

----- Original Message -----

From: Linda Belanger

Sent: March 31, 2011 5:18 PM

To: Scarpitti, Frank; Moretti, Carolina

Cc: Heath, Jack; Jones, Jim; Chiu, Alex; Wong, Tony; Landon, Gord; Burke, Valerie; Shapero, Erin; Virgilio, Joseph; Webster, John; Horchik, Dan; Kanapathi, Logan

Subject: Reject Shore's attack on freedom of speech.

Dear Mayor and Councillors,

I have recently read in the Canadian Jewish News that that Councillor Howard Shore introduced a motion calling on Council to officially condemn Israeli Apartheid Week (IAW) at York University on the grounds that these events are anti-Semitic. I have attended a number of these events and can assure you that the invited speakers are well informed, polite, balanced and non-racist.

Both Nelson Mandela and Desmond Tutu have condemned the policies of Israel as being apartheid. Based on their backgrounds, I trust their views of what apartheid means is over Mr. Shore's. Former US President Jimmy Carter has written a book called Palestine: Peace not Apartheid in which he likens Israel's policies toward the Palestinians to Apartheid. Can one reasonably accuse Mandela, Tutu and Carter of being anti-Semitic?

Shutting down Israeli Apartheid Week would be nothing more than an attack on our most basic democratic right – freedom of speech.

Although I live in Ottawa, I believe that freedom of speech is an issue that all Canadians must defend. I urge you to reject any such motion put before you.

Linda Belanger

Ottawa, Ontario.

----- Original Message -----

From: ceburke

To: Kitteringham, Kimberley

Sent: Thu Mar 31 16:32:07 2011

Subject: Motion to Censure Israeli Apartheid Week

Dear Clerk of the Markham City Council,

I am deeply troubled by the motion to censure Israeli Apartheid Week.

This is an appalling attempt to stifle the voice of the people participating in a liberal democracy. Rather than being open to debate on the issue of Israeli policy, the supporters of this motion will use the government as a tool to silence voices that speak out in disagreement.

The last I looked, Canada was a democracy in which the people should not fear censorship by its government. Let's keep it that way. Do not let the motion to censure Israeli Apartheid Week pass.

Sincerely,

Chris

----- Original Message -----

From: Tony Omran

To: Kitteringham, Kimberley

Sent: Thu Mar 31 16:56:01 2011

Subject: Israeli Apartheid Week

Dear Clerk,

This notion to censure Israeli Apartheid Week is disgusting and ridiculous. Our government, which is supposed to be a democracy, encourages the right to free speech and for its citizens to be critical of governments where the people see fit. Israel is no exception to this. Their human rights record, as Amnesty International and B'tselem, an Israeli rights group has shown, is not only appalling but immoral and inexcusable. Israel has been known to fire on civilian populations in the Palestinian Territories, and when the people who have a concern for the Palestinians create a week for awareness of this intensely important issue, they have the right to be heard.

Markham should stand up and fight for the rights of it's own people, as well as the rest of Canada, to speak as freely as they wish. Once again, Israel is no exception. The aim of IAW is to not only educate the populous about the conflict but to use BDS, Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions to stop Israel's illegal occupation of Palestine.

Thank you for reading and I hope for the sake of the city that you stand up for what's right.

In solidarity,

Tony Omran.

----- Original Message -----

From: Dennis Choptiany

Sent: March 31, 2011 4:51 PM

To: Scarpitti, Frank; Moretti, Carolina

Cc: Heath, Jack; Jones, Jim; Chiu, Alex; Wong, Tony; Landon, Gord; Burke, Valerie; Shapero, Erin;

Virgilio, Joseph; Webster, John; Horchik, Dan; Kanapathi, Logan

Subject: IAW Issue

Mayor and Councillors,

I have recently heard that Councillor Howard Shore introduced a motion calling on Council to 'officially condemn Israeli Apartheid Week (IAW) at York'.

Although I sympathize with the reasoning behind Councillor Shore's motion to condemn IAW at York, his stated justification for the motion lacks credibility and quite frankly is without merit.

First of all, his attempt to equate IAW with antisemitism is baseless.

Antisemitism means 'discrimination against, or prejudice or hostility toward Jews'. As such, any display of antisemitism is reprehensible and should be challenged and, if necessary, prosecuted.

But IAW is not even remotely antisemitic. It is a protest movement against the actions and policies of the State of Israel in its treatment and persecution of Palestinians.

Nelson Mandela and Desmond Tutu have both condemned the policies of Israel as being apartheid. Based on their backgrounds, I trust their views of what apartheid means and how dehumanizing and morally wrong it is. Even Michael Ignatieff made the following quote in 2002:

"When I looked down at the West Bank, at the settlements like Crusader forts occupying the high ground, at the Israeli security cordon along the Jordan river closing off the Palestinian lands from Jordan, I knew I was not looking down at a state or the beginnings of one, but at a Bantustan, one of those pseudo-states created in the dying years of apartheid to keep the African population under control."

Is Councillor Shore saying that Mandela, Tutu and Ignatieff are antisemitic?

Has Councillor Shore lived through apartheid and seen what it can do? Has he taken the time and effort to compare the policies of Israel and the old policies of South Africa to determine whether they are similar? Or is he merely uncomfortable with anyone referring to Israeli policies as apartheid and is lashing out, with the label of antisemitic, toward anyone who sympathizes with IAW.

Secondly, Councillor Shore stated that "We have a moral right and obligation to stand up to threats of antisemitism". But, hiding behind the notion of morality in an attempt to cover up the policies of Israel is not only ingenuous, it is hypocritical.

Moral policies do not result in war crimes or crimes against humanity. But the Goldstone report states that Israeli actions in the Cast Lead invasion and its general treatment of Palestinians in Gaza can be considered as being crimes against humanity. It also noted Israeli actions that would constitute war crimes.

Councillor Shore has a moral right to stand up against real antisemitism. But he also has a moral right to condemn crimes against humanity and war crimes - wherever they are practised.

Finally, Canadians have a legal and constitutional right to Freedom of Speech. If Councillor Shore attended any of the rallies or sessions that are part of the IAW, he would be free to challenge any and all claims that are false. I would strongly support him in doing so, as long as his claims were factual and true.

But he does not have the right to deny a person or group from exercising their right to freedom of speech. That is what he is trying to do with his motion.

I trust that Council will act accordingly and deny this motion presented by Councillor Shore. To do otherwise would be morally and ethically wrong.

