

FALL, 2006

ISRAEL ON CAMPUS COALITION

***APARTHEID AND ISRAEL:
A RESOURCE GUIDE***



Israel on Campus Coalition

800 Eighth Street, NW
Washington, DC 20001
web site: www.israelcc.org

INTRODUCTION:

With the summer 2006 conflict in Northern Israel and Southern Lebanon, anti-Israel tensions on campus have been growing. At the forefront of this anti-Israel campaign is a renewed attempt to claim that Israel is an apartheid state. Recently, campuses around the country have hosted speakers who talk about Israel's apartheid policies and conferences aimed at establishing Israel as a state which practices apartheid.

In response to these claims, this guide is a compilation of background materials and resources for students and professionals to use in the apartheid debate. The first section is a collection of news articles about apartheid from various universities. The following section is a series of facts and talking points, and the final section includes analysis by scholars and journalists about why Israel is not an apartheid state.

RECENT NEWS ARTICLES

These articles report on activities occurring at American University, Emory University, University of Toronto and Wayne State University.

From The Eagle Online, American University's Student Newspaper

<http://www.theeagleonline.com/media/storage/paper666/news/2006/03/06/News/Journalist.Compare.s.Experiences.In.South.Africa.And.Israel-1655881.shtml?norewrite200611031024&sourcedomain=www.theeagleonline.com>

Journalist compares experiences in South Africa and Israel

Kendra Garstka

Issue Date: 3/6/06 Section: News

Journalist Benjamin Progrund denounced the claim that Israel is an apartheid state by comparing his experiences living in apartheid South Africa and Israel, in a speech given on Friday, March 3, 2006.

"Whatever it is and how ever ugly it is, it is not apartheid," Progrund said.

The two states are similar only by how each state attempts to control minorities. But how the two states do that is very different, Progrund said.

Apartheid is defined as racial separation and discrimination. It also means a belief in white racial superiority, Progrund said. Apartheid ended in South Africa in 1994, and Israel was first accused of being an apartheid state in 2000, he said.

Progrund said apartheid can be very powerful if used in the correct way but is often used incorrectly.

"The word has power and if its usage is appropriate, it provides a potent political weapon," Progrund said. " ... wrong usage has cheapened the word."

Progrund said he does not understand why Israel is accused of being an apartheid state because "most countries have minorities. Its how those countries deal with minorities is the issue."

"Why single out Israel?" Progrund asked. "Rather we should weep for the human condition throughout the world."

Progrund said that South Africa cannot be compared to Israel because in South Africa skin color determined people's lives from birth to death.

"[Apartheid] was imposed by law and backed by a rigid system of state," he said. "Blacks were non-persons in white South Africa."

In Israel, discrimination between Arabs and Israelis occurs despite "basic equality in law," Progrund said. Israelis and Arabs are seen together "all the time" in Israel, which would never happen in South Africa, he said. Progrund added that Arabs have the right to vote in Israel while blacks in South Africa did not.

"The vote means citizenship and the power to change," Progrund said.

Progrund said that change is possible and happening in Israel. In South Africa the whole political system had to be destroyed because change was not possible.

The South Africa apartheid experience "could and should be put to use," Progrund said. Israel should learn how to live with minorities and that "armed might and oppression" cannot crush a people's desire for freedom, he said.

Progrund currently lives in Israel. He worked as a journalist in South Africa from 1958 to 1985. While in South Africa Progrund was jailed for refusing to disclose the identity of sources, prosecuted for possession of banned newspapers and for reporting on the conditions of jails for blacks and political prisoners. Progrund was also denied a passport for five years.

From The Emory Wheel, Emory University

<http://www.emorywheel.com/media/storage/paper919/news/2006/10/20/News/International.Speaker.Warns.Of.Impending.apartheid.In.Israel-2379566.shtml?norewrite200611031017&sourcedomain=www.emorywheel.com>

International: Speaker Warns of Impending 'Apartheid' in Israel

By: Stephanie Burger

Issue date: 10/20/06 Section: News

Israel is on the verge of apartheid, Israeli-American activist Jeff Halper said in a speech on Thursday about the ongoing Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

"Israel is not a democracy. It is an ethnocracy," Halper said, noting that Jewish people in Israel enjoy privileges that others in the country do not.

Halper likened Israel's relationship with Palestinians to that of European colonizers in South Africa with the country's indigenous black population. He said he uses the word apartheid "not as a metaphor, not in an allegorical way, but in a very precise sense."

Halper's presentation to about 20 people in White Hall drew angry interruptions from some audience members and provoked heated debate during the discussion that followed.

According to Halper, applying the term "apartheid" to the situation in Israel used to be more controversial. But now, he said, the idea is gaining acceptance, and former President Jimmy Carter is writing a book called *Palestine: Peace or Apartheid?*

Halper said the Israeli government wants to segregate Palestinians into island-like territories reminiscent of South African bantustans, the areas where blacks were forced to live during South Africa's infamous period of racial segregation.

But Halper said Israel's apartheid is worse than South Africa's. Unlike South Africa, Israel will not buckle to international pressure, he said.

"The difference is that nobody, not even Ronald Reagan, could support [South African] apartheid," he said. "That's not the case with Zionism."

He criticized the way Israelis refer to Palestinians as Arabs to deny their nationality, the security barrier that isolates Palestinian communities and highways restricted to Jewish use.

"If that's not apartheid, I don't know what is," he said.

Halper said American Jews are among the most pro-Zionist people because need a "beleaguered, idealized" Israel to serve as the "lynchpin of Jewish ethnic identity." Otherwise, he said, they would just be middle-class whites.

Some audience members reacted angrily to Halper's suggestions that many of Israel's actions against the Palestinians are not justified by security concerns.

"There's something wrong with protecting settlers from death, from terrorists?" College senior David Smolar asked when Halper discussed the security barrier.

Halper said the construction of the barrier shows that "Israel is in the process of making permanent the occupation."

Other students supported Halper's right to state his opinions on such a controversial issue.

College junior Shoshanna Kohr said it makes her proud of Israel that critics like Halper are allowed to express their views, even though she disagrees with them.

But, she said, "it's kind of sad, because Israel needs all the support that it can get when it is viewed so negatively."

Jeff Halper is an American who immigrated to Israel in 1973. He serves as coordinator of the Israeli Committee Against House Demolitions and taught anthropology at Ben-Gurion University until his retirement in 2002.

- Asst. News Editor Susan McMillan contributed reporting to this article.

Contact Stephanie Burger at sdburge@learnlink.emory.edu.

From The Canadian Jewish News

<http://www.canadiancoalition.com/forum/messages/13973.shtml>

Israel Apartheid Week? You Must Be Joking. Article by Avi Benlolo

February 3, 2006

The Arab Collective at the University of Toronto will be hosting its second annual "Israeli Apartheid Week" on campus starting February 13th, 2006. To call Israel an apartheid state is a fabrication and a gross misrepresentation of a first-world democracy. For this reason, an equitable counterbalance had to be created.

Israel is not a perfect state. Like many other democracies, it must achieve social cohesion and improve racial and ethnic stratification. To isolate Israel and to label it an apartheid state through a weeklong conference at a major Canadian university is immoral, unethical and unwarranted.

The Arab Collective believes that "a just and peaceful solution can only come about through an end to the Israeli military occupation of Palestine, the reversal of Israeli policies of apartheid, and allowing the return of the Palestinian refugees. These demands can only come about through international understanding of and mobilization against the Israeli apartheid regime in the form of boycotts, divestment and sanctions".

The Collective's solution runs contrary to a recent report by The Economist Intelligence Unity (EIU), which ranked twenty countries on fifteen indicators of political, and civil liberty. The Index of Political Freedom lists Israel first.

According to the Index, Israel had the best marks for the following 'freedom indicators': election of head of government, election of parliament, fairness of electoral laws, right to organize political parties, power of elected representatives, presence of an opposition, transparency, minority participation, level of corruption, freedom of assembly, independence of the judiciary, freedom of the press, religious freedom, rule of law and property rights.

Saudi Arabia, Syria and Libya received the lowest rating. According to the report, Saudi Arabia held its first ever exercise in democracy in February 2005 when it held municipal elections, but remains an absolute monarchy that has resisted pressure for reform. Syria, meanwhile, is renowned for its authoritarian rule even though there has been a degree of liberalisation under President Bashar al-Assad.

To call Israel an apartheid state in an academic setting while disregarding the absence of civil rights and freedoms in the majority of Arab nations deserves a failing grade. To use a university campus that reflects western values of human rights to denounce Israel while ignoring millions of Muslims who are beaten, tortured and incarcerated by their own people for speaking out in Arab lands is an abuse of that institution.

To call Israel an apartheid state is to ignore the plight of women in the Arab world. In Syria, Egypt, Iraq, Libya, Jordan, Oman, and Yemen, women must have their husbands written permission to travel abroad. In Saudi Arabia, women are forbidden to drive cars or bicycles; are forced to sit in the backs of public buses, segregated from men and at Riyadh's King Saud University, professors lecture to rooms of men while women watch via closed-circuit television from distant all-female classrooms.

