ambulances by systematically denying license permits to prospective ambulance drivers. 1987 was the year that marked the beginning of the uprising, thus medical equipment was essential as people were being killed and wounded on a daily basis.

During the *Intifada*, curfews were imposed regularly, but according to international humanitarian law, in times of war, parties of a conflict must reach agreements concerning the evacuation of the wounded, sick, children and others. At the same time, Israel as the occupying power should provide adequate food, water, medical supplies and health services to those living under occupation.[128] Yet, during the *Intifada*, Palestinians under curfew were denied access to medical treatment, food and water,[129] as people were not even permitted to leave their homes during curfews. Other violations of medical rights include military raids on hospitals, medical treatment being denied in prisons and detention camps and mistreatment of wounded people.[130]

Having failed to control the uprising, the Israeli authorities took steps to halt economic progress in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. Measures were implemented to control the amount of money brought in to these areas from abroad, supply of fuel was halted for one month, telecommunication links were cut, water and electricity disconnected. The restriction of money caused severe problems for many families, especially during the *Intifada*. Many people were unable to attend regular work, thus they depended on money sent from family members abroad. Most of these measures were taken to slow the economy down, including the closure of three Palestinian bus companies, bans on workers traveling from the West Bank and Gaza to Israel, failure to repair damaged water pumps resulting in shortage of water, prevention of food entering towns and villages (sometimes for as long as 16 days as in the case of Beni Na'im in March 1988).[131]

Most of these restrictions have been relaxed in the past few years, especially since the establishment of the PNA (which is now responsible for some utilities in some areas). Yet, such actions still occur. The Israeli water authority has a monopoly over the control and allocation of the entire water supply, including that in the Palestinian territories. While Israelis on an average enjoy 344 m^3 of water per capita, Palestinians have to survive on 93 m^3 per person per annum. In Hebron, 70% of the water goes to 8,500 settlers and 30% goes to 250,000 Palestinians.[132]

---

[126] Palestinian Development Plan 1997: 11. The so-called "by-pass" roads or "safety" roads, between Jewish settlements and enclaves in Palestine and Israel are de facto roads for "Jews Only". See "The Israeli Apartheid Maps", Internet.online, http:// www.MiddleEast.Org

[127] Al Haq 1988: 70

[128] Article 55, IV Geneva Convention 1949

[129] Al Haq 1988: 76

[130] Ibid: 74f, Goff (ed.) 1999: 111ff

[131] Al Haq 1988: 280

[132] Miftah of Palestine: Internet.online, available at: http://www.miftah.org

D. Ideology

1. Graeco-Roman Egypt

The starkest contrast between the conquerors' attitudes before and after conquest is in Egypt. The Greeks were inspired by, admired and even copied elements of all main aspects of Egyptian culture, at least in the eighth, seventh, sixth and parts of the fifth century BC. Among the numerous Greek mercenaries who served in Egyptian armies were many officers, who belonged to the social elites back home in Greece. They were allowed to marry Egyptian women once the first Greek colony in Egypt, Naucratis in the Nile Delta, had been given to the Greeks in 620 BC by King Psammetich for their mercenary services against the Persians. Many Greek mercenary officers then married into the elite families of Egypt.[133]

In the Ptolemaic kingdom, three centuries later, the opposite was the case: only Greeks of low social standing, and only very few at that, ever married Egyptians. *Apartheid* was still not there in law, but it was in practice:[134]

The reasons behind this 180° switch of Greek attitudes towards foreigners in general and Egyptians in particular are complex. Once the Greeks had beaten off the Persian invasion attempts in the fifth century, arrogance and *hybris* spread quickly.

> "In the eyes of the Greeks the barbarians were not only foreigners, but inferior beings: between Greek and barbarian, says Isocrates, there is no less difference than between man and beast...The superiority of the Greeks gave them rights: it was natural and just that Barbarians should obey them as slaves obeyed freemen...Between them no friendship was possible, but there must be eternal war."[135]

This is of course an over-generalization. There were a few exceptions, for instance Diogenes, the famous cynic who lived in a barrel, but these exceptions were marginal beings or freaks. In human history, it seems that whenever military conquest is completed, (further) contempt towards the conquered people sets in. The same phenomenon can be observed in South Africa. Of course, racism was there from the very start. But as long as there were still unsubjugated Khoisan in the Cape, there was still some sort of dignity afforded to the Khoisan as a whole by the White invaders. Only when the land had become all White did racial contempt on a systematic basis set in.[136]

2. South Africa

Racist ideas of Europeans since the 17th century became an important part of the origin of the later racist social order in South Africa, where the:

> "...Africans served Europeans as a convenient mirror, or as a screen onto which they projected their own fears about themselves and their world. The encounter with Africa in the seventeenth century occurred in an era that emphasized [especially for the Dutch colonists, however lax they were] order, self-discipline, self-abnegation, sexual restraint and Christianity. These were difficult ideals. The Europeans' failure to realize these lofty goals, or even their temptations to deny them, created serious inner tension to which the contact with Africa gave emotional release."[137]

Africans were seen as inferior by the Europeans from the 17th century due to their inferiority in military technology, their powerlessness and slavery. They were seen by the Europeans as lazy (for refusing to work for the settlers) and religiously immoral. As the

---

[133] Haider, Peter: Griechen im Vorderen Orient und in Ägypten bis ca. 590 v.Chr.: 59-115 in Ulf, C. (Ed.): Wege zur Genese griechischer Identität: die Bedeutung der früharchaischen Zeit, Berlin, Akademie Verlag, 1996: 111ff

[134] Walbank [4]1994 (1981): 119

[135] Davis, Simon 1951: 2

[136] Lester 1996: 14

[137] Cohen, 1988: 33, quoted in Lester 1996: 33f, text added by Lester.

Africans opposed the dispossession of their land by the Whites and tried to fight back, they were seen as thieves in the eyes of the Europeans, which further intensified the Whites' negative perception of the "soulless Africans".

Segregation (before the 1948 *apartheid* system) was often based on the assumption that Africans were an inferior branch of an evolutionary tree. In the late nineteenth century, Whites thought that the Africans who were intelligent must have acquired their intelligence from ancestors who had White blood in them.[138] The end of the nineteenth century brought transformation for all racial groups in South Africa, and discrimination became more and more unquestioned among Whites. "Racial order" became paramount for establishing new economic, social and spatial relations.

By the 1920s, some Whites began to realize that differences between Africans and Europeans were due more to culture than to nature. By seeing racial differences through culture, the Europeans still thought of the Africans as inferior. Yet, now they believed that there was a chance for this 'inferior culture' to advance through industrialization and urbanization in order to achieve the cultural level of Whites.

By the 1920s, race had become a crucial criterion for social segregation, mainly to secure White dominance over Blacks in the region, thus the Whites did not feel that segregation should be eliminated in order to help the Africans develop culturally. Segregation was a solution to the problem of industrial developments, since it gave the White population the opportunity to use cheap, unskilled Black laborers at low cost, and at the same time, Whites thought they did not have to live amongst them. This was seen as a natural and rational thing to do for the Whites, since it was in their economic and social interest. This, according to Lester "...provided the structures which the *apartheid* ideologues would seek to consolidate."[139]

During the early years of the *apartheid* system, culture became the ideological basis for the differences between races, thus the White perception of Africans started to acknowledge their difference as "other" rather than "inferior". It was up to each racial group to ensure that its own people, language, religion, tradition, etc. would survive.[140]

At the same time, a more racist, de-humanizing mythology was spreading in South Africa, disseminated by politicians, broadcasting, teachers and textbooks[141]. The government was determined to protect the White minority and further develop their interests, aiming at separate developments even between the Afrikaners and the English-speaking South Africans. The Whites became more concerned with maintaining and securing their economic advantages, rather than their collective national identity.

Closely connected with the ideological justification of *apartheid* were two basic issues: the first being economics. It was important for the Whites in South Africa to develop economically in order to survive as a nation, therefore separate economic developments were necessary as they needed to secure their (economic) supremacy over the Black majority. The second issue emerges from the former one and manifests itself as fear of Black supremacy (or even urbanization). Throughout South Africa's White history, racial fear has been evident. This can be traced back to the seventeenth century, when the VOC obstructed relations between the Blacks and the White settlers. Therefore, *apartheid* came to be seen as the final solution to the problem. Segregation depended on race, rather than class or culture. According to Wade:

> "For the *apartheid* system to continue to exist and provide the surplus needs of the White minority, that minority has to exercise

[138] Lester 1996: 58
[139] Ibid: 83
[140] Ibid: 111
[141] Ibid: 112. An additional aspect of apartheid ideology, which we have had no time or space to cover here, is sexism. Graeco-Roman Egypt, South Africa and Israel could all serve as cases in point.

> political power in a manner based on wide-ranging denial of reality. In practice, this means a mechanism that enables the Whites to deny the existence of Blacks as autonomous individuals..." [142]

3. Israel

For centuries, both the Arabs and the Jews have developed historical roots in the country now known as Israel. Both groups have strong emotional attachments to the country. This has created two nationalisms, an Arab nationalism, which claims Palestine as their homeland, and a Jewish nationalism, which through "Zionism" established a homeland in the "Holy Land" and contributed considerably to the development of the modern state of Israel.

Since Abraham, according to the Bible, around 2000 BC, or since around 800 BC as some scholars believe[143], the Jews had thought of Palestine as their "Promised Land".

