THE ONE-STATE SOLUTION ISRAEL-PALESTINE AND SOUTH AFRICA - A CASE FOR AN ANALYSIS OF APARTHEID

Hafiz Hammad Uddin, Research Scholar, Dept. IR, Federal Urdu University, Karachi.
Hafizhammaduddin@gmail.com , https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6698-0900
Mamnoon Ahmad Khan, Assistant Professor, Federal Urdu University, Karachi.
mamnoon.ahmed@fuuast.edu.pk , https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0348-3346

ABSTRACT: *"Apartheid" is the term to describe the sightings and practical approaches of the State of Israel is a key issue in modern international political problems. South Africa has demonstrated the state of relations with many states, and we observe that the use of apartheid in general should be a valuable commitment to Palestine and Israel within a structure close to the political hypothesis. Moreover, reference to the apartheid experience, given the progress made by South Africa since 1994, has increased the chances of progress and has become a central element in discussions on the "single state option" to the Middle East conflict. Since we have been endowed with a credible philosophy, by viewing the Middle East strategy as a political hypothesis, we suggest that it is a method of introducing two similarities and two differences between Israel (post-1948 and post-1967) and the apartheid state in South Africa.*
KEYWORDS: *One state solution, Israel Palestine, South Africa, Solution of Palestine.*

Introduction:

"Apartheid" is utilized to refer to the findings and practical methods of the Israeli state is a focal point for modern-day legislative issues well beyond the geographical scope of Palestine and Israel. In the current tense political climate, research on apartheid in Palestine and Israel has often been diverted from a standardized logical framework. In an article in the Diary of Israel Studies, it is described as a fragment of the "authentic Palestinian public sphere". (Inbar, 2006, p. 827). It cannot be denied that the investigations between South Africa and Israel were conducted by Palestinians, as well as by many others of a different nature, including Jewish and other experts whose personalities lie between these groups or potentially outside them. Even more fundamentally, an apology in the form of "targeted public relations" excludes the way in which an established grant agreement places Israel in relation to other pioneering social orders, including South Africa (Will 2007: 412; Pollak 2009). Furthermore, South Africa has correlated with many state-run developments and regulations, counting those of Brazil and the United States (Marx, 1998). Moreover, the study of State practices and strategies as they emerged during the apartheid period is gradually becoming part of the standard formulation, which is included in relative policy analysis. The term has been in use for a long time - generally without much controversy or accusation - and refers to a number of countries and legal frameworks other than Israel that will be debated further in detail. As has been noted in other sources, the opportunity for racial understanding created by Charles Mills has considerable potential as a means of understanding broad trends in power relations within and between States. For Mills, a dynamic world was created by a dynamic racial understanding, including an understanding of the lack of freedom and expansionism that brought white Europe to the top. In general, racial understanding does not exist between those who enter, but between those who "control" and those who do not. We recommended that the idea of "racial understanding" (Pateman and Mills 2007) was relevant to the Palestinian and Israeli situation. In particular, we found it appropriate to understand the order in which Jewish "nationality" in Palestine and Israel corresponded to pagans; how Ashkenazi Jews from European and Western nations were recognized as the dominant political, social and financial