And finally, to call Israel an apartheid state is to ignore its national psyche of benevolence tied to the Jewish people's historical experience of oppression, pogroms, inquisitions and the Holocaust. On the issue of the oppression of Africans, the founding father of Israel, Theodor Herzl exhibited the Jewish sense of "tikkun olam" (repair of the world) and social responsibility that prevails strongly today when he said over one hundred years ago:

"There is still one other question arising out of the disaster of nations which remains unsolved to this day, and whose profound tragedy, only a Jew can comprehend. This is the African question. Just call to mind all those terrible episodes of the slave trade, of human beings who, merely because they were black, were stolen like cattle, taken prisoner, captured and sold. Their children grew up in strange lands, the objects of contempt and hostility because their complexions were different. I am not ashamed to say, though I may expose myself to ridicule for saying so, that once I have witnessed the redemption of the Jews, my people, I wish also to assist in the redemption of the Africans"

Without question, the search for a just and a lasting peace is deeply intertwined in the Jewish psyche. Israelis and Jews living in the Diaspora have continuously backed consecutive Israeli governments over the last fifteen years to seek a peaceful resolution to the conflict which would lead to a Palestinian state. Israelis and Jews worldwide want peace, but not at the cost of dismantling the State of Israel.

The university is often touted as a bastion for freedom of expression and as a reflection of values espoused in western democracies. While these values should be preserved, to what extent can groups hijack university campuses to gain credibility, "radicalize" students and faculty, and influence the public at large with misinformation and without a counterbalance?

In my view, the embryo of Israel Apartheid Week now appears to have been "The Toronto Palestinian Solidarity Conference" originally scheduled for November 23, 2003 but held on November 30, 2003 after some concerns were raised by Friends of Simon Wiesenthal Center and other groups. In order to attend that conference, all participants (including myself) had to sign the following "Basis of Unity" pact despite the fact the University of Toronto required the removal of the document because it prohibited dissent:

1. We support the Palestinian right of return. It is non-negotiable. 2. It is becoming increasingly clear that a two state solution is not a viable or acceptable option for the Palestinian people. 3. Israel is a racist apartheid state. 4. Our activism is imbued with an anti-colonial feminist practice. 5. We support the right of the Palestinian people to resist Israeli and colonialism by the means of their choosing. 6. Actions that we organize out of this conference will be developed under the framework of respecting a diversity of tactics.

The event itself was like a microcosm of the problems of the Arab Middle East in that it was completely non inclusive, non participatory and made uncomfortable those with different points of view. During his introductory remarks, the host casually stated the following: "if you are at the conference and disagree with the Basis of Unity you can leave. We will take no more questions relating to the Basis of Unity". Clearly, this approach was not to build consensus or find truth, but rather, to influence students and faculty and build radicalism on campus.

Criticism of Israel is always warranted when it is truthful and factual. But programs like Israel Apartheid Week which misrepresent the true nature of civil rights in Israel can only foster antisemitism by isolating and demonizing Israel, "the Jew among the nations".

As an equitable counterbalance to Israel Apartheid Week, Friends of Simon Wiesenthal Center and student advocacy group, Betar Tagar will be supporting University of Toronto students with Know Radical Islam Week starting February 6, 2006. Its time for them to freely express their own views as well.

With the transplanting of Israel Apartheid Week to other universities across Canada and Europe, its time for people of good conscience who espouse virtues of liberal democracy and civil rights to politely request the organizers of Israel Apartheid Week to look in the mirror.

Avi Benlolo is the Canadian Director of Friends of Simon Wiesenthal Center for Holocaust Studies.

From The Canadian Jewish News

<http://cjnews.com/viewarticle.asp?id=8468>

Hillel seeks name change for ‘Israel Apartheid Week’

By **SHERI SHEFA**
Staff Reporter

November 9, 2006

As the Arab Students’ Collective was busy making arrangements to hold its second Israel Apartheid Week at the University of Toronto, Hillel was in close talks with the school to have the name of the event changed.

“It’s the name that we take issue with. That’s what we find offensive,” said Tilly Shames, Israel affairs director for Hillel of Greater Toronto.

Last year, part of the controversy surrounding Israel Apartheid Week, a week-long series of anti-Israel lectures and events, was that it was scheduled to coincide with Hillel’s annual IsraelFEST. The move was seen as a deliberate attempt to divert attention from the Hillel event, which aimed to promote Israeli arts and culture.

Other Jewish groups, such as B’nai Brith Canada, were urging U of T to cancel Israel Apartheid Week on the grounds it would create a dangerous environment for Jewish students, but Hillel decided against that approach and acknowledged the right of other groups to hold campus events.

This year, Hillel is once again not trying to have the Feb. 13-17 event cancelled, but it has asked U of T’s office of student affairs to change its name to omit the word “apartheid.”

“Hillel of Greater Toronto has worked very closely with the university to have the name changed, and we are in constant communication,” Shames said.

“We have let our feelings be known that the name of the event won’t create a positive atmosphere on campus,” said Hagai Kuperman, president of Hillel at U of T.

But he added that only the university has the power to decide if the name should be changed.

A decision had not been made at The CJN’s deadline. Calls and e-mails to U of T’s office of student affairs were not returned.

“Extremist programming is not where the students are today,” Shames said. “It’s unfortunate, because it taints the university experience when students are exposed to extremism.”

While Hillel has focused its energy on having the name changed, Shames said she is also concerned by material the Arab Students’ Collective may present.

Last year, there were many complaints from Jewish students when a mock refugee camp was constructed on campus and posters were put up promoting the Al Aqsa Martyrs' Brigade, the military wing of the Fatah movement that is responsible for suicide bombings in Israel, she said.

Avi Benlolo, Canadian director of Friends of Simon Wiesenthal Center for Holocaust Studies, also believes that associating the word apartheid with Israel is a major concern to Jewish staff and students on campus.

“While the name of the event is one of the greater issues, we are also concerned about the advertising throughout the campus. Seeing the name will register in the minds of students that Israel is an apartheid state, and that is an issue,” Benlolo said.

He said the university needs to re-evaluate what it finds permissible.

“I do not think the event is productive. I don't think it fosters peace. It isn't accurate and misinformation being applied is a complete fabrication of what Israel really is – a first-world democracy.”

In response to Israel Apartheid Week, the Simon Wiesenthal Center, in partnership with Betar Tagar, a Zionist campus group, organized a series of lectures called Know Radical-Islam Week, which began Feb. 6 and runs until Feb. 10.

Topics included civil rights in radical Islamic societies and the threat of radical Islamic terrorism.

“It is obvious that this is a direct response to Israel Apartheid Week. We are running it a week before. We can't take this lying down. The Arab Students' Collective is growing and they are transplanting Israel Apartheid Week to other universities. Not responding to this event is not working,” Benlolo said.

He said he hopes lectures on radical Islam will inform students and staff, and encourage them “to work together and build bridges rather than work against each other.”

Kuperman said that instead of dwelling on events that point fingers at certain groups, Hillel is more interested in promoting gatherings that bring different cultures together, rather than set them apart.

Kuperman said he has been working with U of T's anti-racism and cultural diversity office on a series of interfaith events with other student groups, such as the Muslim Students' Association and the Hindu Students' Council.

“We want to focus on creating a dialogue in hopes that people will see we have a lot more in common,” Kuperman said.

From the Detroit Jewish News

<http://www.jnonline.us/main.asp?Search=1&ArticleID=1930&SectionID=23&SubSectionID=&S=1>

October 18, 2006

NEWS: Anti-Israel Activities at Wayne State

Jewish and Zionist supporters counter claims that Israel is an apartheid state.

Don Cohen

Special to the Jewish News

Against the backdrop of anti-Israel programs and speakers, a Wayne State University rally last week advocating divestment from companies doing business with Israel and calling for dismantlement of the "apartheid" Jewish state has raised concerns about the campus environment for Jewish and pro-Israel students.

Oftentimes, proponents of divestment and boycotting Israel suggest they are not anti-Israel but simply pro-peace. However, ARA-WSU (Anti-Racist Action-Wayne State University), a campus-based organization not registered with the university and tending toward anarchist politics, makes no such claim.

"We work towards the dismantling of the apartheid state of Israel," it said on the group's flyers posted around the Detroit-based campus.

The flyers called Israel "the frontline of [the] U.S. empire in the Middle East," and slammed the WSU Board of Governors and WSU President Irvin Reid as "defenders of white supremacy and [the] Empire," citing Reid and Detroit Mayor Kwame Kilpatrick as proof that "it is not only Whitey who carries out white supremacy these days."

Some 25 supporters and 25 counter-protesters as well as campus security and a few administrators were at the Oct. 12 rally outside the Adamany Undergraduate Library. The ARA-organized group appeared to be mostly students. Those in opposition were students organized by Students for Israel and the Jewish Law Students Association as well as community members organized by StandWithUs-Michigan, a pro-Israel educational and advocacy group. Campus-based Arab, Muslim and "peace groups" did not co-sponsor the event.

Students passing by during the cold lunch hour largely ignored both groups.

One student, Khalil, who had been identified in the Dearborn-based Arab American News as the organizer, was defiant as he addressed the rally, telling them they "stand on the footprint of history."

"We will continue and forge our own future and our own society," he said, yelling into a bullhorn. "We don't need permission to organize on our own university."

He claimed victory for refusing to register as a student organization and claimed the university backed down from a threat to not allow the event. He claimed that registering would result in the university turning over their names to the FBI.

"Threats of violence and police brutality will not make us compromise," he said, calling for "student power and student control of the university."

Following the rally at the library, the protesters marched around campus carrying signs and chanting slogans. They were turned away from entering the Faculty Administration Building, where President Reid has his main office.

Leading Up

It was four years ago this month when Wayne State students presented President Reid with a petition requesting divestment from companies doing business with Israel; the president promptly rejected the idea.

In April 2003, pro-Israel students were caught off-guard when, at the last minute, the WSU Student Council added a strongly worded divestment resolution to its agenda. The vote took place two weeks later on the second night of Passover, effectively eliminating any official Jewish representation. By a divisive 9-7 vote, WSU became one of the first campuses in the nation to pass a student-based divestment resolution.

