Resistance in Circulation:
Zionist and Anti-Zionist Mobilizations of “Apartheid”
as Trope and Mode of Reference, 1948 -1980

Thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the M.A. degree

Submitted by
Shimrit Baer

Under the supervision of
Dr. Louise Bethlehem

(December 2015)

Abstract: This thesis traces the ways in which apartheid as a signifier had been mobilized by Zionist and anti-Zionist conversations in the 1950s-1970s, transforming the postcolonial organization of urban space. I initiate my historiographic narrative by viewing how apartheid was circulated as a trope during Israel’s early state-building years, shaping the ways in which Zionist spatial control could be discussed. I then move from mobilizations of apartheid as a trope to its use as a mode of analysis, presenting the case of how Palestinian discourses at the UN in the mid-60s had leveraged apartheid both as an analogical trope and as a human rights based analysis geared at international condemnations of Israel. Within this framework, I argue that early Palestinian analyses of Zionism as a style of apartheid were paradoxically limited in their capacities to render extreme segregation in Israel-Palestine legible. Finally, I posit that in the civil rights era, the relation between apartheid and events in Israel-Palestine was re-articulated by urban communities that were themselves struggling against extreme sociospatial control. This leads to a discussion of how the parallel movements of Black Consciousness and the Palestinian resistance had exchanged ideas while formulating divergent approaches to the contested ideologies of integrationism and separatism. In conclusion, my thesis advances knowledge-power-space as a helpful medium through which to read historical and ongoing Zionist and anti-Zionist mobilizations of apartheid as a trope and mode of reference.
Resistance in Circulation:
Zionist and Anti-Zionist Mobilizations of “Apartheid”
as Trope and Mode of Reference, 1948 -1980

I. Introduction.

In 1980 the Palestinian refugee artist Abdul Hay Musallam created a Palestinian-South African solidarity sculpture that was featured in a poster entitled, “Support the Mass Struggle Against Apartheid in South Africa.” The International Artists Group (IAG) poster publication is important for being one of the earliest known representations of Palestinian/anti-apartheid solidarity. The poster was created at least two full decades after anti-apartheid activism had already assumed global dimensions as a mass movement. As will be argued in this paper, by the early 1950s even the nascent state of Israel had already started creating its own representations of apartheid, effectively making apartheid the subject of books and plays suitable for domestic mass-consumption, and marketing anti-apartheid activism as a central vehicle for its foreign relations. By the turn of the 1960s, following the Sharpeville Massacre near Johannesburg, when state brutality against Black South Africans was broadcast to the world, anti-apartheid activism generated unprecedented levels of international awareness, leading to a series of UN condemnations and resolutions. Apartheid “opened a window on the paradoxes of the so-called ‘modern’ world—and highlighted how concepts of nationalism, development, justice, and self-determination [could take] on new meanings” (Irwin 2010: 323). By 1980, apartheid had, for many groups, become a lens through which knowledge-power could be theorized.

Musallam’s own artwork was generally influenced by symbolism (Look 2015). In the present instance, the anti-apartheid poster’s representation of an emblematic “Africanness” uncomfortably recalls colonial motifs, with the barefoot, pre-modern Africans as guerilla fighters wielding modern military weapons, but flanked by tribal huts and rural motifs. The English caption appears as if in a schoolchild’s script, in an uneven cursive that seems inexperienced and insecure, or “primitive,” with a (mis)corrected error in the cursive “f” in the centrally framed word, “Africa.” This expression of childishness, incompetence or carelessness is
remarkable in the body of Palestinian posters, which were, as a rule, highly invested in both graphic and technical sophistication.⁴ Researcher Dan Walsh, whose Palestine Poster Project Archives has an original print of the poster, has proffered the explanation that “spelling mistakes were common in revolutionary posters.”⁵ There is dubious evidence to support this explanation, especially as, jarring against the labored writing, the actual spelling of the difficult word “apartheid” is without error. In all, for whatever reasons, the message that the poster conveys winds up being as much about South African-Palestinian solidarity as it is about its opposite: disruption, fissure, uncertainty and distance – as well as stereotype.

The inextricable contradictions posed by this rare Palestinian anti-apartheid solidarity poster from 1980 allow new points of entry into a series of questions that this thesis seeks to address. Primarily, how did the Palestinian resistance render the meaning of apartheid and appropriate that term for the analysis of its own condition during the early postcolonial era? And what had mobilized such appropriations? Within a growing corpus of research aiming to historicize the “apartheid analogy,” it is often pointed out that between 1971-1972, Beirut-based Palestinian circulars (namely, *Shu’un Filastiniya* and *Al-Hadaf*) were brokering early comparisons between the Bantustan strategy in South Africa and the Israeli military occupation of Palestinian lands (Clarno 2009: 66-67). Thus it is often assumed that the theorization of Zionist segregation as a “style” of apartheid (much as Jim Crow was theorized as a “style” of apartheid⁶) did not occur until the early 1970s, and that even then, the comparisons were infrequently made, and made without any attendant cultural expressions. The belated appearance of apartheid as a mode of analysis in Palestinian discourse in the 1970s, and its relative absence in debate until around the mid-1980s (when the apartheid analysis of Palestine suddenly began to proliferate rapidly in images and texts) is commonly accepted as a given. Thus in the introduction to a 2015 collection of essays entitled, *Apartheid Israel: The Politics of an Analogy*, the editors claim that “although comparisons between Israel and South Africa *stretch back to the 1970s*, the past decade has seen a growing recognition that Israel’s policies and practices toward the Palestinian people should be characterized as apartheid” (Soske and Jacobs 2015:2; my emphasis).

It is beyond dispute that the “apartheid analogy” has been on an increase, especially in the 1990s and 2000s, a fact variously attributed to the voices of Palestinian intellectuals made newly audible through the internet, the impact of the
Lebanon invasion and the contributions of some Jewish-Israeli academics on the left, as well as the negative impact of increased settlements, restrictions, military checkpoints, surveillance and pass laws, ‘Bantustanizing’ Palestinian territories (Farsakh 2005: 231). Yet were there indeed, as has been assumed, so few convergences between the anti-apartheid and Palestinian struggles prior to the 1970s? How are we to understand the apartheid analogy’s apparent absence in Palestinian popular discourse until around the era marking the collapse of South Africa’s apartheid system in the early 1990s? What kind of cultural exchange had existed between the South African and Palestinian liberation movements, whether in shared motifs, rhetoric, graphic representations, or music and literature? And by what means was the circulation of the trope of apartheid to Palestinian discourse facilitated – or, conversely, blocked?

These questions arise from apparent logical incongruities, for the two liberation struggles had shared many parallels in experience, most crucially in their struggles against spatial restrictions, but also in their parallel organizational needs -- as in their needs for preserving the image of a geographic center of their struggles – and their similar lexicons of “home” as identity, as well as their generational anxieties vis-à-vis turnovers of leadership and increasing youth activism (Collins 1996: 69). Further, there is difficulty in explaining the often erratic and belabored mobilization of the apartheid analysis by Palestinian activism, particularly considering that emergent Black Power movement (interconnected as it was with the anti-apartheid resistance) was exchanging ideas and rhetorical strategies with the PLO Center in Beirut from as relatively early as 1965 (Feldman 2008; 2014). Why were the South Africans and the Palestinians so dissociated from one another’s resistance?
If these days the apartheid analogy seems to have taken on a certain presence in conversations about Israel-Palestine, it is well to remember that historically this was hardly always the case. Before the apartheid analogy began to be enunciated as a critique of Israel’s occupation of Palestinian territories, apartheid tropes were doing service in organizing power and circulating knowledges about postcolonial urban space, impacting Zionist and anti-Zionist contestations, and reshaping rights discourses. This thesis traces the ways in which constructions of apartheid in the postcolonial years between the 1950s and the 1970s were circulated in cities that were themselves shaped by extreme forms of spatial segregation and legacies of resistance to demographic control. From within specific urban locales, circulations of apartheid as a signifier facilitated the shuttling of ideas about knowledge, power and space between newly convergent movements, transforming the postcolonial organization of urban space.