authority in Israeli state; and how the overall ethnic understanding between the province of Israel and the pioneer partners was aimed at depriving Palestinians of their rights through outrageous restrictions and being stateless (Bakan and Abu-Laban 2008). The universal territory is confused by a true "not quite white" (Brodkin 1999: 23) standing of Jewish people in North America and Europe, which closed the circle of the Holocaust, in which the people developed generally as a racially "different" entity, matter to the fundamental enemy of Semitism (hostile to Jewish fanaticism). Despite this, the rise of Zionism after World War II as a segment of Western ideological power, the colonization of a viable Palestine, and the preference of scholars for the status of European Jews in Israel as an essential part of the state's pioneering role have changed race and class relations in the Middle East and in general today. The resulting colonization, racism and speculation against "other" Arabs, such as the Palestinian population, require an assessment of the processes of racism. The use of the term "apartheid", which means "division" of "races" under the auspices of the State, is predictable given the structure of racial understanding and reveals the restrictive and ruthless nature of the attribution of Israeli Jews, which is comparable to the indigenous Palestinian population. Even if we do not limit the methodology and the real disparities of race, class and gender in South Africa today, despite the progress made in 1994, the reference to the apartheid experience remains remarkable in that it offers an opportunity to move forward. Many proponents of the call for significant and fundamental change to resolve the ongoing conflicts in Palestine and Israel, mainly through an inter-state agreement, are making claims about a framework similar to apartheid or in terms of testing it (Farsakh, 2002, 2005; Abunimah, 2005; Cook, 2006). Beginning with our work, which introduces Israel into the sphere of relative investigations within the system of basic racial assumptions, we attempt in this article to advance the Palestinian-Israeli dialogue by analyzing the implications of the apartheid investigation for social equality in the surrounding region, including consideration of the single state system. We propose that, for a relative political theory, the idea of apartheid serves as a valid classification of the state of Israel, which is appropriate both after 1967 and since the founding of the state in 1948. The perspective of a single state can be useful in the study of apartheid because it not only recommends a system of understanding the racial and ethnic nature of the state of Israel, but also presents a conceptualization that may highlight another option - the reality of post-apartheid. Therefore, the apartheid system offers a transformational and regulatory situation, an option as opposed to ethnic particularism and a test for Israeli uniqueness. In any case, our investigation does not depend on a clear relationship between Palestine/Israel and South Africa regarding apartheid. As we have been given a methodology that is consistent with the technique of rapprochement in political theory, we consider it a method of presenting two similarities and two contrasts. Relative studies that classify Israel as a "permanent state" or expect perfect similarities with Western liberal electoral systems are unclear attributes to which the structure of apartheid draws attention (Ben-Rafael, 2004; Migdal, 2001). These two symmetries and antagonisms between South Africa and Israel can easily be mitigated by a further differentiated perception of the actual factors under study, not just examples of racism. We recommend that, given the actions of countries with fundamental imbalances, comparable to racial and ethnic characteristics that affect citizenship and rights, the demand for apartheid has a fundamental and precise authenticity for Palestine and Israel. It was also an important norm-setting apparatus that supported a comprehensive and convincing synthesis strategy. By contextualizing "semi-

apartheid contemplation", the unique characteristics of South Africa and Israel can be strongly analyzed. From this perspective, apartheid, which includes Palestine and Israel, has contributed to the opening of vast new territories and has put to the test the calm that has hindered the relative political consideration of what is considered sui generis within Israel. Furthermore, there is no doubt that such a position offers both progress and quality within the framework of a liberal law that depends on the model of a single state but has limits. In order to highlight the elements of our thesis, in this section we try to achieve certain objectives: the reflection on the relationship between the concept of the unitary state and the state of apartheid. In the main part, we propose to mention the anomalous and unpleasant situation created by the use of the apartheid review because of Palestine and Israel. In the next part we will analyze how apartheid is provided for in the act of granting benefits and in world law, and how it constitutes creators who maintain the situation of a state. In the third part, we will present a selected outline that shows the different ways in which the framework of apartheid was considered useful for understanding the state of Israel. In the fourth part we will explain how the land of Palestine and Israel resembles the land of apartheid in South Africa. Finally, we analyze the evaluation of the study on apartheid in Palestine and Israel in terms of its crucial importance, which uniquely takes into account the organization of social solidarity with the Palestinian interests of boycott, divestment and sanctions.

Confronting Apartheid: A Comparison of Single State, Scholarship and International Law Activists

Many researchers and political experts who adopt the position of a single state in response to the Middle East emergency recognize the abandonment of apartheid as applied to Israeli territory. This idea, although not very present in the era of 1940s and the 1970s, was generally avoided in the 1990s by the pursuit of a two-state model of solution; recently, however, debates of the one-state model of solution have made a dramatic comeback after US President Donald Trump's Peace Plan for the Middle East. Edward Said's major speech in the New York Times in 1999, entitled "The One-State Solution," is a testament to the newly established good judgment. He said that the time had come to ask if the whole procedure launched in 1993 in Oslo was the precise mechanism for creating harmony among Israelis and Palestinians. The elections were fundamentally disgusting: either the war continued or, despite many obstacles, an exit plan was actually sought that aimed at harmony and justice (as in post-apartheid South Africa) (Said, 1999). There is now a large body of literature, co-ordinated by the expansion of scientific assemblies, explicitly devoted to the assessment of a state's procedure in relation to its proposals for action in the Middle East conflict. In a useful summary of the discussion, Ghada Karmi recommends that the two-state system, despite its advantages and disadvantages, should not have the possibility of progressive recognition. The most striking option, which contradicted this and the range of unilateral proposals by Israel, was a single-state agreement (Karmi 2007: 229). The idea of "apartheid" would generally complicate one- and two-state talks. This is also true of the reverberation revealed in Palestine and Israel, which is largely due to a visible widening of the gap that is linked to, and not moderated by, the transition strategies and procedures of the two States. Jonathan Cook draws attention to the administrative difficulties associated with the two-state model and points out that, to the extent that it is perceived in Israeli society, he expects that the fears of Palestinians or "Middle Eastern Israelis" will be inexorably sabotaged in a particular conservative Jewish state (Cook, 2006). In particular, the slow progress of the "line of separation", which many