Sincerely,

Dennis Choptiany

----- Original Message -----

From: Ahmad Khawaja

Sent: April 1, 2011 7:06 PM

To: Scarpitti, Frank; Heath, Jack; Jones, Jim; Landon, Gord; Li, Joe; Burke, Valerie; Hamilton, Don; Moretti, Carolina; Campbell, Colin; Ho, Alan; Kanapathi, Logan; Chiu, Alex

Subject:

Dear Mayor and Councillors,

As a constituent in Markham for all 20 years of my life, as well as a York University student it pains me to hear that Markham council is considering taking a position on condemning Israeli Apartheid Week (IAW). As an advocate for protecting against human rights abuses anywhere in the world it is evident that the state of Israel is a leader in perpetrating injustice and is continually infringing on humans rights as documented by a multitude of United Nations (UN) resolutions. Israel's involvement in attacking and killing members of the Freedom Flotilla humanitarian convoy is still fresh in the minds of millions around the globe, not to mention Israel's use of White Phosphorus (a banned chemical weapon) against civilians in Gaza during the massacre in 2007/2008. Israel is also guilty of destroying hospitals, UN schools, and is also responsible for killing UN aid workers all of which is documented in the Goldstone Report (Richard Goldstone is a former judge, and is a member of the UN human rights council). It is also a shame that the IAW is being labelled as being anti-Semitic as Justice Richard Goldstone himself is Jewish and can vouch for the atrocities committed by Israel. Furthermore there are thousands of adherents to the Jewish faith (many of which I have the honour of being colleagues with) who also condemn the illegal actions of the state of Israel. It is sickening that anti-Semitism is being used as a deterrent to avoid the issues at hand. If this motion is passed this will lead to any and all criticisms of the state of Israel being discarded as anti-Semitic rhetoric. Discussion about Israel's policies will be stifled and the road map to peace will be blocked, if there is no discussion there is no moving forward, and passing this motion is not moving in the right direction. Many are of the opinion that Israel is guilty of many crimes however they are not an apartheid state, who better than the former President of South Africa Nelson Mandella and Archbishop Desmond Tutu to respond to this claim, both condemn Israel for committing crimes of apartheid, and who better than them understand apartheid as they dealt with it first hand. Thank You for your time, your efforts are greatly appreciated. Vote Against The Motion!

Sincerely,

Ahmad Khawaja
York University
BSc Kinesiology

----- Original Message -----

From: Hisham Ali

Sent: April 2, 2011 9:14 PM

To: Ahmad Khawaja; Scarpitti, Frank; Heath, Jack; Jones, Jim; Landon, Gord; Li, Joe; Burke, Valerie; Hamilton, Don; Moretti, Carolina; Campbell, Colin; Ho, Alan; Kanapathi, Logan; Chiu, Alex
Subject: Not in My Markham

Dear Mayor and Councillors,

As a constituent in Markham for several years of my life, as well as a university student it pains me to hear that Markham council is considering taking a position on condemning Israeli Apartheid Week (IAW). As an advocate for protecting against human rights abuses anywhere in the world it is evident that the state of Israel is a leader in perpetrating injustice and is continually infringing on humans rights as documented by a multitude of United Nations (UN) resolutions. Israel's involvement in attacking and killing members of the Freedom Flotilla humanitarian convoy is still fresh in the minds of millions around the globe, not to mention Israel's use of White Phosphorus (a banned chemical weapon) against civilians in Gaza during the massacre in 2007/2008. Israel is also guilty of destroying hospitals, UN schools, and is also responsible for killing UN aid workers all of which is documented in the Goldstone Report (Richard Goldstone is a former judge, and is a member of the UN human rights council). It is also a shame that the IAW is being labelled as being anti-Semitic as Justice Richard Goldstone himself is Jewish and can vouch for the atrocities committed by Israel. Furthermore there are thousands of adherents to the Jewish faith (many of which I have the honour of being colleagues with) who also condemn the illegal actions of the state of Israel. It is sickening that anti-Semitism is being used as a deterrent to avoid the issues at hand. If this motion is passed this will lead to any and all criticisms of the state of Israel being discarded as anti-Semitic rhetoric. Discussion about Israel's policies will be stifled and the road map to peace will be blocked, if there is no discussion there is no moving forward, and passing this motion is not moving in the right direction. Many are of the opinion that Israel is guilty of many crimes however they are not an apartheid state, who better than the former President of South Africa Nelson Mandella and Archbishop Desmond Tutu to respond to this claim, both condemn Israel for committing crimes of apartheid, and who better than them understand apartheid as they dealt with it first hand. Thank You for your time, your efforts are greatly appreciated. Vote Against The Motion!

Sincerely,

Hisham Ali

----- Original Message -----

From: Khaled Mouammar

Sent: Monday, April 04, 2011 1:16 PM

To: Kitteringham, Kimberley

Subject: Fw: RE: The extreme right turned Israel into an anachronism

Please place the article below as correspondence on the April 11 General Committee meeting.

Khaled Mouammar

National President

Canadian Arab Federation

----- Original Message -----

From: Khaled Mouammar

Sent: Monday, April 04, 2011 1:16 PM

To: Kitteringham, Kimberley

Subject: Fw: RE: The extreme right turned Israel into an anachronism

This article appeared in Haaretz, an Israeli newspaper. It asserts that there is institutionalized discrimination against the non-Jewish population in Israel.

<http://www.haaretz.com/print-edition/opinion/the-extreme-right-turned-israel-into-an-anachronism-1.353451>

Haaretz

01.04.11

The extreme right turned Israel into an anachronism

Unlike Europe, where the right has significantly grown but is still not in power, in this country the racists, the extreme and clerical right is the government, with only a vacuum opposing it.

By Zeev Sternhell

Slowly but surely Israel is acquiring the status of an anachronistic entity. The legislation that passed in the Knesset that dark night last week, which makes ethnic inequality a legal norm, has no parallel in democratic countries because it contradicts the very essence of democracy. In terms of the principle on which it is based, institutionalized discrimination against the non-Jewish population takes us back to the early days, when Israel's Arab citizens were under a military government.

This had a far-reaching effect on Israeli society. Aside from the desire of Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion and the ruling elite not to limit their freedom of action, it was the ethnic and institutionalized discrimination that rendered impossible the writing of a constitution. In that way

the Israelis, who for the first time became citizens in their own country, learned that independence did not require equality and democracy did not include respecting human rights.

In the year after Israel canceled its military government in Arab areas, the great disaster of the Six-Day War took place, and a military government was established in the territories. Over time, with the settlements, a colonial regime has been created that does not even try to conceal its nature. **At a time when all Western countries have stopped ruling over other nations, Israel is creating a colony for itself, and even transferring the norms that reign in the occupied territories across the borders into the state itself.**

Does the West have any such anachronism? The settlement colonialism is the main reason today, usually the only one, for the opposition, sometimes bordering on hatred, that Israel arouses among much of the Western intelligentsia. It's not the enemies of Zionism and the anti-Semites who are delegitimizing Israel, but Israel itself, with its own two hands.

Although the extreme right has become stronger in Europe too, and the last word has yet to be said, racists don't rule there, and they are considered a repugnant minority not only to the left, but to a substantial part of the liberal right as well. In this country, however, the extreme and clerical right is the government, with only a vacuum opposing it.

The disgraceful flight from a confrontation with the right in the Knesset will not soon be forgotten, and the center's moral bankruptcy will be recorded as a disgrace. The greatest enemies of democracy and the sources of fascism's strength have always been not the radical right's independent power, but the opportunism, conformism and cowardice of the center.