My historiographic narrative seeks to challenge the understanding of the ways in which the Palestinian resistance to extreme spatial segregation and demographic
control around the 1950s-1970s had interacted with knowledge production about institutionalized spatial regimes in South Africa and the United States. Such a historiography has been enabled by two scholarly interventions in the fields of cultural studies and ethnic studies, respectively. First, this study derives from the framework of “Apartheid: the Global Itinerary,” an academic project headed by Louise Bethlehem and supported by the European Research Council, which explores the transnational circulation of apartheid during the Cold War era. Apartheid is reconceptualized as an apparatus of transnational cultural production occasioning contestations over knowledge: it becomes a “powerful political and cultural signifier that produces both accommodation and resistance as it circulates in the global public sphere” (Bethlehem 2013). My research proceeds from the theoretical premise that once the signifier “apartheid” is disengaged from its socio-political habitat and is placed in circulation outside of South Africa it acquires a malleability that makes it tractable to conflicting political claims (ibid.). At the interface between civil rights, Black Power, the Palestinian struggle and Zionism, the signifier “apartheid” is mobilized by cultural agents to institute boundaries, situate local narratives of space, and transform structures of belief and knowledge, impacting the course of political struggles. In discussing these cultural wars in which the signifier of “apartheid” is mobilized, I further draw upon Bethlehem’s concept of “hyper-transmission” (ibid.), which inclines away from a psycho-social analysis of unarticulated social anxieties as conducive to the rapid circulation of certain texts (Van der Vlies 2006), and leans in favor of a more historiographic and materialist approach that places an emphasis on how particular social structures, institutions and venues of exchange induce the circulation of ideas (Bethlehem, ibid.). The notion of hyper-transmission provides a useful conceptual framework for the discussion of what I call the hypo-transmission, or relative non-circulation, of constructs of apartheid in the exchanges between Black Power and the Palestinian popular struggle.

Second, this study has been enabled by Keith Feldman’s analysis of Palestine as a global imaginary that has been shaping how race is understood and managed in the United States. Shadow Over Palestine: The Imperial Life of Race in America (Feldman 2014) defamiliarizes the existing historiography of civil rights by tracing the “substantive, if also fleeting, transnational textual circulation between the anticolonial horizon of Black freedom struggles and Palestinian knowledge production.” Feldman argues that the civil rights organization SNCC had reshaped
both itself and the course taken by Black Power through its confrontations with cultural apparatuses that were effectively *blocking* public discussions of Israel-Palestine (2014: 75). Specifically, SNCC remixed Palestinian texts in the service of a “decolonizing knowledge project” (Feldman 2008: 220); the emergence of Black Power became aligned with new theorizations of the relationship between knowledge and power. The inflow of alternative and taboo knowledges about Palestine and South Africa had opened up an epistemic shift for civil rights activism (ibid.: 9-10). Finally, Feldman powerfully suggests that “the question of Israel and Palestine [has been] constitutive of—rather than epiphenomenal to—the meaning and function of race in the United States” (ibid.:11). Struggles over how Israel-Palestine could be represented provided multivalent lessons about racial exclusion at home and abroad.

Taken together, the above interventions open up new venues for the analysis of the cross-cultural circulations of the Palestinian and the anti-apartheid struggles. The innovation I attempt here is to relate these cross-circulations to changing strategies of resistance against *residential exclusion* and *spatial control*. While demographic control had long been a object of resistance, too little attention has been given to how antitheses to segregation, at the local level, impacted global movements and their interrelation. The violence of segregation often hides under the more visible atrocities its maintenance demands; the cause hides under the spectacle of effects. One outcome is that segregation often remains an ambiguous term and an under-analyzed social fact. If Feldman has shown that the emergence of the Black Consciousness movement was inherently linked to the theorizations of knowledge-power, it is here proposed that it was also an important strategy against the insoluble contradictions posed by urban segregation. At a time when the competing strategies of desegregation, separatism, integration, assimilation and nationalism were met with disillusionment and had proven to be inadequate answers to structural inequalities, Black Consciousness arose as an alternative, polyvalent and versatile praxis of postcolonial reorganization. As a poetics of knowledge-power, Black Consciousness sought to articulate the performativity of ghetto space by delineating cultural-spatial boundaries that were inherently duplicable, transferable and permeable. One of the ways Black Consciousness foregrounded knowledge was by defamiliarizing the facts surrounding apartheid and segregation in both South Africa and Israel-Palestine. It also provided an antithesis to segregation that could be conveyed and enacted indirectly—e.g., by a handling of style, imagery, symbolism and music—rather than
by direct, explicit calls for separatism or integrationism. Simultaneously it provided for an exploration of segregation and its limits by redrawing the urban map (making visible the borders between and around neighborhoods) as well as the global map (rearranging imperial cartographies by blurring national demarcations and reconstituting Black ‘minorities’ as global majorities [Daulatzai 2012: xvi].) In all, the movement articulated a postcolonial praxis of space that was open-ended, ironic and multi-layered.

The story of the cross-circulations of the Palestinian, Black freedom struggles and anti-apartheid struggles is a story of how these movements made one another’s segregation and resistance legible. The present thesis addresses a lacuna in the scholarship by, first, repositioning these three struggles in relation to segregation; and, second, viewing their trilateral relationship through the prism of apartheid. The exigency of viewing such a set of relations through the prism of apartheid is suggested by the fact that the very signifier “apartheid” itself takes on various forms, sometimes as a trope (as in a simile, analogy or a net of allusions), sometimes as a legal term, and sometimes as an analysis of a social structure. This malleability of “apartheid” as a signifier has allowed it to be modified and mobilized for various ends, sometimes at cross-purposes. In turn, the ways in which “apartheid” has been modified and mobilized has shaped cultural space, impacting postcolonial reorganizations of space.

This paper moves from apartheid as a trope to apartheid as an analytic framework. In the first section it is argued that the trope of apartheid in Israeli circulations in the early state-building years of the 1950s worked to contain the ways in which Palestinian subjection to Zionism’s spatial control could be understood and talked about. The contradictory roles played by the trope of apartheid allowed Israeli discourse to promote the idea that racial analyses had no bearing upon segregation in Israel-Palestine, while complicating the story of collective land entitlements that Zionism was telling itself and the world. The second section looks at Palestinian discourses at the United Nations in the mid-1960s, when apartheid was leveraged both as a metaphorical trope carrying emotive purchase, and as an analysis that could spark international condemnations of Israel and precipitate its political isolation. It is shown, however, that Palestinian analyses of Zionism as an apartheid structure took on very specific forms in this period, and were limited in their capacities to render a unifying narrative by which extreme segregation in South Africa and Israel-Palestine could be made legible. The last chapter looks at how, through Black Consciousness, the
relation between apartheid and Israel-Palestine was re-mobilized from within urban communities that were themselves struggling daily with the realities of extreme sociospatial control. This leads to a discussion of how the overlapping movements exchanged ideas and formulated knowledge, power and space.

II. Method, literature and key terms

This thesis arrives from within the field of cultural studies and is firmly located within a tradition of interventionist scholarship levered against depoliticizing and eurocentric approaches. Admittedly cultural studies itself had been a historical byproduct of the racial consciousness movements of the 1960s and 1970s, arising in the midst of, and often against, the era’s surge of post-Marxist approaches and their assumptions of the false consciousness of the masses (Morley and Chen 2006). The question of the apartheid analysis of Palestine will be approached dialectically, tracing cultural change “occurring through the production and resolution of internal contradictions” (Kurashige 2012: 171).

Another point to stress in methodological terms is my focus upon urban locales, rather than individual figures, as the protagonists of a story about the malleability of the signifier “apartheid,” and its mobilization by the Palestinian resistance. Centering on city spaces, rather than persons, as carriers of ideas projects a premise about the ideological and political nature of space: urban arrangements bear a relationship to ideas (Yiftachel & Yacobi 2003: 676; Lefebvre, 1996). Focusing on the discursive spaces opened up by each city, I posit, helps illuminate a distinctly postcolonial struggle with the contradictory terms of segregation, integration, separatism and assimilation. Several key urban sites (e.g., Atlanta, Oakland, Cairo, Algiers and Paris) have had to be excised from the discussion due to space limitations, leading to a selection method based on the degree to which the city was perceived to have impacted the meetings between apartheid and other regimes of extreme segregation.

A central difficulty in studying the Palestinian discourses is the fragility of a history wherein many sources of the period have been destroyed, as happened in the 1982 Israeli confiscation and destruction of Palestinian archives, including the Palestine Research Center’s (PRC) archives in Beirut, with subsequent damage to
Palestinian libraries, archives, newspaper offices and computer files (Feldman 2015:32). Above and beyond this, there is the difficulty, as Mazin Qumsiyeh warns in *The Popular Resistance in Palestine*, that ‘Western’ historians tend to either adopt an Israel-centric logic of Palestine, or they overcompensate in the opposite direction—and thus “romanticize and oversimplify the Palestinians’ struggle and history,” which is attributed to the fact that “the authors do not read Arabic and thus cannot refer to the original data on a subject that is a struggle of an indigenous, Arabic-speaking people” (2011: 3). In respect of both language considerations and an interest in *transnational* circulations, this study chooses to train its view specifically on Palestinian discourses on apartheid as debated in international forums in English, presented in position papers to the United Nations, and included in the various PLO factions’ massive outputs of explanatory publications intended for international consumption.