residents describe as the "apartheid partition", shows that sporadic Israeli governments are considering expanding their withdrawal. They also expressed their disagreement with the election of the International Court of Justice, which ruled that the development of a blockade on Palestinian territory somewhere was illegal (de Bakan and Abu Laban). As stated in the section "the guards": "Investigations between the white directives in South Africa and Israel's disadvantages in controlling the Arab ethnic group it controls are being carried out one after the other. Opponents of the enormous steel and obstacles to improvement in the West Bank and Jerusalem have called it "problematic apartheid" because it allows for divided systems and protects the country. (McGreat, 2006). For example, in Israel, an apartheid scuffle erupted in South Africa. This is also true of former Prime Minister Ehud Olmert's statements about the scale of the threat to Israel if the two-state model is ignored (Benn et al., 2007). In July 2008, Haaretz, the chairman of the Israeli association, called in his announcements before the UN for Israel to be cautiously described as an apartheid state. At the time he did not want to remove his announcements while he was on trial in a nearby chapel, which prompted him to visit Britain and was supported by the World Zionist Federation (HaLevi, 2008). In addition, in February 2010, Ehud Barak, former Israeli defense minister, received a "shocking and disparate reminder from his relatives that their inability to live in harmony with the Palestinians would lead them either to leave the state without significant Jewish involvement or to leave an "apartheid" agreement. (McCarthy, 2010). Moreover, and given these real elements in general, the current improvement in the social situation of the FSB (boycott, divestment and sanctions) against Israel favours the possibility of 'apartheid' against Israel to a moderate degree (Bakan and Abu-Laban, 2009; BNC, 2008). This improvement is a response to more than 170 assemblies of the United Palestinian Society and deserves general support, including among Jews outside and inside Israel. For example, Canadian editor and essayist Naomi Klein and Israeli trainer Neva Gordon wrote in support of the BDS (Klein, 2009; Gordon, 2009a). In Israel, the call for the BDS was supported by rallies such as the boycott from within, which brings together Jews and Palestinians living in Israel. Following the attack by Israeli military forces on an escort pioneer who had pledged to resist the attack on Gaza on May 31, 2010, known as the Gaza Freedom Flotilla, new voices joined together to break the apartheid system in Israel and South Africa and supported an intensifying struggle for BDS. Among them was Stéphane Hessel, a former French minister and Holocaust survivor, a member of the Nazi resistance in France and one of the main founders of the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights (Hessel, 2010).

Moreover, apartheid is one of a number of established violations against humanity by the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court. These violations include manifestations of killing, massacre, repression, extradition or exchange of persuasive populations, captivity or extreme hardship, or other actions of insensitivity, "which are presented as part of a large-scale or effective attack coordinated with information about an attack against any population of non-military personnel". (Rome Statute, 1998). In addition, Article 7, Section 2(h) states: "The offence of apartheid shall be understood to include acts of insensitivity ... which are presented in connection with a regulated system of deliberate abuse and domination by one racial assembly against another racial assembly or assemblies and pending the maintenance of that system". (Rome Statute, 1998). The relevance of the investigation of apartheid in the Palestinian and Israeli contexts has had a significant impact and has involved researchers for a long time and in a range of methods. While some recommend a straight equation with the

context of South Africa, apartheid is treated more generally as a conventional strategy in relation to the pioneer pilgrim countries. Apartheid can thus be seen as a system of bringing together racial and ethnic elites that can be critically tested, discussed and suppressed. Assumed in this increasingly conventional sense, it is, we find, not only logically valuable in the case of Palestine and Israel, but it also combines diversity and obvious oppositions with its basic characteristics. It thus disrupts the apparent otherness of the structure of Zionist ideology, which can be assumed as a specific reference to apartheid.