And what would we say if in a Catholic country in Western Europe, the church leaders controlled political parties and dictated entire chunks of national policy? How would we react to the sight of a party leader and important government minister kissing the hand of a robe-wearing cardinal and running to carry out his instructions in the public arena? And how would we accept the news that to attain one of the most important positions in the country – chief of the Shin Bet security service – the clergy's consent was required?

Of course, such sights would generate scorn and disgust, but in this country we have long gotten used to the fact that the settlement rabbis' "halakhic rulings" can openly reject the rule of law and the state's authority, and the hilltop youth are allowed to declare de facto autonomy in the areas they control. We have also gotten use to figures like Foreign Minister Avigdor Lieberman, Interior Minister Eli Yishai and MK David Rotem, the chairman of the Knesset's Constitution, Law and Justice Committee, whose ilk in Europe are part of a history many people are ashamed of. It's sad to see how one of the great hopes of the 20th century has become an anachronism before our eyes.

----- Original Message -----

From: Khaled Mouammar

Sent: Wednesday, April 06, 2011 9:50 PM

To: Kitteringham, Kimberley

Subject: Fw: Town of Markham business mission to Israel

Dear Ms. Kitteringham,

Please place the email below as correspondence on the April 11 General Committee meeting.

Khaled Mouammar

National President

Canadian Arab Federation

On **Wed, 4/6/11**, Khaled Mouammar <benwalid@rogers.com> wrote:

From: Khaled Mouammar

Subject: Town of Markham business mission to Israel

To: "Frank Scarpitti", "Caroline Moretti"

Cc: "Haneen Zoabi"

Date: Wednesday, April 6, 2011, 9:41 PM

Dear Mayor Scarpitti,

I understand that you and Councillor Carolina Moretti are planning to go on a business mission to Israel soon (YorkRegion.com, April 4, 2011).

I find it regrettable that the Town of Markham is seeking to strengthen economic ties with Israel - a country that consistently violates international law and has been found guilty by the United Nations, Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, Breaking the Silence, Physicians for Human Rights-Israel, and the National Lawyers Guild of committing serious human rights violations.

As you are aware, Markham is the most diverse municipality in all of Canada. Its strength comes from its respect and acceptance of all the different cultures and communities within its boundary.

On the other hand, Israel is a country which defines itself as Jewish state even though 25 percent of its citizens are Muslims and Christians. A recent bill passed by the Israeli Knesset requires new citizens to take an oath of loyalty to a "Jewish and democratic state" thereby marginalizing and negating the existence of one-quarter of its citizens.

I therefore find it surprising that the Town of Markham would want to associate its name with Israel - a country with an internationally tarnished reputation.

Unfortunately, it appears that you are intent on going ahead with this trade mission initiated by Councillor Howard Shore, the same person who has put forward a motion to defend Israel's apartheid policies against the Palestinian people.

The Knesset recently revoked Ms. Zoabi's parliamentary immunity because she opposes Israel's discriminatory policies against its Palestinian Arab citizens and because she is an outspoken critic of Israel's immoral and illegal siege of Gaza's 1.5 million inhabitants.

You may contact Ms. Zoabi.

Hoping that you will give this matter your serious consideration.

Khaled Mouammar
National President
Canadian Arab Federation

<http://www.yorkregion.com/news/article/975495--councillor-told-to-foot-bill-for-israel-trip>

YorkRegion.com

April 4, 2011 Councillor told to foot bill for Israel trip By L.H.

Tiffany Hsieh

The Town of Markham will not pay for Thornhill Councillor Howard Shore to go on its upcoming trade mission to Israel.

This decision comes after a last-minute intervention last week by Mayor Frank Scarpitti, calling for a consistent approach to funding a maximum of two council members on all trade missions.

Mr. Shore was recently voted on board the May trip by a town committee, after the mission had been given a budget of no more than \$29,000.

At the time, fellow councillors supported Mr. Shore's participation in the trip, as the lone Jewish councillor in Markham, despite exceeding the pre-approved budget by \$6,000.

Mr. Scarpitti, who was absent at that meeting, flagged the item during council last week.

The mayor said he wants a limit of two members of council on trade missions and any additional councillors going would be funded through either corporate sponsorship or government programs.

"It's an approach that serves the community well and sticks to the value and credibility of our business missions," Mr. Scarpitti said.

The mayor himself and Councillor Carolina Moretti, who chairs the town's economic development committee, were the approved elected representatives on the Israel trip.

Neither offered to step aside to make room for Mr. Shore, despite the fact many councillors have stated he would be an asset on this particular mission due to his background and knowledge of Israeli issues.

The mayor's motion to overturn the committee's decision was supported by council, but it didn't sit well with Councillor Don Hamilton.

"I don't know how to say it, but we spent all kinds of time at committee discussing this — the merits of including Councillor Shore, who understands the language," Mr. Hamilton said.

He said he's not happy the mayor seems to be able to come on scene and make changes to decisions committees had previously debated through due process.

“I don’t know how to say it, but we spent all kinds of time at committee discussing this — the merits of including Councillor Shore, who understands the language,” Mr. Hamilton said.

He said he’s not happy the mayor seems to be able to come on scene and make changes to decisions committees had previously debated through due process.

The mayor said nothing is final until voted by council.

“I don’t think you want to go there because I don’t think the committee had all the facts,” Mr. Scarpitti said, adding the budget committee also spent considerable time dealing with funding the mission.

“We can get into merits, but that’s not what this is about,” the mayor said.

While Mr. Shore said he’s fine working with the town to source additional funds, he commented it’s his belief that having an elected representative who understands the country “adds something to the mission”.

At that council meeting, three people made depositions in opposition to the trade mission entirely.

Markham resident Hebba Fahmy, along with Jake Javanshir and Smadar Carmon, voiced their concerns about the town seeking to strengthen economic ties with Israel.

Mr. Javanshir, who grew up in Israel, said the mission would support “injustice”.

The Israel-born Ms Carmon of Independent Jewish Voices – Canada in Toronto said the human rights situation in Israel is “unimaginable”.

She questioned why the town would want to connect with a country that has been “totally disobedient” to everything the United Nations has asked it to do.

“Why? Why would you want to do that?” Ms Carmon said. “For me, it’s just an insult.”

----- Original Message -----

From: Khaled Mouammar

Sent: Thursday, April 07, 2011 3:19 PM

To: Kitteringham, Kimberley

Subject: Please place the information below as correspondence on the April 11 General Committee meeting.

Councillor Howard Shore's accusations this year against Israeli Apartheid Week and York University are nothing new. Last year Jason Kenney, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, levelled similar accusations.

Below is an article from James Laxer, a professor at York University, dismissing such accusations.

<http://www.rabble.ca/blogs/bloggers/james-laxer/2010/01/canadas-stolen-democracy-welcome-2010>

Canada's stolen democracy: Welcome to 2010

By *James Laxer*

Created Jan 2 2010 - 8:52pm

James Laxer

Story_publish_date:

January 3, 2010

Stephen Harper has an aversion to Parliament. When the House of Commons sits, he and his ministers have to answer questions. The body language of the Prime Minister and his ministers, and their surly, disrespectful attitude to those on the other side of the aisle tells the story.