In response, Reid and the board decisively and officially rejected the recommendation, unanimously adopting an April 30 resolution that criticized the divestment resolution, noting "accusations, acrimony and demands of this nature are counter to the traditions of intelligent dialogue and free discourse for which this university stands."

The WSU Student Council reversed its decision when school resumed in the fall. The issue has not come up again.

The organizer of the 2003 divestment effort, Shemon Salam, who headed the now-defunct Student Movement for Justice (SMJ), was a main organizer and speaker at last week's ARA rally. Now a WSU graduate, Salam is believed to teach at an elementary school in Detroit.

In another instance of *deja vu*, Salam's efforts were again quickly rejected by President Reid, who had letters delivered to Jewish organizations, including the Detroit Jewish News, reaffirming his opposition to divestment. The Oct. 12 letter, much of which was reprinted as a letter to the editor in the Oct. 13 Detroit Free Press, said, in part, "Wayne State University opposes divestiture and has no intention of divesting itself of stocks in companies doing business with Israel or any other legitimate state."

Campus Climate

Jonathan Schwartz, a third-year law student from Farmington Hills, says, "The Jewish student body at WSU has faced an increasingly anti-Semitic environment on campus. The university has sponsored numerous anti-Israeli speakers, and the dialogue is extremely one-sided and biased against Israel."

Calling the ARA flyers that attacked Israel, President Reid and Mayor Kilpatrick "anti-Semitic and racist," Schwartz filed a formal complaint with the president's office. "They took it down but didn't promise any concrete action," he said.

Schwartz was pleased with the counter-protest, saying: "I am proud that people are willing to stand up and support Israel during difficult times."

He called the protesters anti-American. "They don't like that Israel is a supporter of America, and that America is a friend of Israel," Schwartz said. "What they are doing shows why we, and other Americans, are supporting Israel. They say they support Lebanon, Palestine and Iraq, but who is supporting Iraq? The United States is. So who are they supporting in Iraq, the terrorists?"

Schwartz called some of the latest flyers circulating around campus "too racist and too inflammatory."

"These are people who want the destruction of Israel," Schwartz said. "There are anti-Semitic attitudes in there."

Omar Faruque, a first-year pharmacy student from Bangladesh, and the only Muslim member of Students for Israel, can attest to some of the anti-Semitism on campus. "Many of my friends are anti-Semitic and hate Jews," Faruque said while participating in the counter-rally, quickly adding that they were still his friends and were "good people."

"They say Jews want to take over the world," Faruque added. "I think of myself as a good person who thinks rationally and it really bothered me. They tried to put that stuff in my head, but there was cognitive dissonance. So I joined Students for Israel to learn about the Jewish people and Israel. My friends don't like it. Before I joined SFI, I also hated most Jewish people and felt badly about them."

Hillel's Take

Miriam Starkman, executive director of Hillel of Metropolitan Detroit, whose office is on the Wayne State campus, says the community needs to distinguish between perception and reality.

"The perception that Jewish students are outnumbered by Arab and Muslim students leads people to think there is a lot more hostility and anti-Israel action on campus than is really the case," Starkman said.

While she agrees that most university-sponsored programs on Israel are critical than

supportive, she says few programs deal with Israel overall. "If there are two or three programs a year, that's a lot on this issue."

"The administration has been very supportive," Starkman added. "They are very sensitive and want to be very sure this is a secure educational environment."

She estimates that 500 to 600 Jewish students attend WSU, almost evenly divided between undergraduate and graduate students.

Taking Action

StandWithUs-Michigan has worked to support concerned students and get the message out to the broader pro-Israel community. The group sent out two e-mails the week before the rally urging communication with WSU administration and attendance at a counter-rally. StandWithUs/ Michigan founder and volunteer director Linda Stulberg of Oakland County said she is aware of dozens of communications that had gone to the WSU administration. "It was heartwarming to see the outpouring of support for the students," she said.

The first e-mail noted that in the past month, student groups hosted a visit of the "Wheels for Justice" tour that focused on the "occupations of Iraq and Palestine" and a Sept. 30 teach-in titled "Faces of Imperialism: The U.S.-Israeli War Against the People of the Middle East."

On Oct. 11, the university sponsored Professor Rashid Khalidi, director of Columbia University's Middle East Institute in New York. On Nov. 14, the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) ambassador to the United States, Afif Safieh, is scheduled to be a sponsored speaker.

While Stulberg commends President Reid for his continued opposition to divestment, she says the university must address broader issues.

"StandWithUs is greatly concerned by student reports of anti-Israel bias within programs and departments and of an increasingly hostile climate on campus," Stulberg said. "We share the students' concerns that malicious anti-Israel/anti-Semitic graffiti and flyers, one-sided anti-Israel polemics and divestment campaigns demonizing Israel contribute to a hostile climate."

She also is concerned that a non-campus group has such freedom to spread its message. "Campaigns such as this effort by the ARA, while 'camouflaged' as anti-Zionist, smack of anti-Semitism," she said.

The national office of StandWithUs has sent a three-page letter to the board of governors and President Reid explaining its concerns and urging a policy review. The letter also contains an offer to serve as a resource to bring prominent pro-Israel voices to campus, and includes a copy of the Findings and Recommendations of the United States Commission on Civil Rights Regarding Campus Anti-Semitism, Stulberg said. The report,

issued on April 3, 2006, says, "University leadership should ensure that students are protected from actions that could engender a hostile environment in violation of federal law."

StandWithUs also sponsored an anti-divestment ad in the campus newspaper, the South End, the day of the rally.

Campus Response

While concerned that students are experiencing problems, WSU Dean of Students David Strauss said he has not received any reports of harassment or intimidation.

"We are a public university and support the right to free speech," Strauss said. "Our No. 1 priority is to preserve the right to free speech and ensure events are safe events. There are avenues that students can pursue if they are having problems on campus or in the classroom. I haven't been made aware of it, so I don't see this as an issue taking place."

While campus regulations provided by the administration allow the university to impose time, place and manner restrictions on groups using the campus, after meeting with the ARA rally organizers Strauss determined the event would be allowed.

While only registered student groups can use university facilities, receive university funds and have their materials distributed by the Dean of Students Office, no campus regulations limit registered campus groups, unregistered groups or others, from posting notices on campus or holding outside events.

The flyers were "not threatening and not slandering in my estimation," Strauss said. "There is discourse at a university on many issues, as there should be. We have a welcoming and open campus with lots of opportunities to organize and have events. It's up to the students to determine how active and involved they want to be."

Noting that both Students for Israel and Hillel have applied for and received Student Council funds, Strauss urged greater involvement. "Don't just sit back and be reactive," he said. "Pursue programs, fill the showcases [in the Student Union], be active, get involved and make a difference on campus."

"I think there has been, in recent years, particularly among Orthodox students, a feeling of intimidation on campus," said Allan Gale, associate director of the Jewish Community Council of Metropolitan Detroit. "They see public criticism of Israel, programs, posters and chalking. I've heard this from students, but I'm not saying they are a majority."

"You find this on many campuses," Gale said, and universities can have a difficult time balancing things.

"Freedom of expression and freedom of speech are sacrosanct," Gale says, making universities reticent to step in.

Sharona Shapiro, Michigan director of the American Jewish Committee, has been on campus to speak with students and consult with Hillel staff.

"I hope the students will be informed, dynamic and energized," Shapiro said, after attending the Khalidi lecture and meeting with students and staff.

She voiced the hope that the activity of StandWithUs "will be of assistance to the Wayne State Jewish student groups that care, and link up with Hillel and the staff so there is a comprehensive advocacy plan."

She acknowledged there are issues that need attention and expressed confidence that they can be addressed.

"WSU values having a Jewish presence on their campus," she said.

RESOURCES

This section of the guide is composed of resources from the Jewish Virtual Library, the Anti-Defamation League, and Stand with Us.

From the Jewish Virtual Library

Myths & Facts Online

Human Rights in Israel and the Territories

By Mitchell G. Bard

<http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/myths/mf18.html#i>

"The Israeli regime is not apartheid. It is a unique case of democracy."

— South African Interior Minister Chief Mangosuthu Buthelezi^{5b}

MYTH

"Israel's treatment of Palestinians is similar to the treatment of blacks in apartheid South Africa."

FACT

Even before the [State of Israel](#) was [established](#), Jewish leaders consciously sought to avoid the situation that prevailed in South Africa. As [David Ben-Gurion](#) told Palestinian nationalist Musa Alami in 1934:

We do not want to create a situation like that which exists in South Africa, where the whites are the owners and rulers, and the blacks are the workers. If we do not do all kinds of work, easy and hard, skilled and unskilled, if we become merely landlords, then this will not be our homeland.⁶

Today, within Israel, Jews are a majority, but the Arab minority are full citizens who enjoy equal rights. Arabs are represented in the [Knesset](#), and have served in the Cabinet, high-level foreign ministry posts (e.g., Ambassador to Finland) and on the [Supreme Court](#). Under apartheid, black South Africans could not vote and were not citizens of the country in which they formed the overwhelming majority of the population. Laws dictated where they could live, work and travel. And, in South Africa, the government killed blacks who protested against its policies. By contrast, Israel allows freedom of movement, assembly and speech. Some of the government's harshest critics are Israeli Arabs who are members of the Knesset.