A Comparison of Apartheid: The Literature of One State, Israel and South Africa

An in-depth analysis of the vast interdisciplinary and global literature that points to a single state government creating links between the South African and Israeli apartheid frameworks is beyond the latitude of this argument. In any case, a momentary reflection on chosen literature shows the assessment of the apartheid inquiry from the perspective of the goal of change. Unexpectedly, in any case, considering that post-apartheid South African culture is still characterized by gender, class and racial imbalance, the destruction of legitimate disparity (such as apartheid) remains an extraordinary change. Many advocate a vision of a single state for social change in Palestine and Israel and reinforce the idea that apartheid is an instrument of denunciation and replacement. Virginia Tilley in her book The One-State Solution: A Breakthrough for Peace in the Israeli-Palestinian Dead End (2005), continued to focus on the real elements of the conflict in South Africa until 1994, exerting almost identical pressure on Israel after 1967. The key issue is a significant compromise between the regions involved in the creation of an Israeli state, which presents the Oslo model as a reference Palestinian state. The fact is that Israel is now so deeply rooted in the regions concerned that progress towards a closed and omnipresent state is the next most important step towards the peaceful goal of confrontation. His research is more observational than analytical and focuses on real factors in the logical study of Palestine and Israel. It has been argued that Palestine and Israel today are, so to speak, one of the states hardest hit by apartheid, and that a single state is an important method of reproduction. Moreover, Leila Farsah (2002; 2005) seems to favour the single-state model. Her statement will generally focus on apartheid in South Africa. Furthermore, she argues that these positive associations are not suppressed, but identified with the principles of recruitment. She argues that Palestine and Israel have moved closer to the South African apartheid model since the 1967 occupation and, more remarkably, since the introduction of the Oslo approach to monetary and labour issues in the 1990s. In this respect, relations with apartheid and South Africa follow this path of symmetry, as does South Africa itself, and the well-known end goes in the opposite direction. In particular, Farsah argues that trade is moving towards a peaceful Palestinian state, reflecting the "bantastization" of South Africa. The dislocated Palestinian ethnic group, divided by accumulated checkpoints, labour restrictions and improved apartheid divisions, has ensured the failure of a feasible state of Palestine, necessary to achieve the kind of results that South African apartheid has achieved.

In any case, from the point of view of a related political theory, the critical point in this environment is not only the contrast with the similarities, but also the fact that Palestine and Israel find similar environments when considered comparable to apartheid Republic of South Africa. The reality of the survey undermines the allegedly unique nature of Israel and calls for a focus on racially divided ethnicities. More importantly, these ongoing cases concerning the application of the Apartheid Inquiry to Palestine and Israel are in any case applicable to contemporary world events, in fact, they are drawn from earlier documents. For example,

Baja Abu Laban and Ibrahim Abu Lugod (1974) made important statements in their writings on apartheid (Will, 2007: 412). In particular, they observed a "decline in confidence in racial domination and a colonialist past" in Israel and South Africa during the apartheid period (Abu-Laban and Abu-Lughod (1974, p. viii). Research on South African apartheid was not generally rejected by Zionist supporters. More importantly, there is an important link with fundamental suspicions about the extent of condemnation of the Israeli state. Theodor Herzl, an Austro-Hungarian tape recorder and coordinator of modern Zionism in the late 19th century, distinguished himself in his task from the British colonialist Cecil Rhodes, the initiator of the advanced colonization of South Africa and Rhodesia (the provincial precursor of Zimbabwe). The authority of the South African Defence Force during the World War I, Jan Smuts, was one of the early supporters of the 1917 Balfour Declaration, which gave little support to Zionist colonization of Palestine by the British side (Weinstock, 1989). Towards the end of this political spectrum, the investigation in Israel and South Africa was raised by Marxist Zionists to show the latest version of a tour of the Israeli state (Rodinson, 1973). In an astonishing story, Marxist Tony Cliff describes how he and his partner Charlie Rosenberg, a South African who came to Palestine originally as a Zionist communist but who quickly became an opponent of the Zionist position, led to the use of apartheid for an extremely long period of time (Cliff 2000:9). This brief table shows that the study of apartheid, including the references that separate Palestine and Israel, and of apartheid in South Africa, plays a central role that is both exceptional and contemporary and highlights the case of sectarianism that has been identified in Israel, and the potential for radical change, particularly in the actions of individual states. At the same time, the distinction between different types of apartheid is blurring. In the next section, we will examine the possibilities of these similarities and differences between Israel and South Africa with regard to apartheid from the perspective of the post-apartheid model.