The styles vary. When Harper stands up to answer a question, he does up his jacket in the manner of a butcher securing his apron before he gives an animal the chop. Peter MacKay adopts an unctuous manner at the start of an answer and concludes by sliming an opponent. John Baird bullies and spews contempt. **And Jason Kenney plays the jackal, preferring to sink his teeth into dead meat left behind by the others. He's the one who claimed that York University is such a hotbed of anti-semitism that what goes on there can be compared to "pogroms". As the grandson of a rabbi who has taught there for the past 38 years, I guess I'm lucky I'm still alive.**

The members of the Conservative cabinet are not very bright guys. And they don't see why they should have to be subjected to cross-examination. Replying to critics is not their strong suit. When the questioning gets too hot as it did before Christmas on the Afghan prisoner abuse issue they don't shoot the messengers, they just shut them up.

By the time the House rose the Conservatives were dropping in the polls to about 36 per cent, down from the 40 per cent range they occupied about six weeks earlier, and down from their score in the 2008 election. The favourite narrative of the supine mainstream media that Harper is a brilliant political strategist, headed for a majority in the next election, was a little patchy by

the time the pundits were going out for eggnog in early December.

Harper does have one golden rule. When the going gets tough, prorogue the House. He did it a year ago to avoid the certain defeat of his government in the Commons. This year he's done it to get the parliamentary committee investigating the torture scandal off his back.

Before Parliament reconvenes with a new Speech from the Throne on March 3, the Vancouver Olympic Games will have showcased Canada to the world, with Harper playing the genial (for him) host. His strategists believe that this will repair the reputation the nation earned at Copenhagen, as the "colossal fossil". By then, as well, these geniuses are confident that the ugly tableau of cover-up, the smearing of Richard Colvin and the constant changing of the government story on the prisoner abuse scandal, will have faded from memory.

Stephen Harper likes to think of himself as the manly leader of a sporting nation. Perhaps in the reflected glow of gold medals, the Prime Minister will acquire the warmth he lacks within to endear him to the forty per cent of Canadians he needs to win a majority in an election in 2010.

Harper would not be the first leader in history prepared to enhance his own power by hiding the savaging of his country's system of government behind the laurels of young athletes.

A year ago, the Prime Minister was prepared to mislead his fellow citizens about the essence of our system of government---the requirement that the ministers of the crown must enjoy the backing of the majority of the members of the House of Commons---to retain power. To stay at the helm, he was quite happy to delude Canadians into believing that the PM is directly elected and that the members of parliament from Quebec aren't quite equal to the others.

When the history of this era is written years from now, the story is likely to be that of a not very talented gang with values distant from those of the Canadian mainstream, holding onto office longer than they should have because the opposition couldn't figure out how to unite to deal with them. Some will bear more responsibility for this sorry state of affairs than others.

Just don't blame the large majority of Canadians who continue to have the sense to reject Harper and his boys, medals notwithstanding. Yes, Canadians care about the economy, the environment, and the prisoner abuse scandal. They are concerned about the reputation of their country in the rest of the world. Give them a way to rid themselves of Harper in the next election and the people will do the rest.

----- Original Message -----

From: Mary-Jo Nadeau

To: Scarpitti, Frank; Heath, Jack; Jones, Jim; Landon, Gord; Li, Joe; Burke, Valerie; Shore, Howard; Hamilton, Don; Moretti, Carolina; Campbell, Colin; Ho, Alan; Kanapathi, Logan; Chiu, Alex

Cc: Kitteringham, Kimberley

Sent: Wed Apr 06 21:47:57 2011

Subject: Faculty for Palestine Letter to Markham City Council on Motion to Condemn IAW

Dear Mayor Scarpitti and Councillors,

Please find attached our letter (and Appendix) regarding your upcoming motion to condemn Israel Apartheid Week.

Sincerely,

Mary-Jo Nadeau
for Faculty for Palestine

April, 5th 2011

Dear Mayor and Councillors of the City of Markham,

We are writing on behalf of Faculty for Palestine, an academic network which includes over 450 faculty members across Canada belonging to over 50 universities and colleges. The group came together in 2008 as a result of a shared concern about attempts to silence pro-Palestinian voices on university campuses in Canada.

We are writing regarding the upcoming motion on Israeli Apartheid Week (IAW) at York University. We are deeply concerned about the proposed resolution and its impact on freedom of speech and academic freedom. We strongly urge you not to adopt it, and to take into consideration the chilling effect of such a resolution. In particular, we urge you to consider the following points.

- 1) The draft resolution mischaracterizes IAW. The motion portrays IAW as an **“odious series of events promote anti-Semitic harassment, intimidation and bullying and creates a divisive and poisonous atmosphere of bigotry, intolerance and academic falsehood.”** This description is factually incorrect, and your adoption of it would be a major and unfortunate misstep. We recommend that you distance yourself from such a frivolous and dangerous description of this event. Most notably, in making the decision on this resolution, one should bear in mind that “anti-Semitic harassment, intimidation and bullying”, in addition to hate speech, are all morally reprehensible acts that are either illegal under Canadian law, or prohibited by universities. If IAW were in fact as this resolution describes it, then it would not have been allowed to take place by universities and the law enforcement authorities for the past seven years.
- 2) IAW is a legitimate education activity, consistent with the many educational events that take place on campuses throughout the year. It adheres to all University policies, and as such, has been defended by the President of York University.
- 3) IAW is an annual international series of events held in cities and campuses across the globe. The aim of IAW is to educate people about the nature of Israel as an apartheid system and to build Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions (BDS) campaigns as part of a growing global BDS movement. In 2011, IAW took place in over 100 cities around the world, including cities in Canada, the US, UK, South Africa and throughout Europe, South America and the Middle East. The week’s events include lectures, multimedia events, cultural performance, and film screenings. IAW aims to highlight the role that could be played by people and governments across the world in providing solidarity with the Palestinian struggle by exerting urgent pressure on Israel to alter its current structure and the practices described by many academics as apartheid policies.
- 4) IAW is one of the few educational events that consistently brings in a wide range of prominent speakers from across the spectrum of global civil society. This includes Palestinians, Jewish anti-Zionists, and South Africans who have been at the forefront of this struggle. Speakers at Israeli Apartheid Week worldwide have included prominent academics such Prof. Judith Butler of UC Berkeley, Prof. Noam Chomsky of MIT, and Prof. Avi Shlaim and Prof. Karma Nabulsi of Oxford University. IAW also includes notable elected representatives from around the world including Mr. Ronnie Kasrils (a member of the African National Congress and former cabinet Minister), and Dr. Jamal Zahalka and Haneen Zou’abi (members of the Israeli Knesset).