The situation of Palestinians in the territories is different. The security requirements of the nation, and a violent insurrection in the territories, forced Israel to impose restrictions on Arab residents of the [West Bank](#) and [Gaza Strip](#) that are not necessary inside Israel's pre-1967 borders. The Palestinians in the territories, typically, dispute Israel's right to exist whereas blacks did not seek the destruction of South Africa, only the apartheid regime.

If Israel were to give Palestinians full citizenship, it would mean the territories had been annexed. No Israeli government has been prepared to take that step. Instead, through negotiations, Israel agreed to give the Palestinians increasing authority over their own affairs. It is likely that a final settlement will allow most Palestinians to become citizens of their own state. The principal impediment to Palestinian independence is not Israeli policy, it is the unwillingness of the Palestinian leadership to give up [terrorism](#) and agree to live in peace beside the State of Israel.

Despite all their criticism, when asked what governments they admire most, more than 80 percent of Palestinians consistently choose Israel because they can see up close the thriving democracy in Israel, and the rights the Arab citizens enjoy there. By contrast, Palestinians place Arab regimes far down the list, and their own Palestinian Authority at the bottom with only 20 percent saying they admire the corrupt Arafat regime in 2003.^{6a}

“There is still one other question arising out of the disaster of nations which remains unsolved to this day, and whose profound tragedy, only a Jew can comprehend. This is the African question. Just call to mind all those terrible episodes of the slave trade, of human beings who, merely because they were black, were stolen like cattle, taken prisoner, captured and sold. Their children grew up in strange lands, the objects of contempt and hostility because their complexions were different. I am not ashamed to say, though I may expose myself to ridicule for saying so, that once I have witnessed the redemption of the Jews, my people, I wish also to assist in the redemption of the Africans.”

— [Theodor Herzl](#)⁷

MYTH

"Black African nations cut relations with Israel because of its racist policies toward Palestinians."

FACT

Black African nations did not break relations with Israel because of any concerns about racism; most severed ties with the Jewish State in 1973 because of pressure from the Arab oil-producing nations. Full diplomatic ties were continued only by Malawi, Lesotho and Swaziland, while a few other countries maintained their links through Israeli interest offices at foreign embassies. Commercial ties were also not entirely disrupted, many black African students continued to train in Israel and Israeli experts remained active in Africa.

Israel has had a long history of friendly relations with black African countries. From 1957 to 1973, Israel trained thousands of Africans in all aspects of life including agriculture, health care and economics. Thousands of Africans went to Israel for training, while similar numbers of Israelis were sent to Africa to teach.⁸

Golda Meir, the architect of Israel's Africa policy, believed the lessons learned by Israelis could be passed on to Africans who, particularly during the 1950s, were engaged in the same process of nation building. "Like them," she said, "we had shaken off foreign rule; like them, we had to learn for ourselves how to reclaim the land, how to increase the yields of our crops, how to irrigate, how to raise poultry, how to live together, and how to defend ourselves." Israel could provide a better model for the newly independent African states, Meir believed, because Israelis "had been forced to find solutions to the kinds of problems that large, wealthy, powerful states had never encountered."⁹

Once the coercive power of the Arab oil-producers eroded, African countries began to reestablish relations with Israel and to seek new cooperative projects. This trend gained momentum with the ongoing peace negotiations between Israel and its Arab neighbors. Today, 40 African countries maintain diplomatic ties with Israel, and reciprocal visits by heads of state and government ministers take place frequently. In May 1994, Israel's President [Ezer Weizman](#) attended the historic inauguration of Nelson Mandela as the first black African president of South Africa.

From Stand With Us

<http://standwithuscampus.com/index.php?module=htmlpages&func=display&pid=46>

Dealing with DIVESTMENT & APARTHEID Programs on Campus

FACTS ON APARTHEID

- Apartheid was the official policy of the white minority in South Africa. Under this system, the Black majority was prevented from voting and gaining access to political power.
- Israel, a Jewish majority country, is a fully democratic country that ensures the political and human rights of all of its citizens. Arabs that live within Israel are citizens with full rights.
- Several Israeli Arabs are elected members in Israel's parliament.
- There is confusion between Israeli Arabs living within Israel's borders, and those Palestinians living in the West Bank. The Arabs in the West Bank are not Israeli citizens. After the Oslo accords and prior to the wave of violence started by the Palestinians, nearly all of the Palestinians in the West Bank were under the direct jurisdiction of the PA.

Divestment campaigns singularly demonize Israel and designate Israel for pariah status, while ignoring other states, including many in the Middle East, which systematically abuse human rights. As Benjamin Pogrund, the prominent South African Jewish journalist who was imprisoned by the apartheid regime, has written: "Palestinians are not oppressed on racial grounds as Arabs but are, rather, the competitors in a national/religious conflict for land."

From the Anti-Defamation League

<http://www.adl.org/Israel/apartheid/default.asp>

Israel and Apartheid: The Big Lie Introduction

Posted: August 29, 2005

"The South African apartheid state never inflicted the sort of repression that Israel is inflicting on the Palestinians."

- Speaker, Rally for Palestine, London, May 21, 2005.

The demand for sanctions against Israel is one of the pillars of the global campaign against the legitimacy of the Jewish state which has surfaced over the last five years. In July 2005, a conference in Paris held under the auspices of a UN body, The Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People (CEIRPP), culminated in a declaration endorsing "a global campaign of boycotts, divestment and sanctions" against Israel. That the momentum for a boycott campaign is building is evidenced by the support for such measures in various sectors, from British university campuses to American Protestant churches. Of course, not of all these bodies call for the complete isolation of Israel, but they share the flaw of pinning upon Israel the greatest responsibility for the ongoing conflict in the Middle East. Therefore, Israel is singled out for punishment.

The boycott campaign against Israel takes its inspiration from the struggle against apartheid in South Africa, which involved a sustained campaign of economic sanctions. In drawing this parallel, many activists take the view that Israel, like apartheid South Africa, is a colonial state whose laws and institutions enforce the subservient status of the indigenous population. Moreover, the solution is implicit in the diagnosis; because white domination was dismantled in South Africa, it follows that what is regarded as Jewish domination, in the form of the State of Israel, should go the same way.

In combating the various boycott and divestment campaigns, supporters of Israel will invariably come up against the apartheid analogy. At the U.N. World Conference Against Racism, held in Durban in 2001 – and notorious for its obsessive demonization of Israel – non-governmental organizations issued a declaration with numerous references to Israel as an "apartheid state." More recently, European and American campus activists, among both faculty and students, have based the case for an academic boycott of Israeli higher education institutions on the alleged similarities between the Israeli occupation of the West Bank and Gaza, and apartheid. So pervasive has this analogy become that many opponents of Israel's security fence refer to it pejoratively as the "apartheid wall."

The apartheid analogy is critically flawed. It bears little resemblance to the realities of contemporary Israel and plays down the uniqueness of the apartheid state in South Africa. That state was extraordinarily repressive, regulating every detail of the lives of its subjects – 90 percent of whom were non-white – on the basis of their skin color. By contrast, Israel is a democracy which encourages vibrant

debate, which has a flourishing free press and which shares with other liberal democracies a core value: the equality of all its citizens before the law.

From the Anti-Defamation League

http://www.adl.org/Israel/apartheid/what_is_apartheid.asp

Israel and Apartheid: The Big Lie Apartheid: What was it?

Posted: August 29, 2005

In 1994, one of the modern era's most heinous forms of social organization came to a peaceful end. In the new South Africa, apartheid was no more. Black and white South Africans, along with the outside world, celebrated the demise of a system which, in the Afrikaans language, means "separateness" and "apartness." The racial separation and discrimination inherent in the principle of apartheid was enshrined in 1948, when South Africa's National Party came to power. Convinced of their racial and moral superiority, the white architects of apartheid imposed what former President F.W. de Klerk, looking back on apartheid, called a "manifest injustice" on the Black population.

That injustice was not confined to just denying the vote to Black South Africans. It was rooted in law. Dozens of laws were enacted by the apartheid regime to enforce segregation, among them:

The Group Areas Act – Passed in 1950, this enforced physical segregation by creating different residential areas for whites, blacks and other racial groups, such as Asians and those of mixed race (known as "coloreds").

Prohibition of Mixed Marriages Act – Passed in 1949, this forbade individuals from different racial backgrounds from marrying each other. Through this law, and through the Immorality Amendment Act of 1950, which prohibited sexual relations between whites and blacks, the apartheid regime echoed the infamous Nuremberg Laws of Nazi Germany, which discriminated between Jews and those of "pure" German origin.

Bantu Education Act – Passed in 1953, this law stunted the intellectual and creative development of Black children by gearing their education to reinforce their subservient social position (Hendrik Verwoerd, later to become South Africa's Prime Minister, used the phrase "in accordance with their opportunities in life"). An extension to University Education Act in 1959 banned Black students from attending white universities and created separate higher education institutes for Blacks, whites, Asians and "coloreds."

Reservation of Separate Amenities Act – Passed in 1953, this law provided the icons of the apartheid regime: signs on public buildings, transport and other amenities which declared 'Europeans Only' or 'non-Europeans Only'. The law specified that public facilities had to be separated on racial grounds and did not require these facilities to be of equal standards.

Suppression of Communism Act – Passed in 1950, this law used such a wide-ranging definition of "communism" that any meaningful act of opposition to apartheid was banned.

Through these and a host of other laws, apartheid South Africa was able to tightly regulate, and therefore discriminate against, its Black population: where they lived, with whom they could engage in social contact, what they were permitted to study, what they were allowed to say.