Israel's Apartheid System in the Post-Partisan Era: Transformation & Challenge

The complexity of legal obligations in post-apartheid South Africa certainly needs to be taken into account when addressing key issues such as institutional structures and methods and the reorientation of public affairs towards racially motivated issues (see Shepherd, 2009). Nevertheless, the transition from apartheid to a traditional framework is in itself an unprecedented opportunity for the majority of the population and has led to a decline in relative considerations. We recognize that the transition from apartheid to post-apartheid South Africa has changed the mindset of different peoples. Regardless of the progress made in realizing the true components of South Africa's profound uniqueness, often referred to as "monetary apartheid", the size of the vast global South has inspired those who identify with the specific oppression to which the black people of South Africa are subjected. It is also a sign that post-apartheid society is not an ideal world, but that it is in fact an important step in the development of a set of constitutional rights for victims of slum settlements. Nelson Mandela, imprisoned forever and branded as a "psychological oppressor", remains today an ethical symbol of power, whether or not he represents a further period of high demands that have not been met with results. Although there are obvious obstacles to the direct pursuit of the search for the "other" Mandela (Adam and Moodley, 2005), the potential for change is a major driving force behind the reflection on the single state system in the Middle East. The sense that silent progress on South Africa after apartheid has been made has, to some extent, been conveyed by UN delegates who have not lost sight of Palestine and Israel. For example,

Father Miguel D'Escoto Brockman, President of the UN General Assembly, encouraged the UN to utilize the word "apartheid" to define the agreements reached by Israel in the occupied territories of Palestine, highlighting in particular the echoes of the UN's endorsement of the South African crusade (Brockman, 2008). In his report as UN Special Rapporteur, entitled "The situation of human rights in the Palestinian territories occupied since 1967", Richard Falk "draws specific attention to the manner in which martial control of the Palestinian territories has been exercised for more than 40 years, as well as to the characteristics of expansionism and apartheid". (Falk, 2008). As Virginia Tilley suggests, the Israeli model of "ethnic majority rule" is extremely old-fashioned in the face of the post-apartheid example developing around the world. This undeniably means "a terrible humiliation because the model has long since been outdated elsewhere. The movement was created to conquer South Africa and immediately discredit apartheid". (Tilley, 2005, p. 181). Tilley also believes that the "White Australia" project, "Greater Serbia" Milosovica, and the formal and informal racial avoidance strategies associated with the southern states of the United States prior to the 1960s are also outdated models. According to Tilley, Israel suffers from particularly poor planning; global trends since the Second World War show, albeit at a moderate pace, a deviation from the ethnic norms of the elite in most countries (Tilley, 2005: 182).

Apartheid also appears unjustly in certain areas of networked life. For example, Israel was not involved in the formulation in the law of freedom of expression. In any case, according to the Crisis Directive, the 1933 Press Regulations, which were promulgated by the British legal structure, officials can severely block media that have been used against Arab media on many occasions (Cook, 2004a). Because Jews and Arabs teach in two unique oral languages, have unusual social orders, and are topographically very isolated, there are two enlightened skeletons in Israel until they go to school. There are also two systems of illumination. According to 2004 data. 33% of all students in Israel come from the Middle East, but their schools receive only 7% of the school administration's consumption. According to a 2001 Human Rights Watch report, there is deliberate isolation in Israel in education against Palestinian youth (Human Rights Watch, 2001). It is said that this authoritarian and isolated structure ends up lagging behind in Hebrew and Arabic at both the school and university levels. In any case, Palestinian underdevelopment in the post-democratic era accounts for about 25 per cent of Israelis, but only 8 per cent of the underdeveloped population is in higher education. In school tests, Hebrew is preferred to Arabic, with a point system that gives greater motivation to learn Hebrew. Psychometric tests are used in addition to confirming studies, which have been shown to contain social references that increase the likelihood of higher marks among Jewish population. There are also confirmation meetings directed in Hebrew. These natural tendencies to understudy in Arabic were identified and modified in 2003; however, they were modified again afterwards because "allegedly to the detriment of Jewish children", which is the basis of most minds in post-operative education (Cook, 2004a). Gradually, the significant difference between Palestine and Israel and the South African scenes is in any case recommended by Zionist society, which has tried to omit the native population of Palestine completely from the only "Jewish State". Zionism, the political method of fighting the Western enemy of Semitism - important here against Jewish fanaticism - by founding an ethnically selected national industrial state, saw a bad situation for ordinary Arab workers. As Leila Farsakh points out, Palestinians were a minority of the working population after 1948, not blacks of South Africa, who provided the bulk of the working