There has been a robust tradition of comparative studies focusing on the circulations of apartheid and anti-apartheid activism. One area of comparative study, opened up by Rob Skinner (2009), has investigated the anti-apartheid movement’s emergence within different contextual settings. Skinner has shown that anti-apartheid activism did not of necessity address racial ideologies, per se; he cites how in Australia, the U.S. and Britain anti-apartheid activism emerged in response to domestic interests. This accords with the general historiographic claims forwarded here, to the extent that Palestinian circulations of apartheid analyses and tropes bore a relation to the ways in which the Palestinian struggle had formulated itself vis-a-vis racial ideologies and political goals. An emphasis, however, will be placed on the culture-bound circulation of apartheid in different settings, following the insight that “the global contest over the meaning of apartheid and of resistance to it occurs on the terrain of culture” (Bethlehem 2013).

Another area of study has been the comparison of the South African and Palestinian struggles. Mona Younis’s (2000) *Liberation and Democratization: The South African and Palestinian National Movements*, published during the Al Aqsa Intifada, initiates such a comparison but, interestingly, it over-privileges class to the detriment of racial analyses, and elides the contributions of emergent *racial consciousness* movements. According to Younis, one of the obstacles in the first stages of both South African and Palestinian resistance movements was that “elites” were in class conflict with their own mass bases, and were, additionally, “misreading”
how imperialism really worked. Younis’s lexical key draws heavily from Marxist analyses, with its “elites,” “traditional leaders,” “rural peasants,” “transfer of surplus,” “lack of leverage,” “the weakness of the working class,” “misreading,” being “duped,” and false class consciousness (Younis 2000: 103-104). This vocabulary reverberates throughout Younis’s appraisal of both the early Palestinian and the ANC resistance.

Against this, there has grown in the last few years a promising area of studies aiming to correct the academic neglect, and indeed the suppression, of Arab contributions to the development of U.S. civil rights discourses and understandings of race. This area of studies, arising in a post-9/11 setting of institutional anti-Muslim and anti-Arab racism, seeks to reframe the Middle East as pivotal to the formation of Third-Worldist movements of the 1960s. Soheil Daulatzai introduces the concept of the “Muslim International” as a space of cultural circulations between Black Islam, Black Power, and the Muslim Third World -- a cultural space framed by U.S. imperialism in the Cold War era, profoundly shaping the course of local racial contestations (2012: xxii). Daulatzai looks at how the figure of the Muslim has been mobilized in U.S. Cold War discourses to limit the scope of dissent. Simultaneously, the confluence of global Black and Muslim movements shaped local space: “[w]hether it was in Mecca…[or] Egypt, Bandung, Algeria, Palestine or elsewhere, the Muslim Third World had a profound effect in shaping the political vision of Malcolm X, Black radicalism, and the Muslim International” (ibid.: 16). Daulatzai’s approach to the flexibility of tropes in circulation reinforces my own view that the mobilization of apartheid as a trope had significantly impacted the divergent articulations of knowledge, power and space.

Also adding to the scholarship of Arab and Muslim contributions to understandings of race in America are the invaluable studies of Melani McAlister (2005), Pamela Pennock (2014) and Salim Yaqub (2015). McAlister offers an investigation of the “invisible significance” of the Middle East to Americans during the Cold War and after (2005: 303); her focus is on how U.S. Middle East interests became translated to the cultural sphere, reproducing for mass-consumption certain imaginararies of Israel and the “Arab World.” However, she does not relate to how the means of spatial organization in U.S. cities were impacted by discourses about the Middle East. Pennock focuses on Arab-American student activism in the 1960s and 1970s, and explores how Palestinian circulations became enfolded into the protest
arena of civil rights. She argues that alliances with Black Power had, in fact, done service to Arab-American visibility and legitimacy (2014: 56). Likewise, Yaqub centers on the revolutionary pivot of the 1960s and 1970s, viewing how shifting Arab and Arab-American articulations of identity, especially within Arab student organizations and academic publications, had opened up new cultural spaces for African-American discourses regarding Israel-Palestine, both radical and moderate. Collectively, this body of literature represents an emergent historiography of the cultural relays between Arab-American groups, civil rights, and the debates on Zionism. However, none of these studies has been concerned primarily with the role of anti-Zionist political grids in the dissemination of knowledges about spatial control at the homefront. There still remains a lacuna in our understanding of the often contradictory relationships between urban segregation and popular activism against population separation in South Africa, Israel-Palestine, and the U.S. 

Some definitions will be required at the very outset. By ‘segregation’ this paper means an ongoing process whereby a group that has gained a dominant political, cultural, and economic status separates itself from and exerts power over a racialized group, marginalizing that group and removing it from equal access to services, opportunities and resources. While it is beyond the present scope to analyze the different regimes and intensities of segregation in Israel-Palestine, this paper adopts Ilan Pappe’s concept of the segregation of Palestinians as being part of a dual process of ‘rooting out’ and ‘rooting in’: “the strategy, after the [1948] war, was based on the logic that if you cannot uproot people you root them deeply in their areas of living without any outlet or easy access to the world around them” (Pappe 2015). Palestinian populations are systematically ‘cleared’, dispersed and contained in separate Palestinian-only locations (whether entire areas, cities, or separate locations within cities), and then a discriminatory rights regime is applied against categories of Palestinians, depending on their location. Because the segregation of the Palestinian population is structurally inseparable from ongoing policies of ‘location’ and demographic control, it is analyzed typologically here as an ‘extreme’ form of segregation. This study engages with the wars of culture through which that extreme segregation has been understood.

Alongside segregation, it is also necessary to define my use of Black Consciousness, as the two terms will be used in conjunction and by interrelation. Much has been written about race consciousness, ‘double consciousness,’ and
‘colonized’ consciousness. The term Black Consciousness in the present instance is not intended to refer exclusively to any school or any specific movement (e.g., that movement which emerged in South Africa in the mid-1960s and was led by Bantu Stephen Biko.) Instead, Black Consciousness will refer collectively to a pattern of race-conscious movements that often found expression as pan-Asian/Africanism and ‘Third-Worldism,’ and that was geared towards postcolonial reorganization through the articulation of knowledge-power-space. In referring to Black Consciousness, then, this paper refers to a postcolonial articulation of place and displacement, and the relationship of space to the eurocentric legacies of knowledge-power. This accords with some analyses, such Kevin Gaines’s, which hold that Black Consciousness was essentially a movement “grappling with the terms and conditions by which [Blacks] would integrate American society” (2012: 198). Yet even Gaines, in this instance, offers no convincing explanation of what this “grappling” with “integration” really had to do with the epistemic shift he himself seeks to describe. Instead, he offers a genealogy wherein the turn to Black Consciousness was a mass-reaction triggered by escalating acts of police repression of Black activists (ibid.: 197). Such a genealogy seems to concur with the recollections of Stokely Carmichael, the Pan-Africanist intellectual and leader, who himself locates the assassination of Malcolm X in 1965 as his turning point from Civil Rights and voter-registration campaigns to Black Power (Carmichael and Thelwell 2003: 558). Others view the assassination of King in 1968 as a main impetus driving Black Consciousness in the United States (Gaines 2012: 196), or the shocking and brutal state assassinations of Black Panther Party leaders Fred Hampton and Mark Clark in Chicago in 1969 (ibid: 197).

It is beyond dispute that state violence, police beatings and mass incarceration, along with government clampdowns on peaceful protests and the assassinations of Black leaders, had radicalized Civil Rights. But to proffer police brutality as having triggered Black Consciousness on a mass scale obscures the movement’s relation to urban space, place and displacement. It obscures the connections between segregated neighborhoods beset by poor infrastructure, unemployment, dope traffic, revolving prison doors, and the choice of Black Consciousness as a response. In an early (1960) interview on integration versus separation, for example, Malcolm X is confronted with his counter-integrationist stand: what does counter-integrationism or separatism really entail, from a practical point of view? He replies in terms of knowledge-power-space: the answer to segregation is not for the Black community to
integrate into white urban spaces, but for the individual to “first of all [acquire] a knowledge of himself,” escaping the very “educational system” by which the Black person internalizes knowledge.\textsuperscript{12} There could be no antithesis to segregation without taking control of knowledge and power. Similarly, in his autobiography Carmichael offers that “integration is not the objective. Separation is not the objective,” supplementing this caveat with a meme from a 1964 SNCC comical figure, Junebug Jabbo Jones, in a quote which had come to symbolize, for many SNCC activists, the entire civil rights moment: “If you don’t understand the principle of eternal contradiction, you don’t understand diddly” (Carmichael and Thelwell 2003: 309).\textsuperscript{13}

In suggesting that postcolonial space could only be discussed by indexing a “principle of eternal contradiction,” Carmichael was reframing the question of residential desegregation as a question of language and power. One of Black Power’s contributions was the refashioning of the resistance to urban segregation as a resistance to the network of governing epistemes. Thus the shift to a Black vernacular and satire in Carmichael’s discussion of desegregation was not a mere matter of chance allusions or facetiousness to be swept aside.