From the Anti-Defamation League

http://www.adl.org/Israel/apartheid/no_comparison.asp

Israel and Apartheid: The Big Lie Why there's no comparison with Israel

Posted: August 29, 2005

Apartheid was a unique system. Those who lived under apartheid rule were governed by its rules and conventions every minute of every day. In Israel and the territories, there are tensions and divisions over citizenship, ownership of land and human rights – basic elements which one recognizes in the apartheid model. But to turn such recognition into affirmation that Israel practices apartheid defies logic and poses a basic question: Why, out of all the countries in the world in which national, religious or ethnic minorities claim discrimination, is Israel selected for the apartheid label?

There are two components to the accusation that Israel is an apartheid state: historical and legal. The Palestinian version of the 1948 war provides the historical justification for apartheid analogy. According to this narrative, Jewish settlers with a grand colonial purpose grabbed the territory of the indigenous Arab population, expelling the majority and marginalizing the minority which remained. Since that time, the State of Israel is accused of having practiced systematic discrimination against its Arab citizens and of ruling mercilessly over those Arabs living in the territories captured during the 1967 war.

In legal terms, the argument continues, Israel bears a striking resemblance to apartheid South Africa. Therefore, the argument concludes, Israel is a paradox: it claims to be both a Jewish state and a democratic state, but does not accept that one precludes the other. By entrenching and reinforcing its Jewish majority through a combination of legal, political and military measures, Israel is said to have imposed an apartheid system upon its non-Jewish population.

The argument is a dramatic one. To many people in the human rights community, it is seductive as well. It is also wholly false.

From the Anti-Defamation League

http://www.adl.org/Israel/apartheid/behind_the_line.asp

Israel and Apartheid: The Big Lie Israel: Behind the Green Line

Posted: August 29, 2005

In 1948, just as the white regime in South Africa was creating the legal framework for apartheid, Israel's leaders, having survived a war of extermination waged by the Arab countries, anchored the new Jewish State in the principles of democracy. The Declaration of Independence stated: 'The State of Israel... will promote the development of the country for the benefit of all its inhabitants; will be based upon the precepts of liberty, justice and peace taught by the Hebrew prophets; will uphold the full social and political equality of all its citizens, without distinction of race, creed or sex; will guarantee full freedom of conscience, worship, education and culture; will safeguard the sanctity and inviolability of the shrines and Holy Places of all religions; and will dedicate itself to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.'

Of course, that doesn't mean that no national or ethnic group in Israel has suffered from discrimination.

Many Arab citizens of Israel complain, often with justification, about unequal allocation of resources; about the fact that 13 percent of land in Israel is administered by the Jewish National Fund (JNF) and cannot be leased to Arabs under that body's covenant (neither Jews nor Arabs may buy JNF land); about their exclusion from the military service required of Jews and members of the Druze minority, which they argue means they can never be regarded as full citizens; about the impact of the security fence on the Palestinian population, particularly in and around Jerusalem.

Jewish communities, too, have claimed discrimination in Israel. Many Jews from Arab countries or from Ethiopia have said that they do not receive the same educational or career opportunities afforded to Jews of European origin; some representatives of these communities also say that their native cultures and traditions are not respected.

None of this makes Israel unique. In fact, the reverse is true – all democracies have faced claims of discrimination at one time or another. One thinks of African-Americans in the U.S. or, more recently, Roma gypsies in the newly emerged democracies of Eastern Europe. Moreover, any assessment of Israel's record on discrimination needs to recognize the following points:

- Israel's citizens enjoy full equality before the law. This includes not only Jews from a vast array of ethnic and racial backgrounds – including many who would have been the victims of apartheid had they lived in South Africa – but the Muslim and Christian Arabs who make up one-fifth of the population.
- Unlike Blacks in apartheid South Africa, Arab citizens of Israel have full political rights. They vote and participate in the political process, with Arab Knesset representatives across the spectrum, from the Communist and Arab nationalist parties through to the Likud. Salim Jubran, an Israeli Arab, is a judge on Israel's Supreme Court.
- In Jerusalem, the 120,000 Arab residents of the city are entitled to Israeli citizenship, but the vast majority have retained their pre-1967 Jordanian passports and therefore remain in Israel on the basis of permanent resident ID cards. In both 1996 and 2005, Arab Jerusalemites were permitted to vote in elections to the Palestinian Authority. The extraordinarily low turnout on both occasions was duly noted by observers. In the case of the post-Arafat elections in 2005, disillusionment with PA corruption, as well as the decision of the Palestinian Election Commission that all but 6,000 of the voters had to cast their ballots outside of Jerusalem, were the main reasons cited for the turnout.
- Israel is one of the few countries in the Middle East and wider Islamic region where Christians, as well as Muslims and Jews, can freely worship. This stands in contrast with Saudi Arabia, where Islam is the only religion permitted, and with Iraq and Pakistan, where Christians have faced attack from Islamist terror groups.
- Arab students and professors study, research, teach and – above all – argue and debate on all of Israel's university campuses. At Haifa University, selected for a boycott by Britain's Association of University Teachers (AUT), some 20 percent of the student body is Arab.

No reasonable person would dispute that discrimination is a problem in Israel. But the nature and scale of the discrimination is not exceptional. And discrimination is not the same thing as apartheid.

From the Anti-Defamation League

http://www.adl.org/Israel/apartheid/apartheid_analogy.asp

Israel and Apartheid: The Big Lie Apartheid Analogy Fails for West Bank and Gaza

Posted: August 29, 2005

Neither does the apartheid analogy hold water in the West Bank and Gaza Strip, despite the undoubted hardships which Palestinians face in their day-to-day lives. Given the sizeable number of Israelis who support a withdrawal from some or all of these areas, as well as Prime Minister Ariel Sharon's decision to disengage from all settlements in Gaza and parts of the West Bank, it is abundantly clear that Israel does not want to indefinitely rule over the Palestinian population of these territories. Israel's stance in that regard was confirmed by its decision to sign the Oslo Accords, which created the Palestinian Authority, and in its peace agreements with Egypt and Jordan.

- In South Africa, around 12 million disenfranchised Blacks were crammed into Bantustans (impoverished autonomous homelands whose borders were designed to exclude economically viable land) to be used as a reservoir of cheap labor. Four of the 10 Bantustans were proclaimed 'independent' – meaning that residents lost even the handful of limited rights they had in South Africa – but were not recognized as such by foreign governments.
- Israel could not be further from imposing a Bantustan solution on the Palestinians. Not only has the Israeli government and the majority of the Israeli public accepted the idea of a Palestinian State but – as Israel has made clear in the past – genuine guarantees of security will result in important territorial concessions. Israel's goal is to achieve both its own security and Palestinian self-determination. In direct contrast to the Bantustans, which were frozen in a legal no-man's land, a Palestinian state will enjoy both international recognition and generous aid: recent pledges include \$3 billion from the World Bank alone. Rather than being ruled by a puppet leadership appointed by Israel, the Palestinians elect their own leaders. Finally, it should be recalled that apartheid South Africa intended to deport all of its Black citizens into the Bantustans; in the case of Israel's Arab citizens, such an idea is abhorrent to the vast majority of Israelis.
- The importance of Israel's security was noted by Nelson Mandela, the symbol of the struggle against apartheid, who remarked, in 1999, that he could not conceive of Israeli withdrawal 'if Arab states do not recognize Israel within secure borders.'

The world is rightly concerned about the humanitarian impact of checkpoints and curfews on the Palestinians. Such measures are driven not by a racist ideology, but, in the main, by legitimate security concerns on Israel's part. These measures, along with the security fence, are the consequence of a campaign of terror by Palestinian groups such as Hamas and the Al Aksa Martyrs Brigade, which, in deliberately targeting civilians, have claimed over 1,000 innocent Israeli lives.

Some analysts argue that Israeli policy is also informed by its need to secure a Jewish majority within defined borders. It is perhaps more accurate to say that Israel wishes to safeguard its democratic character and its status as a haven for the Jewish people. Permanent occupation of another people who wish to rule themselves is, therefore, not an option, which is why Israel has committed itself to disengagement and future negotiations.

ANALYSIS

This section contains articles from journalists, scholars and professionals, many of whom have lived both in South Africa and Israel, and who argue that Israel's democratic practices do not equate with South Africa's former apartheid policies.

FROM FRONT PAGE MAGAZINE

<http://www.frontpagemag.com/Articles/ReadArticle.asp?ID=22475>

Israel and Apartheid

By Jaclyn Schiff

FrontPageMagazine.com | May 17, 2006

In recent years, Palestinian sympathizers in the United States have waged a coordinated effort to encourage churches, universities and businesses to withdraw their investments from Israel and boycott companies with ties to the Israeli economy.

This semester the George Washington University became another locus for one such campaign. The rationale for divestment (at GWU and in general) is explained in the *GW Hatchet* by GWU Law Student, Fadi Kiblawi. He argues that the situation for Palestinians in present-day Israel is analogous to the conditions blacks faced in Apartheid South Africa. As a result, Kiblawi recommends that the international community respond with a boycott like the one waged against South Africa in the 80s.

It's not the first time I've heard the analogy and as a pro-Israel South African, I never fail to find myself disturbed by such comparisons. Countless activists that push for divestment from Israel employ such rhetoric. Their strategy rests on presuppositions of similarities between the oppression of blacks in pre-1994 South Africa and the conditions of Palestinians in the Gaza Strip and West Bank. At its core though, divestment's basic foundation is riddled with red-herrings and faulty analogies.

In my experience, divestment activists often casually label anything from a fence to a policy, "apartheid." As someone who grew up in South Africa, I often wonder how many of those who champion the term apartheid could accurately define its meaning or even correctly identify its linguistic origin. To date, I have not even heard the term pronounced correctly (often pronounced apart-hide, the pronunciation that most closely resembles Afrikaans is apart-ate). Too many words have been reduced to catch phrases and sound bites that cheapen their actual meaning and few words have been more abused than apartheid.