population somewhere in the region from 1913-1948 (Farsakh 2005: 232-33). For example, working Zionists banned labour from Palestinian ethnicity (part of the legendary Zionist idea of "land for the landless people") and built a collectivist kibbutzis convention on the land (Piterberg, 2008; Shafir and Peled, 2002). As a result of the particular idea of apartheid from Israel, people of Palestine became a segmented minority in Israel after 1948; the lion's share was black South Africans (Farsakh 2005: 233). The primary role of black grassroots workers in the South African apartheid test, including trade guild work and strike activity (Callinicos 1992), is not coordinated in the Palestinian and Israeli environments. These innovative attractions are related to the way Zionism is proving to be a dynamic belief system in the West (even if it is being used to develop a pioneering colonialist practice of exclusivity). Despite representative "cooperation" through the work of "Zionism", the location of the Zionist belief system in the West after World War II is a guaranteed "anti-racism" structure. This is probably not the same as the generally perceived superiority introduced by the supporters of South African apartheid. Zionism of Israel is clearly supported by the system in the Western nations, predominantly in the US (both in mainstream society and in state associations), which confirms a consistent pattern of victimization and generally ensures that any research on the Israeli state and its outcomes is appropriate for those hostile to Semitism (Finkelstein, 2003; Mearsheimer and Walt, 2007). Compared to the South African model, the central importance of lessons, embarrassment and a unified conversation environment in assessing the idea of apartheid in Palestine and Israel has been appropriately augmented.

Main implications of the Apartheid Inquiry

This first statement underlines both the experimental and regulatory importance of the apartheid investigation in relation to Israel's agreements with the Palestinians. Reflections on the mistreatment of Palestinians - in the affected regions, along the Green Line and in the global diaspora - show the regular characteristics of a population that has been dispersed over many long periods of occupation. Israel's fixation on a certain apartheid State is also a test that not only refers to Israel's all-encompassing approach and practices, but also goes beyond the changed idea of "Israel", which was introduced into the dominant history of Zionism as part of the post-war Western faith. In the post-apartheid period, it is surprising that many Western governments have responded to the demands of a system that really did not think much and was dominated by a progressive structure. In the United States, the remarkable appointment of the most important African president, Barack Obama, was hailed by public opinion as a sign of progress within the UN community, however deep the guarantee of change. Former Prime Minister Kevin Rudd of Australia, in his memorable expression of repentance to Aborigines, acknowledged the "insult and corruption" of a 60-year agreement that ended only in 1970, when young people were "uprooted" from their families and placed in districts or modern schools where they were subjected to harsh and harmful practices (CNN, 2008). Stephen Harper, the former Conservative Prime Minister, who is not notorious for his aggressive or antibiotic strategies, was forced to issue a formal apology to Aboriginal Canadians for the apartheid-style treatment that was normalized in the resident school system (CBC News, 2008). In 2008, the government of Canada established an Indian Residential Schools Truth and Reconciliation Commission to examine the inheritance and consequences of this approach. In any case, this post-apartheid model, which ignores its obstacles, is clearly absent in Israel today. Indeed, current Israeli legislation gives every indication that the second path has been taken, namely the path towards an ever-increasing knowledge of the apartheid