There is currently some consensus around the notion that “Pan-African Consciousness…was a revolt against the white man’s ideological suzerainty in culture, politics, and historiography” (Hayes 2006: 26, citing Bernard Magubane). What I am proposing is that it is also useful to read Black Consciousness through its symbolic efforts to transform racialized space, or the experience of place. In other words, I am suggesting a reading of Black Consciousness through its articulations of space-knowledge-power. At stake are the ways in which “spatiological” reorientations become interlocked with epistemological and ontological ones.

If so, the praxis of Black Consciousness can be theorized in three ways that will be relevant to the discussion of the movement’s uptake by the Palestinian struggle: First, it posed an economic theory addressing and countering urban residential segregation. Such economic theory amounted often to a struggle with traditional concepts of capitalism and Marxism, the first being rejected as racially exploitative but also admitted as long as the owners, producers, funders and managers of cultural productions were Black,\textsuperscript{14} and the latter often embraced as more egalitarian but also rejected as an essentially eurocentric product, constituting an elision of race.\textsuperscript{15} Second, it theorized knowledge-power-space, though not formulated in that particular phrase.\textsuperscript{16} Lastly, it had an aesthetic dimension that was premised on the idea of Black
cultural autonomy. For example, a “sonic culture of blackness” was to be “mediated by indigenous cultural institutions and produced by and for a primary audience of African Americans” (Gaines 2012: 194). Similarly, the movement itself was an experiment in a “reversal and deconstruction of dialectical terms…exposing the strategic rhetoric of whiteness” (Gallagher 2001: 146). The outlines of separate physical and cultural spaces were redrawn by the observation of difference; the movement played with *inhospitable* space, with the valorized semi-permeability of Black vernacular speech (Gaines, ibid.: 192), and with Euro-American anxieties about loss of entitlement and the loss of place.

Taking as a premise that Black Consciousness adopted an inherently anti-apartheid orientation, while not all anti-apartheid activism bore any relation to Black Consciousness, I want to suggest, in the course of this thesis, that in the plane of *knowledge-power*, Black Consciousness and the Palestinian resistance *did*, in fact, significantly converge, albeit in specific and limited ways. I will also suggest that, in its approaches to *knowledge-power-space*, Black Consciousness had assimilated the Palestinian resistance to a far greater degree than the Palestinian resistance was, in turn, informed by the conclusions drawn by Black Consciousness. The dialectical links between Black Consciousness and the Palestinian resistance were formed as these two movements rendered segregation in Israel-Palestine legible. In the next section I will go on to look at how the signifier of apartheid began to be mobilized in the service of organizing power and knowledge in the early years of Israel-Palestine.

III. Urban mobilizations of the signifier “apartheid”

**Tel Aviv - Beirut**

This section argues that the trope of apartheid was already performing cultural work of various kinds during Israel’s early state-building years. In speaking of apartheid as a trope, I mean those instances when the signifier of apartheid is not used to generate a historically specific referent, but instead is used to mobilize an imaginary of South Africa that is briefly evoked, and, by means of an additional juxtaposition to Israel-Palestine, it then introduces a further imaginary. As a trope, the signifier of apartheid performs cultural work by setting off a chain of commonly recurring figurative motifs.
Viewing early Israeli mobilizations of apartheid as a trope that is used analogically will be helpful in opening up quite another story, about the mobilization of apartheid in Palestinian analyses of Zionism.

The year 1953 is the chosen point of departure because it was an especially robust one for the hyper-circulation of Alan Paton’s 1948 anti-apartheid novel, _Cry the Beloved Country_, in Israel. The second edition of the Hebrew-translated novel (first published by Am Oved in 1951) was “at the top of the bestselling list” of “high literature” in Hebrew translation (Niger 2010: 251). And its publication was in close proximity to another important cultural event (Bar Yosef 2013: 135). On the eve of April 30, 1953, Israel’s national theater, Habima, premiered _Za’aki Eretz Ahuva_, a Hebrew rendering of _Lost in the Stars_, the Broadway musical adaptation of Paton’s novel. Occasional celebrity appearances at the Habima Theater to see performances of _Za’aki_, with visitors of the caliber of David Ben Gurion and Moshe Dayan, boosted an initial neutral, noncommittal critical and popular interest in the play. Soon the Habima musical version, with its VIP visitors strolling the backstage and posing for photos with the blackface Israeli stars, became the center of national attention -- far more so than the simultaneously screened British film version, or the Hebrew translation of Paton’s novel.

The Israeli reception of Paton’s text and its adaptations had included, at its most scathing, Rivka Gurfein’s critique of Paton’s overly “noble” portrayal of whites versus brutal Africans (_Al Hamishmar_, April 7, 1952). The narrative was criticized for “not revealing who [was] responsible” [for injustice], as there was “something too vague,” politically. This criticism, not altogether extraordinary if placed within the larger context of Paton’s global receptions, was especially laden in meaning in Israel, where it reproduced apartheid – indeed, forms of extreme segregation and ideologies of supremacy -- as remote from the Israeli context. Even Ben Gurion, who had gone to see the musical with much fanfare on July 2, 1953, was able to complain to his diary that the text presented “an idealization of whites.” Then, in an unusual move, _Maariv_ editor Azriel Carlebach used the play on behalf of the Zionist right, to leverage a critique of the Zionist left’s hypocrisy in decrying apartheid while monopolizing Israeli institutions (_Maariv_, December 1953; Bar Yosef 2013: 137). Aharon Harel, writing in a labor-youth organ, came nearer to segregation and race in Israel by arguing that when transferred to the Israeli stage, Paton’s text, which cast whites as “righteous and pure,” only exacerbated an already existing “problem”
consisting of the “seclusion” of Ashkenazim from of Sephardim, and the “mocking and ridiculing” of “Arabs” (Bama’ale, June 12, 1953).\textsuperscript{23} The argument framed a critique of “seclusion” and prejudice, rather than of systematic segregation and racial cleansing. These Zionist critiques of the text and play used apartheid as polyvalent symbol for race and racism while leading to stereotypes and speculations as to what Jewish Israelis would be expected to find should they encounter South Africa or Africa.

In addition, the trope of apartheid was managed aesthetically on the stage through a regime of realism (as in the use of blackface and the wooden set design.) And, indeed, it was the “impressive” special visual effects of the play, and the realistic “Negro” music, that drew most response. In a typically apolitical review of the premiere, the critic ‘R.A.’\textsuperscript{24} had focused almost entirely on the music, while Olam Hakolnoa (“Film World”) likewise offered a context-free discussion of the cast and spectacular effects.\textsuperscript{25}

Meanwhile, political figures had keenly used the Israeli adaptation to forward diverse domestic and foreign relations interests. On the home front, helped by the celebrity pull of the lead actor Aharon Meskin, both the translated novel and the musical were used to foster national solidarity, Labor politics, and Zionism. The novel itself was published by the cultural arm of the Jewish-only labor union (Histadrut); and Jewish-only land and labor cooperatives (kibbutzim) arranged field trips to see the anti-apartheid play.\textsuperscript{26} Additionally, visiting dignitaries -- from the mayor of Stockholm\textsuperscript{27}, to South Africa’s Nationalist prime minister D.F. Malan, to African National Congress leaders Walter Sisulu and Duma Nokwe, to various ambassadors from abroad --- were practically coerced by the Israeli authorities to see Zaaki, being handed gift tickets to the show and then to inevitable backstage photo-ops with the blackface cast (Bar-Yosef 2013: 118).

Another instance of the reduction of apartheid to a certain type of trope or discourse was Za’aki’s “Negro-style” sonic stereotypes, which “testified to the shared historical fates bonding Jews and blacks” (ibid.). Indeed, the sonic representations of this imagined “bond” precisely highlighted the ways in which Zionism, from very early on, grafted apartheid to its own project, and rendered its meanings malleable. At a time when Kibbutz Haartzi (a federation of leftist kibbutz movements) had been trying to persuade the communist, anti-apartheid, pan-African activist and singer Paul Robeson to perform in Israel, the ‘Robeson-esque’ vocalist Shimon Yisraeli (a veteran
Israeli military entertainer) was selected to sing the parts of Aharon Meskin’s internal monologues in Za’aki. In fact, Yisraeli was positioned in the dark, supplementing the stage presence and physique of the Russian-Israeli star with his “Negro” voice representing the character’s true mind (Shalev 2011). During the 1950s Jewish Israeli musicians had composed and/or recorded a dozen or so Hebrew “Cushi [Negro] Ballads”, or translations of spirituals, often featuring “authentic Negro” vocalists. Konrad Mann, conductor of the Habima production of Za’aki and a communist, got the African-British singer Martin Lawrence to record “Negro Ballad” for the Hebrew communist songbook. In 1954 the Hebrew rendition of Lost in the Stars was again recorded by the communist Ron Choir. Thus was the circulation of apartheid as a trope facilitated by even the ideological far-left. The hyper-circulation of Paton’s text helped frame Israel as segregation-free: a mystification that was enabled by government insiders and dissidents alike.