- 5) It is important to emphasize that the term “apartheid” is not used as a derogatory term to malign a specific group of people, nor is it used as a racial slur. It is a legal term, defined by the UN in the *Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid*, and designated as a Crime Against Humanity by the *Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court*. The description of Israeli policies and practices as a form of apartheid has been the subject of robust debate in academic and political circles. The highest authority weighing in on this debate was Prof. John Dugard, world renowned authority on international law, Extraordinary Professor of international law at the Centre of Human Rights of the University of Pretoria and former judge ad-hoc at the International Court of Justice. A 2009 report compiled under his supervision concluded that “the State of Israel exercises control over the OPT [Occupied Palestinian Territories] with the purpose of maintaining a system of domination by Jews over Palestinians and that this system constitutes a breach of the prohibition of apartheid.” Professor Dugard is not the only one with this view, an impressive list of Israeli, Palestinian, and other academics and intellectuals also support the view, and short summary is attached as Appendix A.
- 6) Debate and discussion lie at the heart of academia, and this resolution is an unacceptable interference with this basic principle of the University. It systematically targets freedom of expression and aims to suppress debate and discussion of the policies of the state of Israel and human rights violations. It is both irresponsible and incorrect in claiming that discussion of Israeli state policies aims to target Israelis or Jews, or to label them as racist. By adopting this logic, you would, by extension, be accepting the argument that criticism of similar Canadian state policies is racist targeting of Canadians. The implications of this are quite serious as it would effectively shut down any criticism of racist Canadian policies past and present (including the Canadian state’s own history of Anti-Semitism).
- 7) Your resolution will have a severe impact and will stifle debate and restrict academic freedom and freedom of expression. As such, you can expect to receive widespread criticism from a significant number of Canadian academics whose entire research and scholarly work is critical of Canada’s policies in several fields. While it is legitimate to debate these criticisms of the Israeli State, we urge you to reject this kind of reductionist understanding. It reflects a significant misunderstanding of academic life, academic discussions and the academic process.

Finally, we strongly urge you, for the sake of academic freedom and freedom of speech, and in the interest of the future generations who would benefit from hearing the arguments of both sides of a debate, not to adopt this resolution. In addition, we welcome the part of the resolution to broaden the “lecture series previously endorsed by this Council on the topic of the portrayal of cultural communities in the media to include a discussion of anti-Semitic hate speech”. However, we hope that in the interest of fairness and inclusiveness that such a discussion of anti-Semitism would also include the other voices that disagree with the definition of anti-Semitism that is advocated by some in order to foreclose debate on Middle East issues.

Regards,

Anna Zalik, Assistant Professor, York University;
David McNally, Professor, York University;
Deborah Cook, Professor, University of Windsor;
Alan Sears, Associate Professor, Ryerson University;
Mary-Jo Nadeau, Lecturer, University of Toronto at Mississauga;
Amir Hassanpour, Ret. Associate Professor, University of Toronto;

On behalf of Faculty for Palestine

The Apartheid Analysis: A Brief History of its Emergence

One of the first people to apply the apartheid analysis to Israel was Dr. Hendrik Frensch Verwoerd, former Prime Minister of South Africa, who was also called “the Architect of Apartheid” because of his leading role in the creation and shaping of apartheid in the 1950s. As early as 1961, Verwoerd said “Israel, like South Africa, is an apartheid state.”ⁱ

In the 1970s, the perception that Israel was practicing apartheid was also brought up in meetings between Israeli government officials and their South African counterparts. Although the Israeli officials dismissed this analogy, the South African officials believed that Israel and South Africa practice similar policies with the intention to achieve similar goals.ⁱⁱ

In the 1980s, the idea that Israel was practicing apartheid gained more ground and was espoused by thinkers such as the late Edward Said (University Professor at the University of Columbia).ⁱⁱⁱ It was also the subject of scholarly debates, and literature examining parallels and similarities between the South African apartheid policies and Israeli policies began to emerge.^{iv} The possibility that Israel was going to adopt apartheid as a declared strategy was raised in a number of academic articles dealing with the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.^v The first in-depth study arguing that Israel's policy towards the Palestinians is considered apartheid and comparable to the policies of South Africa was released in 1987 by Dr. Uri Davis.^{vi}

In the 1990s, after the signing of the Oslo Accords, the discourse on the apartheid analysis continued but was mostly confined to the critics of the Oslo Accords and the negotiating strategies of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO). Most commentators adopting the apartheid analysis warned that Israel's current policies could be seen as apartheid policies, and that it was possible the apartheid policies could become permanent. Edward Said was one of the main figures advancing this analysis, in addition to a number of other Palestinian^{vii} and non-Palestinian^{viii} intellectuals.

By 2000, with the intensification of human rights violations after the collapse of the peace negotiations and the outbreak of the second Palestinian intifada, the apartheid analysis gained more ground and became commonplace. The application of the apartheid analysis to the situation created by Israeli policies was prominent among many groups. While many academics adopting this analysis are Palestinian^{ix}, it was also taken up by Israeli^x, South African^{xi}, European and North American^{xii} academics.

The years 2001-2006 saw the publication of a number of books focusing mainly on the issue of apartheid and the applicability of the apartheid paradigm. Marwan Bishara published *Palestine/Israel: Peace or Apartheid- Prospects for Resolving the Conflict* in 2001^{xiii} (followed by an updated edition in 2004).^{xiv} Also in 2001 the anthology *The New Intifada: Resisting Israel's Apartheid*^{xv} was published and included articles from academics, journalists, politicians and activists defining Israeli policies as apartheid policies. Two other key books from the period include Uri Davis' second edition of *Apartheid Israel: Possibilities for the Struggle Within* (2003)^{xvi} and former US President Jimmy Carter's book about the Israeli-Palestinian conflict *Palestine: Peace not Apartheid*.^{xvii}

Increasingly the apartheid analysis or aspects of the discourse are being adopted across a range of circles. This includes notable South African intellectuals and activists,^{xviii}

journalists,^{xix} a rising number of politicians (many of whom are South Africans and some are Israeli),^{xx} UN officials^{xxi}, human rights organizations^{xxii} and legal experts including Israel's former Attorney General, Michael Ben-Yair.^{xxiii} Even the former Israeli Prime Minister, Ehud Olmert, came very close, although indirectly, to recognizing that the situation is an apartheid situation. In an interview he gave in November 2007, Olmert said: "If the day comes when the two-state solution collapses, and we face a South African-style struggle for equal voting rights (also for the Palestinians in the territories), then, as soon as that happens, the State of Israel is finished."^{xxiv} Israel's current Minister of Defence, Ehud Barak, made similar comments in February 2010 when he said that in a situation where Israel keeps millions of Palestinians under its control, and "[I]f this bloc of millions of - Palestinians cannot vote, that will be an apartheid state."^{xxv}

The most authoritative study of the applicability of the crime of apartheid to Israel's policies was published by the Human Sciences Research Council of South Africa in 2009. The study which is 302 pages long, compiled by a number of researchers under the supervision of Professor John Dugard,^{xxvi} concluded that "the State of Israel exercises control over the OPT [Occupied Palestinian Territories] with the purpose of maintaining a system of domination by Jews over Palestinians and that this system constitutes a breach of the prohibition of apartheid."^{xxvii} The report also concludes that "the implementation of colonial policy by Israel has not been piecemeal but is systematic and comprehensive, as the exercise of the Palestinian populations right to self-determination has been frustrated in all of its principal modes of expression".^{xxviii} The report further concludes that the Israeli breaches of international law regarding apartheid and colonialism are breaches of peremptory norms of international law which generate *erga omnes* obligations for other states not to recognize the unlawful situation created by the breaches and not to render aid or assistance in maintaining the situation.^{xxix}

Finally, it is important to note that there are studies and publications that have focused on the differences between the South African apartheid and the Israeli policies,^{xxx} and others that rejected the apartheid analysis.^{xxxi} They are part of the debate and the discourse on the issue. The very fact that such studies were authored attests to the legitimacy of the comparison and the analysis, and to the fact that this discussion is alive and emerging.