framework in Israel. During a war with Gaza in January 2009, former Israeli Deputy Prime Minister Avigdor Lieberman stated that Israel must continue its struggle against Hamas, as the United States did with the Japanese during World War II. He referred to two atomic bombs dropped on Nagasaki and Hiroshima (Gordon, 2009b). As Phyllis Bennis (2009) notes, the decision on the current agreement in Israel is, on the one hand, a bizarre departure. By June 2010, the Israeli Knesset again attempted to issue a statement condemning Israelis (as well as non-Israelis) who advocate a boycott, which could gradually make insurance against such plans difficult. Palestinians, or "Israeli Arabs", are also considered a "segmental threat", a threat to control the Jewish part of the lion due to the normal and large size of the family. In 2003, the Israeli newspaper Haaretz quoted Benjamin Netanyahu, who was then an accountant and currently the executive director: "If there is a problem of division, and it exists, with Israeli Arabs who will remain Israeli residents". The report also notes Netanyahu's statement that "the Declaration of Independence declared that Israel should be a Jewish and law-governed state, but in general it is essential to ensure that the Jewish character is not overwhelmed by the social economy". (Alon and Benn, 2003). Since then there has been a polarization between the general conditions of the Israeli state and the Zionist framework of faith in the West, which receives an uncritical border from this state, and the course of many states and UN specialists in the field of apartheid. Donald Will suggests that Israeli and Palestinian activists (including activists for dynamic friendship) have "unusual difficulties in working in an incredible conspiracy," as South Africa says (Will, 2007: 421). Admittedly, despite specific concessions to the enemy of racist change, the universal significance of Israel remains unimportant and, where it exists, very logical. Israel's repeated violation of world law has been neither retaliated against nor impeded. Various researchers have found a significant difference in the level of assistance in the global network testing South Africa's apartheid framework (census with UN approval and participation) compared to Israel (Will, 2007: 420; Farsakh, 2005: 237). This divergence is one approach to clarifying the loaded discussion framework proposed in the prologue to this article. Ian Urbina notes that the atmosphere of the discussion is different with regard to Palestine and Israel in particular (Urbina, 2002, p. 64). In order to advance the main enemy of apartheid development over Palestine and Israel, a dynamic anti-racist deconstruction of the Zionist position in power is needed as an important precondition for prolonging unity with Palestinian development for equal rights and self-determination. This solidarity is apparently transferred in the case of BDS development (Bakan and Abu-Laban, 2009). In the era of post-apartheid, the vision of an electoral state based on isolated elections and standards of popularity and equal rights may offer some expectations and good faith under conditions that seem to be forever buried in abrutal impasse. Omar Barghouti, a recognized researcher in the field of BDS development and promoter of the One State Agreement, has highlighted the decisive motivation for BDS, not only as an option, but also as opposed to the reaction of the NGO community. As he put it, "Can we just come at the end of apartheid and occupation? Experience also teaches us that the most credible and ethically sound approach is to treat Israel as South Africa treated apartheid, taking a different approach, contrasting it with the sensitive and progressive proportions of BDS. (Barghouti, 2008). As noted by George Bisharat, over 170 Palestinian BDS packages in 2005 of the Joint Society "proclaimed rights that cannot be effectively implemented in a two-state structure". (Bisharat, 2008, p. 29; BDS Global Movement). The problems surrounding many people who benefited from apartheid relations are also

challenging to resolve in the two-state system (Bisharat, 2008, p. 34). As Bisharat points out, the argument for a single-state agreement is unification. Expressed unexpectedly, it could gradually be seen as a "perfect" vision, taking into account the provisions expressed by the state characters on screen in the neighborhood. In conclusion, there is enough obvious help and discussion about a state's responses that some may be tempted to ask the question: "Is the agreement between two states dead? (Sussman, 2004).

Conclusion

Criticism of the confrontation with apartheid is based not only on sound political theory, similar to procedure, but also on the potential it offers for developing global solidarity and promoting balance, harmony and justice in the Middle East. In the context of a transformative vision of the lonely situation of every inhabitant of the Middle East, based on popularity, Palestine and Israel offer a regulatory position that is both fundamental and hopeful, and can move from a minimal position to one that is tempting to a broad class of supporters of a common society around the world. Therefore, the analysis of apartheid is to evaluate a similar strategy, comparable to that of real states, and to broaden our whole politically creative mind to consider adaptation in Palestine and Israel.

REFERENCES:

Abu-Laban, Y. and Bakan, A.B. (2008), 'The Racial Contract: Israel/Palestine and Canada', Social Identities, 14(5), pp. 637–660.

Abu-Laban, Y. and Bakan, A.B. (forthcoming, 2010), 'The "Israelization" of Social Sorting and the "Palestinianization" of the Racial Contract: Reframing Israel/Palestine and the War on Terror', in: E. Zureik, D. Lyon and Y. Abu-Laban (eds), Surveillance and Control in Israel/Palestine: Population, Territory, and Power (London: Routledge).

Abu-Lughod, I. and Abu-Laban, B. (eds) (1974), Settler Regimes in Africa and the Arab World: The Illusion of Endurance (Wilmette, IL: Medina University Press International).

Abunimah, A. (2005), One Country: A Bold Proposal to End the Israeli-Palestinian Impasse (New York: Metropolitan Books).

Adam, H. and Moodley, K. (2005), Seeking Mandela: Peacemaking Between Israelis and Palestinians (Philadelphia: Temple University Press).

Arrighi, G., John, S. and Saul, J.S. (1973), Essays on the Political Economy of Africa (New York: Monthly Review Press).

African Legal Clinic, et al. (2009), 'Joint Statement of the Canadian Civil Society', http://clcdurbandispatches. blogspot.com/2009/04/canadian-labour-congress-durban.html.