The erasure of Israeli segregation from the Zionist lexicon was connected to contestations about land and labor that had been ongoing since the pre-state years; an important keystone was when the third Palestinian Arab Congress, held in Haifa in 1920, had called for a one-citizen-one-vote system and self-determination (Pappe 2008). By the mid-1950’s, an organized fedayeen movement of refugees from 1948 had also emerged to contest the extreme forms of spatial exclusion. In October 1953, while Tel Aviv was hosting foreign dignitaries by taking them to see Za’aki at Habima Theater, the Qibya massacre was conducted by Israel to deter refugees from ‘infiltrating’ back into their expropriated lands (Qumsiyeh 2011). It was against this background that Za’aki was performed nightly in Tel Aviv -- reaching 218 performances. It reached such unprecedented heights of mass-success that one journalist in August of 1953 referred to an Israeli “national psychosis” of Cry the Beloved Country (Maariv: August 14, 1953). The “psychosis” of the musical adaptation, as was argued, was leading to banal violence by anxious customers at the ticket booth (ibid.).

On June 16, 1953 Ma’ariv reported that Habima had prepared a special performance of Za’aki in honor of Prime Minister Malan of South Africa, who arrived for a two-day visit the previous day. Malan was given tickets he did not, in the end, use; “Jewish VIPs from South Africa” picked up the tickets that were slated for him. Malan’s itinerary was planned in coordination with the South African Zionist Federation, and included an informal meeting with Ben Gurion and a tour of Christian
holy sites, as well as a barbecue at Moshav Habonim. Habonim would presumably have been the ideal barbecue site because it was founded by South African Zionists in 1949, on the remains of Kafr Lam, from which Palestinians had been successfully evicted in 1948.

In July, at the heels of Malan’s visit to Israel, Walter Sisulu, Secretary General of the ANC, and Duma Nokwe, of the ANC Youth League, also arrived in Tel Aviv and saw the Habima production (Silulu 2001: 86). Three brief news columns and Sisulu’s memoir (2001) attempt to construct the visit as a spontaneous detour through Israel, occurring solely because of a missed flight connection between Tel Aviv and London. The first article, printed in Yediot Ahronot (July 20, 1953), remarked that the lead actor Aharon Meskin was praised by the two “authentic Zulus” for looking so “genuine” in blackface that folks in Johannesburg could be fooled. Additionally, the article declares that this was the first time the “Zulus” (viz., ANC leaders) had ever been to a theater (ibid.) Ultimately, the ANC visit provided Israeli authorities, politicians, union leaders and socialists alike with an opportunity to mobilize apartheid as a trope that could be amenable to the Zionist project, with the press even portraying the figures of the ANC leaders as nothing more than smiling caricatures. While the ANC leaders were hosted by Israel, given hotel accommodations, taken to the Habima production of Za’aki and photographed backstage with Israeli elites, Israeli paraded its anti-apartheid stance.

Sisulu records that in their visit, the ANC leaders “severely criticized” the Israelis for having hosted Malan, saying it was a “disappointment that [Israel] should have invited a man who had openly expressed sympathy with the Nazis” (2001: 87-88). This thrust at Israel’s moral hypocrisy also legitimized a critique of apartheid on the basis of its links to a racism directed against Jews. The anti-apartheid text, transported to Tel Aviv, became a pretext for Israel-centric conversations, amplifying the silence around both Palestine and Africa.

To summarize thus far, the backstage hangout in Tel Aviv’s national theater created a space for showcasing Israel’s ideologies abroad and sterilizing apartheid at home. Bar Yosef (2013: 135) argues that when David Ben Gurion, Moshe Dayan, and their wives attended a performance of Cry in July 1953 and posed for photographs backstage with the blackfaced actors, “they were taking a moral stand” against apartheid. But it was a public relations enterprise: only three weeks earlier, Israel had been eager to give Malan the same courtesy—down to the Habima tickets.
In the ANC visit, the backstage hangout was converted into the main diplomatic conduit where Sisulu and Nokwe – on a low-profile itinerary that was headed for the Soviet bloc and China to negotiate the supply of arms (Landau 2012: 542) -- could meet Israeli statesmen and military experts of the caliber of Ben Gurion and Dayan in a banal cultural setting.

Sisulu left no records of meetings with Palestinian resistance groups. Similarly, although various radical Black leaders and cultural figures visited Israel in the 1950s and 1960s, it is difficult to find records of any meetings between Palestinians and Black radicals – a notable exception being Malcolm X’s visit to Khan Younis during his trip to Egypt in 1964. Among Black cultural figures visiting Tel Aviv during these years were the Sophiatown jazz group the Manhattan Brothers; the writer James Baldwin (to be among the literary avant-garde of Black Consciousness); anti-apartheid singer-activist Harry Belafonte; and the South African singer in exile Miriam Makeba. In all, these visits to Tel Aviv by Black radicals and celebrities contributed to, rather than challenged, the early Israeli hyper-circulations of apartheid as a trope of certain imaginaries of South Africa. For the time being, the signifier “apartheid” found no salience as a medium for the analysis of extreme segregation in Israel-Palestine.

At the turn of the 70s, Black Panther activist Angela Davis’s visit to occupied Jerusalem in support of the Israeli Black Panthers, a militant organization opposing Euro-Israeli racism and privilege, would serve as yet another demonstration of the slow-paced emergence of apartheid as a frame of analysis for Israel-Palestine. The Israeli Black Panthers was a nationalist organization and, as Oz Frankel (2012: 93) points out, it was actually Matzpen, a largely Euro-Israeli anti-capitalist group, that had brokered the circulation of the Black Panthers into Israel in the first place. The Israeli Panther Movement that was supported by Davis had very much shied away from public association with an organization that was perceived in the Israeli press to be anti-Semitic and anti-Zionist, with no distinction drawn between the two. In 1971 the leftist newspaper Davar called the Black Panther Party a “Negro organization excelling in its hostility to Israel and Jews,” while the more rightist Yediot Ahronot labeled it “an extreme party with an anti-Semitic character.” Black Panther Party leaders Huey Newton, Bobby Seale and Eldridge Cleaver were not mentioned in the Israeli Panthers’ publications (Frankel, ibid.), and Israeli Panthers at one time had even proposed a name change to the “Black Lions of Judea” (ibid.: 93), which would
have left less room for doubts as to the quality of the party’s Zionism. One pamphlet of theirs even explained: “The truth is that we are not Panthers, and we are not blacks but white” (ibid.: 94). Thus, even as late as turn of the 1970s there was still a blockage, or hypo-circulation, in Israel-Palestine of apartheid as a frame of analysis.

Indeed, the mobilization of apartheid as a unit of analysis relevant to Israel-Palestine would need to go by a circuitous by-route, reaching the Palestinian resistance at the grassroots through the channel of Beirut. The city of Beirut became, in the 50s and 60s, the cultural and political center of the Palestinian ghourba (diaspora). The ‘Paris of the Middle East’ —so-nicknamed, in the aftermath of the French mandate, because of its booming banking sector and “an extraordinary influx of the world’s corporate and financial representatives” (Silver 2010: 350; Hoye & Mullin 1982) —housed the Presbyterian-linked American University (AUB), “which advocated and practiced a secular ideal of America” (Killgore 2005). That institution, dating from the later 19th century, was a magnet for training future diplomats in the legacies of European imperialism. It was to that institution that Fayez Sayegh had traveled from Tiberias, Palestine (where his Christian parents had originally settled from Syria) to receive his bachelor’s and master’s degrees, relocating then to the United States in order to earn his Ph.D. in 1949 at the elite, private, Christian-funded Georgetown University (Abu Fakhr 2012). Sayegh would go on to become a diplomat at the UN (Killgore, ibid.).

Sayegh was a major figure in the Palestinian struggle; he founded the Markaz al-Abhath al-Filastini, or the Palestine Research Center (PRC), in Beirut 1965, which was “a major conduit for archiving, publishing, and distributing knowledge germane to Palestine’s national life and culture” (Feldman 2015: 31-32); he also started the Beirut-based PLO newspaper Shu’un Filastiniya (Palestinian Affairs) in 1971, which would the same year become one of the first vehicles for transporting the apartheid analogy of Palestine to the popular level (Clarno 2009: 66). In fact, Sayegh had long been invoking the signifier “apartheid” and applying it to Israel-Palestine in the form of tropes and analytic frameworks through his work in diplomatic channels. He served as the UN’s special rapporteur to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination from 1968 to his death in 1980 (Feldman 2015: 31-32). In 1975, Sayegh became the main architect of United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) Resolution 3379, which considered Zionism as a form of racism (Abu Fakr 2012).
Beirut to New York City

Manhattan – United Nations

Apartheid was mobilized as both trope and analytic frame by Palestinians working in international venues and creating exchanges between Beirut and New York City. But it will be submitted here that even in those instances where Palestinian position papers and UN interventions invoked spatial exclusion and apartheid as a prism through which the “international community” was to understand Israel-Palestine, the very setting of these discourses within the formal arenas of international law and human rights frameworks determined the shape that these analyses would assume. Such analyses, in fact, inhabited specific forms that were resolution-oriented, gearing towards either integrationist or separatist solutions. In addition to my claim that analytic frameworks of apartheid were leveraged by Palestinians as a form of activism, I propose that Civil Rights contestations over knowledge, power and space in the mid-1960s and Palestinian mobilizations of apartheid as a signifier were deeply enfolded into one another.