"The Apartheid Analysis: A Brief History of its Emergence" is excerpted from *The CPCCA's Hidden Message* by Palestine Freedom of Expression Campaign, May 2010)

ⁱ Cited in Chris McGreal, "World Apart," *The Guardian* (6 February 2006), www.guardian.co.uk/world/2006/feb/06/southafrica.israel

ⁱⁱ See Meron Benvenisti, *Conflicts and Contradictions* (New York: Villard Books, 1986), p. 112

ⁱⁱⁱ See for example Said's 1985 interview with Jim Lehrer in Amritjit Singh & Bruce G. Johnson (eds.), *Interviews with Edward Said* (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2004)

^{iv} See for example Alfred T. Moleah, "Violations of Palestinian Human Rights: South African Parallels," *Journal of Palestine Studies* 10/2 (1981), p.14-36

^v See for example Rashid Khalidi, "The Palestinian Dilemma: PLO Policy After Lebanon" *Journal of Palestine Studies* 15/1 (1985), p. 88

^{vi} Uri Davis, *Israel, an Apartheid State* (London: Zed Books, 1987)

^{vii} See for example: Edward Said, "A Desolation, and They Call it Peace," *Al-Ahram Weekly* (25 June -1 July 1998), <http://weekly.ahram.org.eg/1998/383/op2.htm>; Edward Said, "How Do You Spell Apartheid? O-S-L-

O", *Al-haram Weekly* (11 October 1998); Samira Shah, "On the Road to Apartheid: The Bypass Road Network in the West Bank," *Columbia Human Rights Law Review* 29 (1997), p. 221; Raja Shehadeh, "Negotiations Self-Government Arrangements," *Journal of Palestine Studies* 21/4 (1992), p. 22; "The Oslo Agreement. An Interview with Haydar 'Abd Al-Shafi," *Journal of Palestine Studies* 23/1 (1993), p. 14; Graham Usher, "Bantustanization of bi-nationalism? An Interview with Azmi Bishara," *Race & Class* 37/2 (1995), p. 43

viii See for example Mark Marshall, "Rethinking the Palestine Question: The Apartheid Paradigm," *Journal of Palestine Studies* 25/1 (1995), p. 15; Donald Will and Sheila Ryan, *Israel and South Africa: Legal Systems of Settler Dominance* (Trenton: Africa World Press, 1990).

ix See for example Leila Farsakh "Israel: An Apartheid State?" *Le Monde Diplomatique* (November 2003) <http://mondediplo.com/2003/11/04apartheid>; Leila Farsakh "Independence, Cantons, or Bantustans: Whither the Palestinian State?," *Middle East Journal* 59/2 (2005), p. 1; Azmi Bishara, *From the Jewish State to Sharon: A study in the Contradictions of the Israeli Democracy* (in Arabic), (Ramallah: MUWATIN- The Palestinian Institute for the Study of Democracy, 2005); Yousef Taiseer Jabareen, *Constitutional Protection of Minorities in Comparative Perspective: Palestinians In Israel and African-Americans in the United State* (S.J.D. Dissertation, Georgetown University Law Center, 2003)

x See for example Oren Yiftachel, *Ethnocracy: Land and Identity Politics in Israel/Palestine* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006); Tanya Reinhart, *Israeli Palestine: How to End the War of 1948* (New York: Seven Stories Press, 2002)

xi See for example Daryl J. Glaser, "Zionism and Apartheid: A Moral Comparison" *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 26/3 (2003), p. 403; and, "'It's much worse': Anti-Apartheid Activist Farid Esack Speaks on Palestine and South Africa" *The Electronic Intifada* (9 September 2006) <http://electronicintifada.net/v2/article5709.shtml>

xii See for example the interview with Zbigniew Brzezinski in "Ask the Expert: US Policy in the Middle East" *Financial Times* (2 December 2006) www.ft.com/cms/s/2/a2be2f0e-83c4-11db-9e95-0000779e2340.html; Mohammed N Al-Khan "Open Talks Needed on Israel's Apartheid" *Xpress* (16 June 2008) www.xpress4me.com/news/uae/dubai/200808076.html (in this article, Prof. John Mearsheimer is quoted saying "Bishop Tutu has used it and Steve (Stephen Walt) and I use it quite frequently. Things are opening up more and more....Israel is, in effect, creating an apartheid state"); Virginia Tilley, "From 'Jewish State and Arab State' to 'Israel and Palestine'? International Norms, Ethnocracy, and the Two-State Solution," *The Arab World Geographer* 8/3 (2005), p. 140

xiii Marwan Bishara, *Palestine/Israel: Peace or Apartheid- Prospects for Resolving the Conflict* (London: Zed Books, 2001)

xiv Marwan Bishara, *Palestine: Israel: Peace or Apartheid: Occupation, Terrorism and the Future* (London: Zed Books, 2004)

xv Roane Carey ed., *The New Intifada: Resisting Israel's Apartheid* (London & New York: Verso, 2001)

xvi Uri Davis, *Apartheid Israel: Possibilities for the Struggle Within* (London: Zed Books, 2003)

xvii Jimmy Carter, *Palestine: Peace Not Apartheid* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2006)

xviii For notable South Africans who denounce Israeli policies as apartheid policies, see the statement "We Fought Apartheid; We See No Reason to Celebrate it in Israel Now!" www.monthlyreview.org/mrzine/apartheid190508.html; see also Desmond Tutu, "Apartheid in the Holy Land" *The Guardian* (29 April 2002) www.guardian.co.uk/world/2002/apr/29/comment; Desmond Tutu & Ian Urbina, "Against Israeli Apartheid" *The Nation* (15 July 2002) www.thenation.com/doc/20020715/tutu; and Meron Benvenisti, "Bantustan Plan for an Apartheid Israel" *The Guardian* (26 April 2004) www.guardian.co.uk/world/2004/apr/26/comment