South Africa's ambassador to Israel, Major General Fumanekile (Fumie) Gqiba, seems to concur. Ambassador Gqiba, a former commander in the armed wing of the ANC liberation movement recently told a South African paper, "the term 'apartheid' is uniquely South African and devalues the struggle of the black population against one of the worst forms of oppression known to man."

I'd like just one divestment activist to make the comparison between Israel and Apartheid South Africa to a black South African, such as my friend, Maggie Masipha – a women in her 50s who grew

up when apartheid policies were most stringent. Tell her about Israel's "racist" policies that allowed for the appointment of Salim Joubran, an Israeli-Arab judge to its Supreme Court in 2003. Ask her if while she was sitting on the "blacks only" bench she was allowed to go out and vote, let alone play an influential role in her country's judicial process. While Palestinians and Arabs lecture and attend every Israeli University, it was illegal for Mrs. Masipha to attend any South African universities under the National Party's rule. Tell her about how Israel's draconian policies give Palestinian professors like Sari Nusseibeh (who recently opposed the boycott of Israeli universities by the UK's Association of University Teachers) rights to academic freedom. Ask her if these conditions are reminiscent of the oppression she faced.

Divestment activists seem to delight in quoting South African politicians and personalities that agree with their assessment of the situation. All these quotations can be countered by an equal number of quotations from notable pro-Israel South Africans such as Tony Leon, the leader of South Africa's largest opposition party. But quotations and alliances are almost always politically motivated and rarely speak accurately to the situation on the ground. I lived in South Africa for fifteen years (during apartheid and in its aftermath) and I have visited Israel three times.

While people may be eager to lower New York City's high murder rate, one simply would not compare killings in New York to the Rwandan Genocide. Comparing Israel's democracy to South African Apartheid is just as baseless.

From The Guardian

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/g2/story/0,,1704780,00.html>

'Why depict Israel as a chamber of horrors like no other in the world?'

This week's Guardian report on the parallels between Israel and South African apartheid was muddled and disappointing, argues Benjamin Pogrund

Wednesday February 8, 2006

The Guardian

Nearly three years ago I underwent an operation in a Jerusalem hospital. The surgeon was Jewish, the anaesthetist was Arab. The doctors and nurses who looked after me were Jews and Arabs. I lay in bed for a month and watched as they gave the same skilled care to other patients - half of whom were Arabs and half of whom were Jewish - all sharing the same wards, operating theatres and bathrooms.

After that experience I have difficulty understanding anyone who equates Israel with apartheid South Africa. What I saw in the Hadassah Mt Scopus hospital was inconceivable in the South Africa where I spent most of my life, growing up and then working as a journalist who specialised in exposing apartheid. It didn't happen and it couldn't happen.

Blacks and whites were strictly separated and blacks got the least and the worst. And this is only one slice of life. Buses, post offices, park benches, cinemas, everything, were segregated by law. No equation is possible.

That is what came to my mind as I read the Guardian's two-part report this week about Israel and apartheid. The writer, Chris McGreal, is an outstanding reporter. I admire his dispatches from Israel/Palestine. Day by day he honestly and correctly portrays the conflict. But these articles are disappointing. He has lost his way in thickets of information. He has been unable to untangle the confusion and complexities of group relations here. He is muddled in distinguishing between the situations of Israeli Arabs and West Bank Arabs and Jerusalem Arabs.

It is not that he is wholly wrong. Arabs suffer severe discrimination. Israel is in occupation of the West Bank and is responsible for oppressive and ugly actions. But he fails to explain the why and the wherefore. He had a choice in deciding how to decipher the situation. He could have adopted the approach of Heribert Adam and Kogila Moodley, well-known Canadian academics specialising in South Africa and the Middle East. In their book, *Seeking Mandela*, published last year, they say: "Although Israel and apartheid South Africa are often equated as 'colonial settler societies', we argue that the differences outweigh the similarities." They warn that the "simplistic assumption that the South African model readily lends itself to export may actually retard necessary new solutions by clinging to visions or processes of negotiation that may not work in another context". That assessment is surely far more relevant than quoting the debased views about South Africa and Israel of the late Hendrik Verwoerd, a father of apartheid, as McGreal has strangely done.

McGreal had to decide whether the glass is half-full or half-empty. His approach could have been that here is a tiny country which came into being, in the shadow of the Holocaust, less than 58 years ago. It has been under continual attack since the start and is still beset by enemies sworn to its destruction, whether Islamic Jihad and Hamas through suicide bombings, the Arab states through their refusal to recognise its existence, the recent "wipe-out" call by Iran's president, or the actions and declarations of a mixed bag of malevolent forces, anti-semites and semi-Jews. That induces a siege mentality among Israel's Jews. They fight to live and do not always do it pleasantly. They make horrible mistakes and inflict suffering on others. It is not secret. I do not know why Chris McGreal says the Israeli public is unaware of what is happening: newspapers publish the details in profusion, provoking discussion and action.

Yes, racism does exist in Israel - directed against Arabs, and also among Jews. Amir Peretz, new leader of the Labour party, is said to be having problems with western-born Ashkenazi voters because he is Moroccan-born and Sephardic. An explanation offered for the police violence in clearing the Amona outpost last week was the antagonism between the protesting young people, who were mainly religious Ashkenazi, and the police, who were a mixture of Moroccan and Russian immigrant stock, Bedouin and Druze.

Is Israel so different from other countries that struggle to come to terms with their minority groups? Why depict this country as a chamber of horrors like no other in the world?

The glass is indeed half-full. In South Africa, change for the better was simply not possible: the apartheid system had to be eradicated. In contrast, change is possible in Israel. An accusation by a member of the Knesset, Ahmed Tibi, who is Arab, that the central Bank of Israel had a discriminatory employment policy with no Arabs among its 800 staffers, drew the assurance from the bank's then governor that tenders would be advertised in the Arab-language press. He added: "Bank of Israel hires according to criteria of merit, and ignores differences in religion, sex, race or nationality." Tibi also complained that the state monopoly Israel Electric did not employ Arabs; a start has since been made with the hiring of six Arabs. There is continual progress: the evidence is there if you want to see it. The first Arab was appointed to the high court of justice two years ago. Last year, for the first time, an Arab was appointed director-general of a government ministry.

McGreal notes that inside Israel, 93% of the land is reserved for Jews while South Africa's whites kept 87% of the land for themselves. Thus Israel and apartheid South Africa are the same. But the QED is not as straightforward as his citing of these figures would have us believe. In law, land in Israel is open to everyone but, yes, in practice, through legal stratagems, 93% of the land has been only for Jews. This, however, has been breached by the Arab Ka'adan family: in a 10-year legal struggle, they have established their right to buy land and build a home in the "Jewish" community settlement of Katzir in northern Israel. The high court of justice has given a precedent-setting decision that the state cannot discriminate on the basis of religion or nationality when allocating state land to Israeli citizens. The case has dragged on but final success is in sight. Other court actions are underway. Land exemplifies both the negative and positive aspects of the lives of Israel's Arabs: it conveys the discrimination - and the movement towards change; slow, slow, but underway.

On education, McGreal states that separate and unequal education systems were a central part of the apartheid regime's strategy to limit black children to manual and service jobs - something I observed firsthand and fought against in South Africa. But I have to question his reference to what he says is the current belief among Arab parents that their children's schools are deliberately starved of state resources so that Arabs will be doomed to lesser jobs. Every government school, whether Jewish or Arab, gets identical funding; differences, and hence resources, arise through what parents pay and what local authorities pay (most local authorities in Israel are in poor financial shape; Arab local authorities are even worse off with problems in collecting local property taxes). The Jewish schools are Jewish day schools. The Arab schools are Muslim and use Arabic, which is an official language in Israel. There is no bar to Arabs attending Jewish schools, and some do.

I am also puzzled by the health ministry figures that McGreal has chosen to use about state spending on development of health facilities in Arab areas (the clear implication being that Arabs are starved of health care). Contrary to the picture painted, health is a visible indicator of the differences between apartheid South Africa and Israel. In South Africa, the infant mortality rate (IMR) in 1985 was 78 per 1,000 live births. Among colour groups:

whites 12, Asians 20, coloureds 60, blacks 94 to 150. In Israel, in the 1950s, the IMR among Muslims was 60.6 and among Jews 38.8. Major improvements occurred in health care during the 1990s and by 2001 the IMR among Arabs was 7.6 (Muslims 8.2, Christians 2.6, Druze 4.7). Among Jews, 4.1. According to the health ministry, the higher Muslim figure was due mainly to genetic defects as a result of marriages between close relatives; poverty is also a factor. Other countries in 2000: Switzerland, 8.2, and 12.3 for Turks living there; United States, whites 8.5, blacks 21.3.

He is also mistaken in saying that Arabs have been singled out for discrimination in getting reduced child allowances. They are the same as Jewish ultra-Orthodox families. These two groups have the largest number of children and have suffered equally from cutbacks in allowances, especially for the fifth child and beyond.

Here in Jerusalem on Monday, I watched the BBC's Auschwitz on television. The episode dealt with French collaboration in delivering Jews to the Nazis for destruction, and how British policemen on Guernsey handed over three Jewish women. It was a reminder, if any be needed, of why Israel exists: to fulfil the centuries-old dream of a homeland for Jews and as a sanctuary for Jews. It's not a perfect society. It struggles to find itself as a Jewish state (with no consensus about what that means), and it struggles to evolve as a democratic society with full rights for minorities. It deserves criticism for its flaws and mistakes. It also merits sympathy and support in facing unfounded attack.