Completed in 1952, the United Nations headquarters in Manhattan, a modernist style skyscraper complex carrying the very “imprint of Rockefeller plutocracy” (Bartos and Hitchens 1994: 9) was apprehended even by its own planners as risking “bad symbolism” (ibid.: 18). It was constructed on prime real estate, donated, with of tax exemptions, inter alia, by the Rockefeller family (Bartos and Hitchens, 1994: 12). And it would shape, to the curious pedestrian, “a parallel universe of bureaucracy and diplomacy” as well as American superiority (ibid.: 1;16). It would also shape “European and U.S. discourses about individualism, the nation-state, ‘democracy,’ and the broader philosophical and juridical frameworks of the Enlightenment, modernity, and Western liberalism” (Daulatzai 2012: xxiv) – discourses that would be shielded at the UN from certain “forms of sabotage and resistance.” The Manhattan headquarters represented the best in global liberal repertoires of citizenship (Pols 2006), for in it the very meanings of things were to be voted on. ‘Genocide’, ‘crimes against humanity’, ‘racist discrimination’, and ‘apartheid’ were words that Fayez Sayegh batted out at the UN, on behalf of Palestine, and against fierce opposition.
Owing to his decades of diplomatic activities at the UN, Sayegh came to be considered “one of the most visible spokespersons of the Palestinian cause in the West.”47 Particularly in the late 60s to the end of the 70s, while he was serving on the UN Special Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (including three successive four-year terms as a Rapporteur), he brought the apartheid analysis of Palestine to bear upon human rights debates in specific ways. Interestingly, his mobilizations of apartheid in the mid-1960s decentered segregation, even though South Africa itself had already analyzed Israel an “apartheid state” (1961) under the premise that ethnic cleansing was absolutely necessary for the survival of Israel. What was important for Hendrik Verwoerd was that Zionists “took Israel away from the Arabs after the Arabs lived there for a thousand years” (Clarno 2009: 66).48 Verwoerd’s analysis thus restored separation to view as being an ideological substructure upon which the more visible buttresses, the repressive apparatuses of apartheid, were built. It was in order to maintain its segregation, Verwoerd implied, that Israel was forced to initiate policies of ethnic cleansing, legal inequality, and the denial of indigenous claims.

In 1965, the year Sayegh founded the PRC, he was identifying Zionism’s racial doctrines as self-segregation, exclusiveness, and supremacy49 (Feldman 2015: 37)—in other words, he was theorizing Israel-Palestine precisely in terms of segregation. He was also specifically faulting “the Zionist practitioners of apartheid in Palestine” (Sayegh 1965: 27). But what is illuminating is that although he had isolated the significance of the segregationist roles of state and pre-state institutions (the World Zionist Organization, the Jewish Colonial Trust, the Colonization Commission, the Jewish National Fund, and the Palestine Land Development Company – [Feldman, ibid.]), the focus was on labor and land segregation. Sayegh did not directly address the problem of residential segregation in Israel-Palestine – itself a delicate issue for Palestinians under Israeli rule who were content to persist as a community and to maintain their social fabric in their peripherally located and economically dependent villages and towns (or ghettos).50 For whatever reasons, Sayegh addressed neither the conflicts of residential segregation, nor the debates about integration that were rupturing Civil Rights organizations and precipitating Black Power.51 Sayegh viewed Zionism a system of exclusion, but his proffered antithesis was integrationism modeled on civil rights. To Sayegh, Zionism was an erroneous ideology that could be overcome by ‘awakening’ the ‘human’ conscience:
[I hope that] human conscience will still wake up among the Zionists living in Israel, and will make them realize that they have usurped someone else’s land, and will make them accept to live as human beings in a democratic Palestine, where they and the rightful inhabitants have a place [...] I believe that human beings are human beings everywhere. I believe that the human conscience of many people in Israel will still awaken to the tragedy that they have been instrumental in inflicting upon another people....52 (Sayegh, 1967)

Thus Sayegh’s antithesis to segregation in Israel reinforced local liberal integrationist ideologies and co-opted the universalist logics of Enlightenment, humanism and modernity that were enshrined in UN charters and the human rights regime.

Indeed, Sayegh’s was the opposite conclusion to that reached at the same time, using the very same knowledge base, by the civil rights group SNCC (Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee) – headed by Stokely Carmichael – for, since 1965, the PRC and SNCC were in correspondence and exchanging information. By the early 1960s Sayegh’s PRC in Beirut was collecting and producing “a broad swath of documentation germane to life in Palestine” which was relayed to the Arab League’s New York office (Feldman 2015: 31). SNCC’s headquarters in Atlanta was obtaining texts from the League’s Arab Information Center and the Organization of Arab Students (OAS), headquartered in New York, and the OAS, for its part, was “interact[ing] with other foreign student organizations…[including] the Pan-African Students Union”; indeed, the OAS was joining the radical pan-African union in mass demonstrations (Pennock 2014: 59). In September 1966, the PRC in Beirut had started a “Facts and Figures” series, and its first publication, soon to be relayed to SNCC, was titled, “Do You Know? Twenty Basic Facts about the Palestine Problem” (Feldman 2015: 37). This was to have “profound repercussions” on the cultural and political landscape (ibid.).

In July-August 1967, in the midst of an unprecedented mood of ecstasy in the U.S. over the “miraculous-messianic” event of Israel’s military victory (Gavrieli-Nuri, 2010: 95), SNCC produced its own, near-identical, version of the PRC’s “Do You Know?” pamphlet, titled “Third World Round-up: The Palestine Problem -- Test Your Knowledge”.54 Feldman demonstrates that “fully fifteen of the [PRC’s] twenty ‘facts’ appear verbatim (or nearly so) in the SNCC article”; additionally, the SNCC and PRC documents share textual, rhetorical, and empirical similarities (2015: 75). SNCC’s remix enfolded Israel-Palestine into a U.S. “counter-history” of a “permanent state of war” (Feldman 2008: 195); the phrase comes from the opening lines of the SNCC document and denotes racialized theaters of war, including in the Middle East, waged
for the sake of U.S. global hegemony. Feldman shows that the SNCC document showcased “imaginative performances” (ibid.) —i.e., it offered a praxis of language as resistance—unsettling cultural certainty through juxtaposition, analogy and defamiliarization. In other words, SNCC negotiated “Do You Know?” into an epistemic shift from a world of information to one of knowledge-power (ibid.). Through its rhetoric and its images (including a political cartoon), it juxtaposed questions and answers; history and counter-history; integration and separatism; ‘facts’ and ‘the white press’; German fascism and Jewish nationalism; and, lastly, Egypt’sGamal Abdel Nasser and Black Muslim heavyweight Muhammad Ali as two champions of anti-imperialism (ibid.: 220). The SNCC document “remixed” knowledge about the singularity of extreme population separation. It presented a series of racial discourses (Nazism—Jim Crow—Apartheid—Zionism) wherein knowledge and physical space constituted each other and maintained power relations.

In an essay on “Theorizing the Restlessness of Events,” Robin Wagner-Pacifi argues against post-structuralist trends where “the circulatory nature of power is emphasized over any thorough examination of power’s stopping points” (2010: 1367). If meanings, it is reasoned, circulate by default, then achieving the stability of meaning must require the exertion of a deterrent force. Wagner-Pacifici claims that it is possible to analyze “artifactual points of rest” as they become stabilized through techniques of representation (copying with difference), performatives (exerting illocutionary force) and demonstratives (direction pointing).55 Thus, for example, the “stopping points” of “apartheid” as a signifier could be analyzed through the PRC’s representative speech acts (e.g., representations of Zionism and apartheid as sharing an ideological “kinship”), performatives (e.g., UN declarations of “Zionism as racism,” intended as a call to action), and demonstratives (e.g., attempts to redirect the attention of anti-apartheid activists towards Palestine-Israel). Yet such an analysis would have to come to terms with why these speech acts were not directly felicitous to the legibility of Israeli segregation for American audiences. Although the approach thus over-privileges transmission rather than reception, it can, however, shed some theoretical light on a process wherein a circulation of knowledge originally jumpstarted by the PRC had eventually led to the PRC’s own epistemic devices being deployed by SNCC to restrain or halt the reigning ideology of integrationism, effectively restarting new “circuits of cultural production” (Feldman 2015: 57). It will be claimed that, through its deployment of knowledge-power-space as a tool for
deconstructing the supposed essence of spatial separation, Black Power also created the terms with which to “settle” some of the beliefs about integration and separatism that had been in perpetual flux throughout the century, tearing movements apart.