xix See for example Chris McGreal, "World Apart" *The Guardian* (6 February 2006) www.guardian.co.uk/world/2006/feb/06/southafrica.israel; Chris McGreal, "Brothers in Arms- Israel's Secret Pact with Pretoria" *The Guardian* (7 February 2006) www.guardian.co.uk/world/2006/feb/07/southafrica.israel; Gideon Levy, "Twilight Zone/ 'Worse than Apartheid'" *Haaretz* (10 July 2008) www.haaretz.com/hasen/spages/1000976.html

xx See Ronnie Kasrils, former Minister in the Government of South Africa in Ronnie Kasrils & Victoria Brittain, "Both Palestinians and Israelis Will Benefit from a Boycott" *The Guardian* (25 May 2005)

www.guardian.co.uk/education/2005/may/25/highereducation.uk1; see also the former Minister and Member of Knesset in Shulamit Aloni, "Yes, There is Apartheid in Israel" *CounterPunch* (8 January 2008) www.counterpunch.org/aloni01082007.html; and the former Minister and Member of Knesset in Yossi Sarid, "Yes it is Apartheid" *Haaretz* (25 April 2008) www.haaretz.com/hasen/spages/977947.html; see also Mustafa Barghouti a current member of the Palestinian Legislative Council in "'Tales from Gaza': Dr. Mustafa Barghouti and Mairead Maguire returns from the Strip and Call for International Solidarity with the Palestinian People" *Al Mubadara News* (23 November 2008) www.almubadara.org/new/sdetails.php?id=5180

xxi See for example the statement by Miguel D'Escoto Brockmann, President of the UN General Assembly, on the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People 24 November 2008, New York www.un.org/ga/president/63/statements/ids241108.shtml. See also the reports of the former UN Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Palestinian territories occupied since 1967, John Dugard, 21 January 2008, A/HRC/7/17; 29 January 2007, A/HRC/4/17

xxii "Forbidden Roads: Israel's Discriminatory Roads Regime in the West Bank," *B'Tselem Information Sheet* (August 2004) www.btselem.org/Download/200408_Forbidden_Roads_Eng.pdf

xxiii See for example Michael Ben-Yair, "The War's Seventh Day" *Haaretz* (3 March 2002)

www.haaretz.com/hasen/pages/ShArt.jhtml?itemNo=136433

xxiv Aluf Ben *et al.* "Olmert to Haaretz: Two-state Solution, of Israel is Done for" *Haaretz* (29 November 2009) www.haaretz.com/hasen/spages/929439.html

xxv Rory McCarthy, "Barak: Make Peace with Palestinians or Face Apartheid" *The Guardian* (3 February 2010) www.guardian.co.uk/world/2010/feb/03/barak-apartheid-palestine-peace

xxvi Professor John Dugard is an Extraordinary Professor of international law at the Centre of Human Rights of the University of Pretoria. He was also former Dean of the Faculty of Law of the University of Witwatersrand. Since 1997 he has been a member of the UN International Law Commission. He was, from 2002 to 2008, a Judge ad hoc in the International Court of Justice. From 2001 to 2008 he served as Special Rapporteur to the UN Commission on Human Rights on violation of Human Rights and International Humanitarian Law in the Occupied Palestinian Territory.

xxvii *Occupation, Colonialism, Apartheid? A re-assessment of Israel's Practices in the Occupied Palestinian Territories under International Law* (Cape Town: Human Sciences Research Council, 2009) 22. www.hsrc.ac.za/Document-3227.phtml

xxviii *Ibid.* at page 16

xxix *Ibid.* at page 23

xxx See for example Heribert Adam & Kogila Moodley, *Seeking Mandela: Peacemaking Between Israelis and Palestinians* (Philadelphia, Temple University Press, 2005)

xxxi Benjamin Pogrund, "Why Depict Israel as a Chamber of Horrors Like no Other in the World" *The Guardian* (8 February 2006) www.guardian.co.uk/world/2006/feb/08/southafrica.israel

----- Original Message -----

From: Keith Landy

Sent: Thursday, March 17, 2011 09:50

To: Shore, Howard

Subject: Motion condemning Israel Apartheid week

Howard,

I wish to commend you and Markham Town Council for this timely motion condemning Israel Apartheid week on Canadian university campuses.

I wish to thank you for this initiative in dealing with this very troubling and invidious annual event (particularly for Jewish students on campus).

As a former South African, I know first-hand what it was like to live in Apartheid South Africa under a racist government. Having also been very involved in Israel advocacy, seeking to promote a just peace with the Palestinians, I am also aware just how far from an Apartheid state Israel truly is.

I attach a chart prepared a few years ago by the South African Jewish Board of Deputies, for your information.

Keep up the great work!

Keith Landy

(Former National President of Canadian Jewish Congress)

Keith M. Landy*

Dissolving the Apartheid Myth

A summary of information drawn from the draft document *Israel, Democracy, and the Apartheid Myth – An Activist's Guide*, produced by The Jewish Board of Deputies of South Africa

February 1, 2008



Dissolving the Apartheid Myth

Political Rights

<i>South Africa</i>	<i>Israel</i>	<i>Arab World</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-whites were initially restricted to voting for a small number of white members to represent them in Parliament • "Independent homelands" or Bantustans were then established to justify denying black people their citizenship rights. • The Tricameral parliament was then established in 1984, with separate chambers for whites, Coloureds (mixed-race), and Asians. • Both the black governing institutions in the "homelands" and the lower chambers were puppet institutions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Universal suffrage, without any exception or discrimination, has underpinned the Israeli political system since its inception in 1948. • All minority groups in Israel enjoy the exact same political rights as Jews. • All Israeli citizens can serve as members of Knesset, form their own political parties, and speak freely against the government. • There are currently 11 Arab MK's. • In 2003, the Israeli judiciary stopped the disqualification of two Arab parties despite the fact that they actively supported terrorism within their own country. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Saudi Arabia, only Muslims can acquire citizenship; serve in the judiciary, or as members of the government. • In Syria, Jews and Kurds are not allowed to participate in the political system. Jews are barred from government employment and are the only group whose religion is identified on passports and identity cards. • All non-Muslims are banned from running for parliament in Yemen. • Jordan has a law explicitly banning Jews from becoming citizens.

Freedom of Movement

<i>South Africa</i>	<i>Israel</i>	<i>Arab World</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Blacks were excluded from living or working in white areas without a permit. They had to carry a "Pass Book" at all times, signed monthly by employers. • Pass book infringements by blacks led to jail sentences and deportation to the "homelands". Approximately 600,000 blacks were being arrested each year for pass law offences. • The passes were granted for only one magisterial district, confining the holder to that area, their spouses and children left behind. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People of every faith, race, and ethnic background can travel throughout Israel without any restrictions, can work anywhere they wish, and remain anywhere in the country for as long as they like. • All citizens and residents of Israel carry an identification card, but this has never been misused as a means of mass population control as was the case in South Africa. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Palestinians living in Lebanon can only work outside the confines of their designated camps if they successfully obtain a permit, and are barred from practicing certain professions outside of these camps.