Amazon.com (2007), 'An Interview with President Jimmy Carter', http://www.amazon.com/Palestine-PeaceApartheid-Jimmy-Carter/dp/0743285034.

Bakan, A. and Abu-Laban, Y. (2009), 'Palestinian Resistance and International Solidarity: The Israeli State, the BDS Campaign and Hegemony', Race and Class, 51(1), pp. 29–54.

Barghouti, O. (2008), 'Countering the Critics: The Boycott and Palestinian Groups',

http://www.counterpunch. org/barghouti10212008.html

Ben-Rafael, E. (2004), 'Where Stands Israel: Response to Daryl J. Glaser', Ethnic and Racial Studies, 27(2), pp. 310–316

Callinicos, A. (ed.) (1992), Between Apartheid and Capitalism: Conversations with South African Socialists (London: Bookmarks).

Citizenship and Immigration Canada (2009), 'Minister Kenney Issues Statement on "Israeli Apartheid Week"', http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/DEPARTMENT/media/statements/2009/2009-03-03.asp   CBC News (2008), 'PM Cites "Sad Chapter" in Apology for Residential Schools', http://www.cbc.ca/canada/ story/2008/06/11/aboriginal-apology.html

Cliff, T. (2000), A World to Win: Life of a Revolutionary (London: Bookmarks). CNN (2008), 'Australia Apologizes to Aborigines',

http://www.cnn.com/2008/WORLD/asiapcf/02/12/australia. aborgines/index.html#cnnSTCText

 Cook, J. (2004b), 'Democratic Racism (II)', Al-Haram Weekly, 699.

Cook, J. (2006), Blood and Religion: The Unmasking of the Jewish and Democratic State (London: Pluto).

Davis, U. (2003), Apartheid Israel: Possibilities for the Struggle Within (London: Zed Books).

Dugard, J. (2008), 'Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid', http://www.un. org/law/avl/

Gordon, N. (2009a), 'Boycott Israel', The Los Angeles Times, 20 Aug, p. A, 23.

Gordon, N. (2009b), 'Avigdor Lieberman, Israel's Shame', http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2009/mar/ 25/avigdor-lieberman-binyamin-netanyahu-israel

Harper, S. (2008), 'Prime Minister Stephen Harper's Statement of Apology', http://www.cbc.ca/canada/story/ 2008/06/11/pm-statement.html

HaLevi, E. (2008), 'Haaretz Editor Refuses to Retract Israel Apartheid Statements', Arutz Sheva, http://www. israelnationalnews.com/News/News.aspx/123596.

Human Rights Watch (2001), 'Second Class: Discrimination Against Palestinian Arab Children in Israel's Schools', http://www.violencestudy.org/a199

Human Sciences Research Council of South Africa (2009), 'Occupation, Colonialism, Apartheid? A Re-assessment of Israel's Practices in the Occupied Palestinian Territories Under International Law' (South Africa: HSRC)

Rebick, J. and Sears, A. (2009), 'Memo to Jason Kenney: Criticism of Israel is not anti-Semitism', http://www. rabble.ca/news/memo-minister-kenney-criticism-israel-not-anti-semitism

Reuters (2009), 'Canada to Skip UN Racism Conference due to Expected Anti-Semitism', http://www.haaretz.   com/news/canada-to-skip-un-racism-conference-due-to-expected-anti-semitism-

1.237859

Richmond, A.H. (2004), Global Apartheid: Refugees, Racism, and the New World Order (Toronto: Oxford University Press).

Rodinson, M. (1973), Israel: A Colonial-Settler State? (New York: Pathfinder).

Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (1998), Final Act of the United Nations Diplomatic Conference of Plenipotentiaries on the Establishment of an International Court, http://untreaty.un.org/cod/icc/statute/ finalfra.htm, (Accessed April 26 2009).

White, B. (2009), Israeli Apartheid: A Beginner's Guide (London: Pluto Press).

Will, D.S. (2007), 'Nonracialism versus Ethnonationalism: Transcending Conflict in Israel/Palestine and South Africa', Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East, 27(2), pp. 412–422.

Yiftachel, O. (2005), 'Ending the Colonialism', Ha'aretz, July 19.

Ziadah, R. (2009), 'Freedom of Expression and Palestine Advocacy', http://www.socialistproject.ca/bullet/ bullet219.html#continue.

Zriek, R. (2004), 'Palestine, Apartheid and the Rights Discourse', Journal of Palestine Studies, 34(1), pp. 68–80.