By all accounts, SNCC’s remix of the PRC pamphlet reached the mainstream press without SNCC’s approval or knowledge. But there are incomplete narratives about the genesis of the SNCC document and its circulation. These narratives can be swiftly outlined, as follows: the first in-depth study of the issue is in Clayborne Carson’s much-cited work stating that the SNCC Central Committee had initiated the PRC remix, with Ethel Minor (Communications Director) ‘volunteering’ to do the writing (1981: 267). Carson, omitting sources, mistakenly states that SNCC did not, prior to this, “ever conduct an extended discussion of the Middle Eastern dispute” (1984: 43); this is countered by Carmichael (2003: 558), who states that SNCC reading groups on Zionism and Palestine had been in progress since 1965, and were led by an unnamed ‘sister’ (Feldman posits this was indeed Minor, through her Black Muslim connections [2008: 213-14]). However, the actual turning point for the reading group, according to Carmichael, was the “shocking” revelation of a “close military, economic, and political alliance between the Israeli government and the racist apartheid regime in South Africa” (2003: 558); “discovering that the government of Israel was maintaining such a long, cozy, and warm relationship with the worst enemies of black people came as a real shock. A kind of betrayal. And, hey, we weren’t supposed to even talk about this…” (ibid.: 559). The 1965 time-reference for this multiple “shock” (i.e., the shock of the absence of knowledge, and of the fact of the policing of knowledge) was not insignificant: it directly followed upon the assassination of Malcolm X in 1965 (ibid.: 558), while Malcolm’s interest in Palestine and his visit to a Palestinian refugee camp in Khan Younis, Gaza, just a year prior to his assassination (Kelley 2014), would have been remembered. The notion that African Americans were, in the pattern of colonized peoples, unwary of their own unconscious behavior, was arguably abetted by the discovery of the coerciveness of “the white press” (Carmichael 1966: 641), which the polarity of knowledges about Israel-Palestine seems to have epitomized.

As a rule, narratives subsequent to Carson’s repeat, even verbatim, that the Palestinian perspective had been circulated to Minor by way of her having been “close friends with Palestinian students during her college years” and “involved with the Nation of Islam.” It is unclear who the “Palestinian friends” of Ethel Minor may
have been, or what kind of exchange was facilitated by the campus setting. The debates center, indeed, on how seriously SNCC took its own anti-Zionist rhetoric in the first place. Carmichael (2003: 559) claims that the draft was only a kind of organizational test, meant “to take the pulse” of SNCC’s leadership. Mathew Quest (2003), alongside others, states that the SNCC newsletter was a discussion-piece: “Minor’s article was not meant to be a public position by SNCC but an internal document for discussion. Exposed to public light without SNCC’s consent in a preemptive strike, and never repudiated, it in effect became the SNCC position.” James Forman would later say that the publication of the issue moved the organization a “step further along the road to revolution” (Murphree 3013: 141).

With the publication, SNCC was immediately attacked as “anti-Semitic,” and many Zionist supporters withdrew financial support, severely weakening the organization; but for all that, as Feldman (2008: 194) argues, the publication was serendipitous to the opening up of the racial analysis of Palestine, which would otherwise have remained obstructed by organizational, political and financial exigencies. In turn, newly unblocked discourses on Palestine had revised the “imaginative geographies” (ibid.: 210) of civil rights movements, fomenting and strengthening Black counter-integrationism and spatial epistemologies. In the few months following the SNCC publication, Huey Newton’s manifesto “In Defense of Self Defense” was widely circulated, the Black Panthers began staging protests with guns, and there were around 164 uprisings, across 28 U.S. cities (ibid.). Moreover, knowledge-power mobilizations over Palestine aligned American dissidents along the lines of both race and class: Mathew Quest shows, through the 1967 letters of James Forman (SNCC’s Director of International Affairs), that he had an “awareness [that] the Arab-Israeli conflict would heighten the class struggle in the African American community,” where tensions already existed between the destitute residents of ghettos and the white owners of housing and local businesses – a situation that was perceived as “semi-colonial” (Quest 2004).

It was proposed at the outset of this section that the knowledge base about Palestine from which Sayegh was drawing his own integrationist conclusions was identical to that being leveraged by SNCC. However, SNCC was explicitly using that very same knowledge base to sediment a mass movement that rejected color-blindness, in its stead offering a counter-integrationist praxis of Black Consciousness based on economic theory, theorizations of knowledge-power, and a theory of Black
aesthetics. Further, Black Consciousness, as an epistemological shift that was ignited by the PRC, engaged questions about the overlapping segregations in Palestine, South Africa and the U.S.

To review my line of argument so far, Israel’s support for apartheid South Africa disturbed a culture of African American support for Zionism. Information about Israel’s connection to apartheid in South Africa, side by side with reports of the racial cleansing of Palestine, was circulated to Black radicals through Arab American organizations, where it was picked up by SNCC during Carmichael’s tenure as chair. The intake of Palestinian narratives by SNCC derived additional momentum from proximity to Malcolm X’s assassination. Palestinian mobilizations of apartheid as an analytical tool were deployed more in the service of solidarity with African American groups than in the service of anti-apartheid activism. In all, through apartheid, Palestine profoundly shaped the contours of US history and economy; but Palestine did not to any similar degree affect South African apartheid itself.

In what ways did traffic with SNCC, at the cusp of the desegregation debate taking shape in New York in 1965-1968, galvanize the Palestinian struggle’s anti-apartheid activism, and its approach to the contradictions of segregationism, desegregation, integration and separatism in Palestine? For Sayegh, the knowledge production on Palestine as framed in New York cemented a Civil Rights integrationist approach. “Integrationist ideology begins from a universalist perspective and considers racism as a deviation from the truth that all humans are equal and that race is only ‘skin deep’… the concepts of prejudice, discrimination, and segregation are the key structural elements of this ideology. Prejudice is the eclipse of reason by superstition; it is the height of irrationality” (Jabaily 2005: 201). Keeping this definition in mind, it is instructive to analyze in depth Sayegh’s landmark 1975 statements to the UNGA, submitted at the Third (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural) Committee, supporting the ruling of Zionism as a form of racial discrimination (the ruling would be later overturned due to pressure from both liberal and conservative quarters.)

While the meanings of such terms as ‘Zionism’ and ‘racial discrimination’ were painstakingly defined by Sayegh in his 1975 statements (ibid.), the meaning of segregation, for its part, was taken pretty well for granted. Treating racial discrimination in Israel-Palestine as being caused by a metaphorical “ideological kinship of Zionism and apartheid” (Sayegh 1975: 23), reinforced the segregation’s
inherent ambiguity. Indeed, Sayegh’s discourse reveals three approaches that were to be recurrent fixtures in the archives of Palestinian analyses of apartheid during these years. Apartheid, as applied to Israel-Palestine, would be rendered either descriptively, or comparatively, or else by virtue of its military and economic links with South African apartheid.

First, the descriptive analysis worked by generating examples of ‘apartheid’ in Israel-Palestine—i.e., without necessarily analyzing the technologies of segregation. For instance: “What characterizes [apartheid] ideologies is their exclusiveness…one does not [advance] on his own merits and by his own free will… [but by] the primacy of the act of birth…[which] becomes a suitable subject of investigation” (Jabbour 1971: 56-57). In rare cases was description waged through an analysis of segregation’s structural and ideological ligaments. For example, in a 1975 document, the PRC cites descriptive statistics from the American Journal of Sociology, to the effect that in a survey, 91% of a sample of Israeli Jews agreed that “it would be better if there were fewer Arabs” (PRC 1975: 11). This was structurally analyzed: “blatantly racist education, received incidentally by both Arabs and Jews… reinforces racist attitudes towards the Arab population”61. Scientific analytical approaches were diametrically opposed to approaches describing Israel’s ideological relation to, or ‘kinship’ with, apartheid, although the strategy of both was ostensibly to summon the same moral condemnation as that which eventually isolated South Africa and generated economic boycott and sanctions. As it happened, however, the social, political and economic climate had prevented the hope of international sanctions from being realized.62