· Benjamin Pogrund was born in South Africa and was deputy editor of the Rand Daily Mail in Johannesburg. He is the author of books on Robert Sobukwe, Nelson Mandela and the press under apartheid. He has lived in Israel for more than eight years and is founder of Yakar's Centre for Social Concern in Jerusalem, which encourages dialogue across political and ethnic lines.

From Mid East Web

http://www.mideastweb.org/israel_apartheid.htm

Apartheid? Israel is a democracy in which Arabs vote

Editor's note- Benjamin Pogrund is well equipped to write about apartheid and Israel. He was born in South Africa, where a leader in the fight against apartheid and outspoken proponent of equality as editor of the Rand Daily Mail. He now lives in Israel, where is is founding director of Yakar's Center for Social Concern in Jerusalem. he is also co-editor of the newly published book, "Shared Histories: A Palestinian-Israeli Dialogue".

By way of clarification, the Israeli Law of Return does not use a religious criterion to decide who is of the Jewish nationality. The Law of Return allows anyone who had one Jewish grandparent to return to Israel as a Jew. This creates a conflict with the orthodox Jewish religious establishment, who use the halachic religious criterion of descent from a Jewish mother.

The slogan "Israel as an apartheid state" has been promoted by anti-Zionists to delegitimize the basis of Zionism. The analogy is used to legitimize and catalyze boycott initiatives such as those that were instituted against South Africa. Some people confound it with criticism of the occupation, but the same people would be opposed to Israel if there were not occupation.

A.I.

Apartheid? Israel is a democracy in which Arabs vote

By Benjamin Pogrund

Apartheid is dead in South Africa but the word is alive in the world, especially as an epithet of abuse for Israel. Israel is accused by some of being "the new apartheid" state. If true, it would be a grave charge, justifying international condemnation and sanctions. But it isn't true. Anyone who knows what apartheid was, and who knows Israel today, is aware of that. Use of the apartheid label is at best ignorant and naïve and at worst cynical and manipulative.

Either way, its inappropriate use cheapens the meaning of the apartheid that South Africans suffered for so long. Just as overuse of "Nazi" has robbed that once-dreaded word of much of its meaning, as happened during the Gaza Strip evacuation in August 2005: the Jewish settlers who yelled "Nazis" at the Jewish soldiers who were evicting them, betrayed and diminished the Holocaust which had murderously swept over Europe's Jews 50 years earlier.

The word "apartheid" was coined in the 1920s for Calvinist religious purposes but became widely known through the general election in 1948 as the expression of Afrikaner nationalist political, social and economic policy. It can be defined as racial separation and discrimination, institutionalised by law in every aspect of everyday life, imposed by the white minority and derived from belief in white racial superiority.

The description of Israel as an "emerging apartheid state" began to roll perhaps around 2000 and gained wider currency during the regional conferences leading up to the UN Anti-racism conference in Durban in August/September 2001. The anti-racism conference of NGOs adopted resolutions condemning Israel as an "apartheid state" and called for an international policy of total isolation "as in the case of South Africa which means the imposition of mandatory and comprehensive sanctions and embargoes (and) the full cessation of all links...". There were also repeated references to "genocide" in descriptions of Israel's behaviour towards Palestinians, plus denunciations of Zionism, Israel's founding philosophy, as "racism" in a transparent attempt to reinstate the now rescinded 1975 UN resolution condemning Zionism as a crime against humanity akin to apartheid.

The sponsors of these statements and their supporters were so wild and off the mark in their language and actions that they discredited themselves. In addition, that is, to creating near-total distraction from the anti-racism cause which was the purpose of their being there. The conference of governments that immediately followed the NGO meeting rejected virtually every one of the attacks on Israel. Later, South Africa's Deputy Foreign Minister, Aziz Pahad, spoke of the "disgraceful events" surrounding the NGO conference and said: "I wish to make it unequivocally clear that the South African government recognises that part of that component was hijacked and used by some with an anti-Israel agenda to turn it into an anti-Semitic event."

So how does Israel stand in regard to the apartheid and racist claims?

First, Israel inside the Green Line (the de facto border after the 1967 war)

Arabs are a substantial minority, about 20 per cent of the population. In theory they have full citizenship rights. In practice they suffer extensive discrimination, ranging from denial of land use, diminished job opportunities and lesser social benefits, to reports of a family ordered off a beach and children evicted from a park. Only some 5,05 per cent of the 55 500 civil servants are Arabs. Arab villages are often under-funded and suffer from poor services and roads. Schools receive smaller amounts of government revenue, so their facilities are poorer.

None of this is acceptable and especially in a state that presents itself as the only democracy in the Middle East. But is it comparable with pre-1994 South Africa? Under apartheid, remember, no detail of life was immune to discrimination by law. Skin colour determined every single person's life, literally from birth until death: where you were born, where you went to school, what job you had, which bus you used, what park bench you sat on and in which cemetery you were buried. In Israel, discrimination occurs despite equality in law; it is extensive, it is buttressed by custom, but it is not remotely comparable with the South African panoply of discrimination enforced by parliamentary legislation. The difference is fundamental.

The Israeli situation can perhaps be better likened to the United States: blacks enjoyed rights under the Constitution but the rights were not enforced for decades; it took the Supreme Court's historic judgement in Brown vs Board of Education in 1954 to begin the process of applying the law.

In Israel, discrimination occurs despite equality in law; it is extensive, it is buttressed by custom, but it is not remotely comparable with the South African panoply of discrimination enforced by parliamentary legislation. The difference is fundamental.

The difference between the current Israeli situation and apartheid South Africa is emphasised at a very human level: Jewish and Arab babies are born in the same delivery room, with the same facilities, attended by the same doctors and nurses, with the mothers recovering in adjoining beds in a ward. Two years ago I had major surgery in a Jerusalem hospital: the surgeon was Jewish, the anaesthetist was Arab, the doctors and nurses who looked after me were Jews and Arabs. Jews and Arabs share meals in restaurants and travel on the same trains, buses and taxis, and visit each other's homes.

Could any of this possibly have happened under apartheid? Of course not.

A crucial, indeed fundamental, indicator of the status of Israel's minority — and another non-comparison between apartheid South Africa and Israel — is that Arabs have the vote. Blacks did not. The vote means citizenship and power to change. Arab citizens lack full power as a minority community but they have the right and the power to unite as a group and to ally with others.

Nor does "Zionism is racism" stand up to scrutiny. On 29 November 1947, the UN General Assembly voted for partition of the then Palestine so as to create a state for Jews and a state for Arabs. For Jews it was Zionism come true — the return to their ancestral home and the creation of a refuge from centuries-old persecution. They accepted partition but Arabs did not. Israel now has a Jewish majority and they have the right to decide how to order the society, including defining citizenship. If the majority wishes to restrict immigration and citizenship to Jews, that may be incompatible with a strict definition of the universality of humankind. But it is the right of the majority.

Just as it is the right of Saudi Arabia and other Arab states not to allow Christians as citizens, or the right of Ghana and other African states to reject or restrict whites as citizens, or the right of South Africa to have a non-racial citizenship policy. It's the norm for countries to have citizenship laws and immigration practices which do not subscribe to universal ideals, but which are, on the contrary, based on their perceptions of colour or religion or economic class or whatever. Europe demonstrates that every day in dealing with would-be economic migrants.

Israel's "Law of Return", giving every Jew anywhere in the world the right to immigration — apart from exceptional cases relating to known criminals and kindred miscreants — is part of the majority's right to decide whom to admit. It stems from the original purpose in creating a Jewish state, or a state for the Jews. Orthodox rabbis in Israel have a controlling influence in deciding who is a Jew. Descent is matrilineal. It is a religious issue — not an "apartheid" one as some claim — which is being fought over among Jews, with the Reform and Conservative streams of Judaism demanding a role.

At the same time, it is clearly unfair from the victims' point of view for Israel to give automatic entry to Jews from anywhere while denying the "Right of Return" to Palestinians who fled or were expelled in the wars of 1948 and 1967, and their descendants. This unfairness, to put it at its mildest, is a tragic consequence of war. Again, however, it is not unique to Israel. The same has happened in recent times, often on far greater scales, in Germany, Poland, the Czech Republic, India and Pakistan, to list but a few parallel situations.

In any event, what is racism? Under apartheid it was skin colour. Applied to Israel that's a joke: for proof of that, just look at a crowd of Israeli Jews and their gradations in skin-colour from the "blackest" to the "whitest". In international usage, "racism" has broadened and now seems to cover any prejudice or discrimination against another group. Under this definition, Israel, a young country that was founded less than 60 years ago, is a hotbed of discrimination and complaints about discrimination. Arabs suffer most but there are constant complaints of discrimination and unfair treatment from (Oriental) Sephardic Jews and (Western) Ashkenazi Jews, as well as religious and secular Jews. There is no shortage of abrasive reports claiming discrimination. One illustration: three prestigious Ashkenazi religious seminaries for girls were reported to maintain a quota whereby only 30 per cent of Sephardic origin are admitted because they are viewed as inferior; this was described as progress because previously the quota was 17 per cent.

The non-comparison is seen yet again in the possibilities of change. In South Africa, change for the better was simply not possible during at least the first 30 years of Afrikaner Nationalist rule. Even if a court occasionally blew a hole in an apartheid law, the all-white parliament rapidly enacted legislation to close the loophole. In contrast, change is possible in Israel, and change is happening. Gains range from the first hiring of Arabs by the parastatal Israeli Electric Corporation, through equality in budgets for Muslim cemeteries, to affirmative action in government service such as last year's appointment of the first Arab judge to the High Court of Justice. Change is imperfect and too slow and there is backsliding, but it is happening.