Marriage and Live-in Relationships

<i>South Africa</i>	<i>Israel</i>	<i>Arab World</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In South Africa, it was illegal to marry across the colour line, and a criminal offence for any white person to have sexual relations with anyone from a different race. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People of all races can marry and cohabit across the colour line. • Marriage is administered by the respective religious authorities. Thus, a Jew may not marry a non-Jew unless one partner converts to the other's religion. Civil marriages, including same-sex marriages from other countries are recognized in Israel. Many Israelis get married abroad to circumvent religious regulations. 	

Access to Public Amenities

<i>South Africa</i>	<i>Israel</i>	<i>Arab World</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to all public amenities and public spaces were subject to segregation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no segregation in Israel, and public amenities and facilities are available equally to all. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Egypt, Bahai's have been barred from attending schools, driving cars, and opening bank accounts.

Public Health

<i>South Africa</i>	<i>Israel</i>	<i>Arab World</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hospitals and ambulances were segregated, with white hospitals of a higher standard than black ones. Many black areas didn't have hospital access. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jewish and Arab medical professionals work together treating both Jewish and Arab patients without discrimination in all areas of Israel. 	

Land Ownership and Residential Rights

<i>South Africa</i>	<i>Israel</i>	<i>Arab World</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> About 13% of the land was divided into ten "homelands" for blacks, who constituted over 70% of the population at the time of their establishment. The country was divided into different areas allocated to different racial groups. Those classified as "non-white" were restricted to designated areas in every urban centre. Forced removals of non-whites from white areas were commonplace. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 79.5% of the land is owned by the government and administered by the Israel Lands Authority (ILA). 14% is privately owned by the Jewish National Fund, and the remaining 6.5% is evenly distributed between private Arab and Jewish owners. The land administered by the ILA is available equally to Jews, Arabs and all other groups. It is not sold, but leased on long terms, accounting for at least half the land now farmed by Israeli-Arabs An Israeli Arab wishing to live in a predominantly Jewish neighbourhood faces no legal barriers to doing so. Indeed, Jews and Arabs live together in many Israeli population centres. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Palestinian Authority law authorizes the execution of Palestinians who sell land to Jews, with a number of executions carried out as a result since 1997. This law extends to all of Mandate Palestine, rendering Israeli Arabs who sell land to Jews within Israel subject to capital punishment in the PA. Jordan prohibits its citizens from selling land to Jews. Restrictions are in force in Yemen regarding places of residence for Jews. Palestinians in Lebanon are forced to live in 12 designated camps.

Citizenship

<i>South Africa</i>	<i>Israel</i>	<i>Arab World</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Citizenship in Apartheid South Africa was based solely on race. The Black Homeland Citizenship Act changed the status of the inhabitants of the "homelands" so that they were no longer citizens of South Africa. They were thus no longer able to apply for a South African passport, and were treated as migrant labourers and illegal immigrants, subject to arrest and deportation. The majority of black South Africans never lived in these "homelands" but the legal system denied them citizenship and restricted their rights to the "homelands" many had never visited. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Citizenship may be acquired by anyone through birth, Law of Return, residence, naturalization Anyone can become a citizen of Israel if they meet the requirements of the Law of Entry to Israel and the Law of Citizenship, similar to the laws governing immigration in most other democratic countries like Canada. Jews wishing to immigrate can do so under the Law of Return, just as countries such as Bulgaria, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Spain, Jordan, Japan, Germany, and Greece have laws facilitating immigration for individuals with ethnic ties. With a population that is over 80% Jewish, Israel is well within its right to maintain this policy. While the government gathers data on different ethnic groups, there are no discriminatory policies enacted based on this information. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Saudi Arabia, only Muslims can acquire citizenship, and all non-citizens are required to carry an identification card designating them a non-Muslim. Jews are legally prohibited from becoming citizens in Jordan. Jews are banned from becoming citizens of Saudi Arabia and are explicitly prohibited from entering the country.

Education

<i>South Africa</i>	<i>Israel</i>	<i>Arab World</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People were forced to attend racially segregated schools, with the white institutions allocated significantly superior government resources. • There was free education for whites until matriculation, but not for blacks, a large number of whom were forced to leave school because their parents couldn't afford to send them. • All black schooling was under government control, without the option of private or mission run schools for those seeking to avoid the system. • The Bantu Education Act was geared toward teaching blacks only the basic skills they would need to work for whites. • A minority of blacks were able to attend "white" universities, which far outranked the "black" institutions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education is compulsory through grade 9, with all children entitled to publicly subsidized education until matriculation from secondary school. • The government operates a Hebrew language system, an Arabic language system, and an Orthodox Jewish system. Israeli citizens can enrol their children in any system they choose. • Israelis can attend any university in the country without restriction. • Every public school gets identical funding from the Israeli government. 40% of the education budget comes from Local Councils. Arab Local Councils collect only 25% of the local tax receipts owing to them compared to 50% in poor local councils with a Jewish majority, resulting in funding disparity. • The government mandated National Task Force for the Advancement of Education in Israel and The Follow-Up Committee for Arab Education have been tasked with finding solutions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sunni Islamic education is mandatory in public schools at all levels in Saudi Arabia, where a significant proportion of the population are adherents to other sects and faiths. Private religious schools for other faiths are not permitted. • Bahai are banned from attending both public and private universities in Iran.

Economic Activity and Employment

<i>South Africa</i>	<i>Israel</i>	<i>Arab World</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Blacks were restricted mostly to menial or semi-skilled positions, with wages fixed at levels significantly below their white counterparts even when performing the same tasks. • Black people were not allowed to employ white people. • Strikes by black unions were banned and strikers severely repressed • Blacks were only permitted to set up their own businesses in the "independent homelands". Otherwise, they needed special permits to work as businessmen or professionals in "white" South Africa. • Certain jobs were available to whites only, and white applicants were heavily favoured. • Blacks were allocated half the state pension funding as was given to whites. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No race or religion-based restrictions on professional employment or business related activities. • Pensions are distributed equally to all citizens • The socioeconomic disparities that exist in Israel are comparable to those in most other countries and are not the result of institutionalized discrimination as was the case in South Africa. • When an Arab Member of Knesset charged that the central Bank of Israel had a discriminatory employment policy, the bank's governor ensured that tenders were advertised in the Arabic language press to counteract the disparity in the workforce. • Arab citizens have been appointed to the Israeli high court of justice, headed university departments, served as director-general of a government ministry, and as a minister in the Israeli government. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members of the Shi'a community in Saudi Arabia are confronted with legally mandated economic discrimination including limited employment opportunities. • Until very recently, Palestinians residing in Lebanon were prohibited by law from working in 72 specified professions outside the confines of their camps, and are still barred from professions such as engineering, medicine, and pharmacy. • In Lebanon, Palestinians must apply for a work permit, which in practice is difficult to come by. As a result, most Palestinians can only find work in unskilled occupations. • In Lebanon, Palestinian labour is often exploited, with employees being paid less than Lebanese nationals. • Jews are barred from government employment in Syria, and face restrictions in Yemen as well.