> "...the Lord made a covenant with Abraham, saying, Unto thy seed have I given this land, from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Of Euphrates..." (Genesis 15:18)

> "...I am the Lord. I appeared to Abraham, to Isaac and to Jacob as God Almighty... I also established my covenant with them to give them the land of Canaan where they lived as aliens." (Exodus 6:18)

After a rocky period of conquests and re-conquests by the different powers of the day, the last independent Jewish state in antiquity was conquered by the Roman Empire. The Jews were then scattered all over the world. Until the nineteenth century, they wanted to return to their "Promised Land" for religious reasons. Later, the Zionists, European Jews, became politically interested in the region.

In Western Europe, Jews often improved their socio-economic and political status, but in Eastern Europe they repeatedly became an oppressed ethnic minority. They decided that in order to further improve their social and political status, they must establish a national home land, in which they would all be united. The Jewish immigration into Palestine could be seen as the initial force leading to the creation of modern Israel. Arabs feared that such actions could in the future result in a Jewish government in Jerusalem, thus they opposed the Zionist movement.

In a violent climate exacerbated by British colonial rule, violent acts between Arabs and Jews started occurring over anticipated future territorial control. By 1921, Dr. Eder, a member of the Zionist Commission told the British Court of Inquiry that: "There should not be equality between the Palestinians and the Jews...only Jews should be allowed to bear arms in Palestine."[144] This was to be implemented rigorously in 1948 and has remained so until now.[145]

The riots between the Arabs and the Jews intensified, to the advantage of the Jews, as they accumulated sympathy for the Jewish case abroad. Then came the Third Reich and Second World War, in which six million Jews were exterminated under Hitler, which further

---

[142] Wade, M.: White on Black in South Africa: A Study of English-Language Inscriptions of Skin Colour. Basingstoke: Macmillan. 1993: 48. quoted in Lester 1996: 245

[143] Görg, Manfred 1997: . Egyptologists Rolf Krauss, Edgar Pusch and Old Testament scholars Bernd Jörg Diebner and Niels Peter Lemche quoted in Der Spiegel, June 23, 1997 (translated as "Archaeology: Was Moses really Pharaoh?" in World Press Review, 44 (12), December 1997

[144] Hadawi, Sami. Bitter Harvest-A modern history of Palestine. Olive Branch Press, New York, 1990: 13, Cf. Davis, Uri 1987: 2; "For the anti-Jewish racist...Jewish society must be segregated outside the body of Gentile society; hence evacuation and, if necessary, annihilation. For the political Zionist, Jewish society must also be segregated outside the body of Gentile society, in this case to Palestine, redefined and reified in Zionist ideology as the Land of Israel..."

[145] Oman, Uzi: Apartheid Laws in Israel: the Art of Obfuscatory Formulation, originally published in Hebrew in the daily Ha'aretz, May 17, 1991. English translation: Internet.online, available at: http://www.hebron.com /apartheid.html

increased the Jews' interest in Palestine as a national home land, and international sympathy for their cause and plight. In a speech to Jews in London after World War I, the future first president of Israel, Haim Weizmann, had insisted:

> "The Jewish state will come, but it will not come through pledges or political statements, it will come through the tears and blood of the Jewish people. . . .A society in Palestine which will be Jewish as much as England is English and America is American."[146]

Zionism was not only the driving ideological force behind the establishment of the modern state of Israel. Along with the *Torah*, it is still the foundation of Israeli law. Three of the main areas in which Israeli law discriminates against non-Jews are residency rights, the right to work and the right to equality before the law. This brings us back to land confiscation, exploitation in the production process and the TRC, respectively.

Finally, Jewish nationalism has often been compared to Darwinian nationalism: 'the fittest (nation) survives'.[147] This brings us back to physical violence and the nigh daily justifications offered by the Israeli Defense Force "securocrats".

In conclusion, the three societies that we have investigated are *apartheid* societies in the wide sense. They all manifest gross human rights violations (also in a wide sense) in the fields of physical violence; land confiscation, redistribution and forced removals; exploitation in the production process; differences in access to necessities; and ideology. Societies that have displayed *apartheid*, or other kinds of intense oppression, in practice, whether it was enshrined in laws or not, could benefit greatly from a Truth and Reconciliation Commission along the South African lines. Although the TRC in South Africa has been successful in revealing truths and bringing about reconciliations, the future application of its principles in other conflict zones could still be improved upon. Our primary suggestion would be to widen the concept of gross human rights violations to include some of the aspects touched upon here.

---

[146] Heikal, Mohammed: Secret Channels: The Inside Story of Arab-Israeli Peace Negotiations, London: Harper Collins, 1996: 42

[147] Ezrah, Yuhri: Rubber Bullets, Los Angeles-London: California University Press, 1998: 89