Even on the critical issue of land: with most of Israel reserved for Jews, an Arab nurse, Adel Kaadan, has been striving for a decade to move into the Jewish town of Katzir. The High Court opened the way for him but bureaucratic tricks have kept him out. It seems he is now on the verge of success — and more cases are in the pipeline to challenge land discrimination.

Second, the West Bank:

It is occupied by Israel. No occupation can be benign. Israeli harshness and misdeeds are reported day in and day out by Israeli media. Everyone is suffering, Palestinians as victims and Israelis as perpetrators. Death and maiming haunts everyone in the occupied territories and in Israel itself. Occupation is brutalising and corrupting both Palestinians and Israelis. The damage done to the fabric of both societies, moral and material, is incalculable.

But it is not apartheid. Palestinians are not oppressed on racial grounds as Arabs, but, rather, as competitors — until now, at the losing end — in a national/religious conflict for land.

The word “Bantustan” is often used to describe Israel’s policy about a future Palestinian state. It might look like that, superficially. But the root causes — and even more, the intentions — are different. White South Africans invented the Bantustans to pen blacks into defined areas that served as reservoirs of labour; blacks were allowed to leave only when needed to work in white South Africa’s factories, farms, offices and homes. The Israeli aim is the exact opposite: it is to keep Palestinians out, having as little to do with them as possible, and letting in as few as possible to work. Instead, workers from other countries are imported to do the jobs that Israelis will not do.

If Israel were to annex the West Bank and control voteless Palestinians as a source of cheap labour — or for religious messianic reasons or strategic reasons — that could indeed be analogous to apartheid. But it is not the intention except in the eyes of a minority — settlers and extremists who speak of “transfer” to clear Palestinians out of the West Bank, or who desire a disenfranchised Palestinian population. The majority of Israelis — 60 to 70 per cent, opinion polls consistently show — want to get out of the West Bank, with divergences of opinion only on where the final borders with a Palestinian state should be drawn.

The separation barrier/wall/fence currently being built is part of this scheme. Its immediate purpose is to prevent Palestinian suicide-bombers from entering Israel. That aim enjoys popular Israeli support. Had it been confined to that and had the barrier run along the Green Line it would have been an ugly blot on the landscape as well as a statement of the failure to achieve peace. However, the barrier has gone further: the Israeli government is using it as a land grab, intruding into the territory that everyone knows should be the future Palestinian state. About eight per cent of that Palestinian land is inside the barrier, on the Israeli side. One of the effects is gross disruption of the lives of thousands of Palestinians who face extreme difficulty in gaining access to jobs, hospitals, schools and their fields.

The barrier/wall/fence, as it now is, is a repugnant aspect of Israeli policy, and all the more so because it is also meant to protect scores of Jewish settlements on the West Bank. But it is not apartheid. Calling it the “Apartheid Wall” is a debasement of the word for the sake of slick propaganda.

“Apartheid” is used in this case and elsewhere because it comes easily to hand: it is a lazy label for the complexities of the Middle East conflict. It is also used because, if it can be made to stick, then Israel can be made to appear to be as vile as was apartheid South Africa and seeking its destruction can be presented to the world as an equally moral cause.

Israel has withdrawn from the Gaza Strip (although consequent problems such as border control still have to be resolved). Now the pressure is to end West Bank occupation. It must happen because it is the only way to secure peace with Palestinian and Israeli states living side by side. There’s a hard

haul ahead, to negotiate evacuation and possible land swaps to compensate for land, such as in the towns which have been built with populations of up to 35 000 and which Israel wants to retain. It would, however, be unrealistic to believe that withdrawal from the West Bank will be enough in itself. Peace can only ultimately come when the rejectionists — the Palestinian organisations like Hamas and Islamic Jihad, and Arab states like Iran — accept the fact of Israel's existence.

Is a binational state the answer? On the face of it, of course. Unfortunately, and for the foreseeable future, it belongs to a never-never land. It looks more attractive the further one is from the Middle East. On the ground it enjoys support only from the extremes on both sides. It's a non-starter for the vast majority of Israelis because it would mean the end of the Jewish state. Those who propagate from afar lack a sense of Jewish history and the survival ethos created by centuries of persecution. Nor do most Palestinians want it. Why should they drown themselves in a joint state which will be dominated by Jews in every walk of life, whether the economy, government or the professions? Rather their own Palestinian pond in which they will be the masters.

Instead of one-sided attacks on Israel, which are not only counter-productive but raise worrying questions about motives, there should be an unequivocal commitment to peace. Genuine peace efforts should have twin aims: first, to persuade Israel to end the occupation and help a viable Palestinian state to come into being; and second, to persuade the rejectionists to change so that Israelis need no longer fear annihilation if they let down their guard.

This article appears in Focus 40 (December 2005). Focus is published by The Helen Suzman Foundation. This article may be reproduced free of charge as long as both Focus and The Helen Suzman Foundation are accredited, and a copy of the reprinted article is sent to P O Box 1524, Parklands, 2121/ Fax 011 880 1850.

It is reproduced here permission of the author.

This article first appeared on the Web as [Israel is a democracy in which Arabs vote - Not an apartheid State at Zionism and Israel Information Center](#)

From The New York Sun

<http://www.ajc.org/site/apps/nl/content2.asp?c=ijIT12PHKoG&b=1531915&ct=2551369>

Opinions

The Dangerous 'A' Words

The New York Sun - Kenneth Stern

June 8, 2006

The first book I thoroughly devoured as a youngster was Nathaniel Hawthorne's "The Scarlet Letter," the colonial-era story of how prejudice can be normative, how Hester Prynne was forced to wear the dehumanizing symbol of the scarlet "A" (for adulteress), and how she, without significant allies but with grace, courage, and loyalty, faced down hatred.

I was 15 in 1968, during the civil rights and anti-war movements. I was certain that if Hester Prynne had lived in the 1960s instead of the 1600s, she would not have been alone, that her neighbors — even if they did not approve of her behavior in every respect would have disapproved of the bigoted and duplicitous treatment she received, and that they would have understood how it not only harmed Prynne but also damaged their society.

I am not so certain anymore. A new "A" is being affixed to the citizens of Israel. In recent weeks, the British-based National Association of Teachers in Further and Higher Education voted 106-to-71 to boycott Israeli academics who do not "publicly dissociate themselves [from Israel's] apartheid policies." The 896 delegates to the convention of the Ontario branch of the Canadian Union of Public Employees voted unanimously to support an "international campaign of boycott, divestment and sanctions" due to the "apartheid-like practices of the Israeli state."

Apartheid is the modern scarlet "A." It refers to the racist colonial ideology of European whites who came to South Africa and oppressed the indigenous blacks. It was a system that was universally condemned as racist and antidemocratic. But in a distortion of history, some are trying to shoehorn the Palestinian-Israeli conflict into the South African analogy.

For example, whites had no history in South Africa. But Jews and Palestinians are both indigenous to the Middle East. Jewish teachings and holidays refer to the land and history of Israel. Jews have lived there for thousands of years. The majority of Jews in Israel today are not refugees from Europe but those who were forced from Arab lands and their descendants.

The apartheid analogy is intended to oversimplify a complicated, long-standing territorial and political conflict into a good-and-evil question in which Israel is inherently, irredeemably, and eternally evil, no matter what it does — just as Hester Prynne's actions were denounced without context. And just as Hester Prynne had to be made less than human in order to cast her out from her community, the apartheid analogy is being used to lay the groundwork for the removal of Israel from the community of nations, and therefore inevitably for the killing of its citizens, who would certainly fight for their country.

There should be a rigorous discussion inside the Canadian Union of Public Employees and the University and College Union — the new British union formed June 1 from the merger of National Association of Teachers in Further and Higher Education leadership with the Association of University Teachers — about the motives behind these resolutions that affix the new scarlet "A" to Israelis.

Members of both groups should ask themselves several questions: Where is their recognition that Hamas is sworn to the destruction of Israel and its replacement by an Islamic Taliban-like state? Why no mention that Hamas cites in its own charter the Russian anti-Semitic forgery, the "Protocols of the Elders of Zion"? Do the Iranian president's ongoing Holocaust denial and vows that Israel be "wiped off the map" not matter?

One question matters more than most: Are University and College Union and Canadian Union of Public Employees members capable of imagining themselves in the place of Israelis too? What would they want the United Kingdom or Canadian governments to do if their children were being blown up by suicide bombers? Would they want barriers put up to protect them? What would they want if neighboring countries did not accept the right of the United Kingdom or Canada to exist, denied their history, and swore to wipe them off the face of the globe? What would they think if despite all the gross human rights violations in the world, including the ongoing genocide in Darfur, Canadians and Britons were being constantly painted as the worst human rights offenders anywhere?

There are groups within the labor movement in Canada and the academic community in the United Kingdom that are working to help their colleagues understand the insidious dangers of the effort to demonize Israel and dehumanize Israelis. If British academics and Canadian Union of Public Employees members can imagine how they would feel as Israelis, not just as Palestinians, I have no doubt that the apartheid analogy can be beaten back. However, if they prove incapable of considering how this debate looks from an Israeli perspective, I fear that there might be another "A" word to explain this failure to imagine — anti-Semitism.

Mr. Stern is the American Jewish Committee's expert on anti-Semitism, and the author of the forthcoming book "Antisemitism Today."