Second, a comparative analysis likened Israeli segregation to apartheid. Its use often lent itself to a dependence on the ambiguities of metaphor and simile. A rare twist of the usual Palestinian comparative analysis is found in the writings of the South African PAC activist Ahmed Gora Ibrahim,63 who stated that South Africa was “practising racial discrimination, as are the Zionists in occupied Palestine…They are both illegitimate children of the same parent” (Ibrahim 1968: 332; my emphasis). Aside from the fact that the comparison waged had to rely on an awkward metaphor (apartheid and Zionism were cast as the naïve yet ominous “children” of relationships that were taboo, impure, or “illegitimate”), what is surprising is that it was apartheid that was being understood via Israeli segregation.
If Ibrahim’s rhetoric simultaneously contested and embraced eurocentric discourses of morality and authority, so too did the comparative rhetoric in Sayegh’s later 1975 statement, which likewise argued for the “kinship” of Zionism and apartheid. As moral authority, Sayegh invoked the liberal British historian Arnold Toynbee by virtue of his having been a “renowned observer and analyst of the human scene” (Sayegh 1975: 23). Interestingly, a European moral authority was felt to be needed in placing segregation in Israel-Palestine along an axis of injustice. Interestingly, Toynbee had graded atrocities in receding order of their supposed degree of inhumanity, as first ‘Genocide’, then ‘Eviction’ and finally ‘Apartheid,’ a fact that helped Sayegh argue that the conditions of Palestinians were morally worse than the conditions of apartheid. From early on Sayegh had deployed the comparative apartheid analysis, primarily to demonstrate that the conditions of racial oppression suffered by Palestinians included, and even eclipsed, apartheid: “Nowhere in Asia or Africa — not even in South Africa or Rhodesia — has European race-supremacism expressed itself in so passionate a zeal for thoroughgoing racial exclusiveness and for physical expulsion of ‘native’ populations across the frontiers of the settler-state, as it has in Palestine, under the compulsion of Zionist doctrines” (Sayegh 1965: 24-25). Ultimately, this approach condemned inter-city segregation, and spatial relations in general, to secondary, almost incidental concerns.

Third, the apartheid/partnership analysis viewed Israel’s support for apartheid as reproducing or intensifying apartheid in both Palestine and South Africa. An interesting use of this was Sayegh’s (1982) presentation of racial segregation at a symposium on “Racism and Racial Discrimination Defined” (Feldman 2015: 55). There, Sayegh identified “the mutually reinforcing interactions of racist systems.” In effect, he was treating of what has here been theorized as “overlapping segregations.” The apartheid/partnership analysis allowed Sayegh to view the “deepening ties between Apartheid South Africa and Israel” not as a question of policy but as pointing to the inherent structure of apartheid itself (ibid.).

Sayegh’s were losing battles on behalf of Palestinian rights and on the behalf of the stability of the legal and cultural meanings of racism and apartheid. Feldman argues that Sayegh’s racial analyses of Israel-Zionism were forcibly overwritten by liberal human rights discourses (2015: 18). For this, Feldman puts forth examples of how an interpellation of “American expertise” on the issues of race, and discourses of “a nebulous Soviet threat or a viral anti-Semitism,” had eroded Palestinian racial
critiques at the UNGA (ibid.). As Feldman posits, interventions against Palestinian racial analyses were used to “elaborate the contours of the proper liberal citizen subject” (ibid.: 45). It is argued here that Palestinian apartheid analyses were not only ‘overwritten,’ but were themselves limiting in their descriptive and comparative, rather than relational and prescriptive, applications. At the 1967 juncture, the PRC’s activity in New York had remained adamantly integrationist, in the sense of an adherence to a liberal Civil Rights idea of racism as an ‘irrational’ error to be morally overcome.

What is crucial is that the Palestinian resistance not only adopted a racial analysis in the leadup to 1967, but also generated “work” that was transferred to the US Black Consciousness movement (ibid.: 18). Continuing along the line of Feldman’s provocative analysis, it is here argued that the PRC opened up discussions that then took place in domains outside the PRC. Although the Palestinian struggle in New York impacted various conversations that were being had about the postcolonial reorganization of space, the Palestinian mobilizations of apartheid as an analysis served to sediment integrationist claims within Palestine’s own advocacy.

_Greenwich Village to Harlem_

A minor claim reiterated throughout this thesis is that the opening up of early venues of circulation of apartheid as an analytical framework for viewing the history of Israel-Palestine was facilitated by _urban centers_ that were, themselves, shaped by histories of spatial segregation and demographic control. In ghettos where extreme segregation had long been met by robust grassroots resistance and Black Consciousness, alternate routes for the circulation of ideas pertaining to _knowledge-space_ were already in place to relay different applications for “apartheid.” The class-based alignments of minority groups in urban locales, the structures that these groups had built for themselves to combat space as a disciplinary regime, and the convergences between various movements had all impacted the circulation of ideas between the Palestinian resistance and Black Power.

The complex interplay between urban layouts and the mobilizations of the signifier “apartheid” was nowhere more apparent than in New York’s set of boroughs. For example, a commonly supposed antithesis to the Central Manhattan thesis of suits and briefcases and discursive blockages was the Greenwich Village folk music and
beatnik scene. Yet in a sense the Village folk scene had only picked up the relay of apartheid as a trope, where the UN had left it off. In fact, the “Village scene” of the 60s helped sediment the ways segregation in Israel-Palestine would be understood in the decades ahead. Because of its unique demographic, economic and physical layout, the Greenwich Village scene was a major site of cultural production, and an ideological testing ground for movements that were pulled apart in integrationist and counter-integrationist directions by the mid 60s. It was also fertile ground for stabilizing notions of apartheid in relation to Israel-Palestine.

The narrative of circulation/blockage of apartheid into Palestine via the Village scene will begin here with a micro-historical node, the night of South African trumpeter Hugh Masekela’s arrival in New York on September 27, 1961. For at the very instant of Masekela’s arrival at the Village music scene he literally was pulled into a tension of contested styles, artistic ambitions, political (non)engagements and, with this, a communal anti-apartheid activism. That evening, Masekela was taken by veteran South African locals to a row of clubs, from the Jazz Gallery in Greenwich Village, where Dizzy Gillespie was sharing a bill with Thelonious Monk, to another nearby hub, the Five Spot, to see the jazz percussionist Max Roach, from where they all hopped on back to the Jazz Gallery, hearing compositions that Masekela himself had been playing back in South Africa with Dollar Brand (Abdullah Ibrahim.) This was just following the Sharpeville Massacre near Johannesburg, when anti-apartheid awareness was at its peak. Roach himself was an anti-apartheid activist who had organized pickets in front of the South African Mission to the UN (Masekela 2004: 312). Roach’s house, as Vusumzi Make told Masekela that night, was also a gathering place for exiles, and Make and Maya Angelou were “always” to be found at Roach’s place; Masekela – and soon Miriam Makeba -- joined (ibid.), which may give a sense of just how closely knit music, identity and anti-apartheid activism were at Greenwich Village. Of the many Sophiatown names closely enmeshed in the “capital of Bohemia” were Jonas Gwangwa, Keorapetse ‘Willie’ Kgositsile, Abdullah Ibrahim, Sathima Bea Benjamin, Letta Mbulu, Nat Nakasa and Lewis Nkosi, who were all to become interconnected with the folk revival scene. Between 1963-1968, Makeba’s home in New York became a meeting hotspot. She and Masekela had “attempted to re-create a sense of family by drawing other political and cultural exiles into their home for dinners and political gatherings…South African musicians joined Makeba and Masekela in New York, trying to make their way within the music industry”
When Alan Paton and Krishna Sha’s 1964 Broadway production of “Sponono” flopped, eleven members of its cast decided they did not want to return to South Africa; five, including Caiphus Semenya and Ndikho Douglas Xaba, were subject to deportation proceedings (Houser 1974: 24). Makeba and her milieu then assisted them in circumventing deportation, getting scholarships for study and in finding apartments nearby. Networks between South Africans and American celebrities (such as James Baldwin and Geraldine Page) directly enabled Xaba to study acting in Greenwich Village (Preston 1992). Nakasa was also among the circle of regulars at Makeba and Masekela’s home. And Nadine Gordimer had visited Nat Nakasa in New York when he was feeling alienated and depressed (Brown 2011: 57).

South Africans in and around the Village folk revival scene helped each other in getting around the system, and in acquiring information about gigs, jobs and antiapartheid activity. And where they met, segregation in the U.S. and South Africa was comparatively analyzed.

If segregation in Israel-Palestine has not usually been configured into this drama, it is because its presence in the scene has gone unnoticed, or has been rendered invisible. A familiar narrative relates of a “Black-Jewish alliance” in the civil rights movement, a “collaboration of liberal organizations fighting for [antidiscrimination] laws that were sought by both groups” (Biondi 2009: 99), where, “motivated by liberal American values...[at] rallies, sit-ins, and marches [Black freedom activists and Zionist Jews] stood shoulder to shoulder...and they were strengthened by the same freedom songs.” In fact, as will be documented below, the so-called ‘soundtrack of the civil rights movement,’ which featured songs of protest against racial incarceration, police brutality, and economic intimidation (Gaines 2012: 195) in both the United States and South Africa, also featured repertoires implicitly or explicitly defending Zionism, while the same venues of music often shut out Palestinian expression altogether. Through popular music and through the dynamics of competitive advantage, through civil rights activism and through anti-war nightclubs, and, especially, through leftist record labels (such as Folkways), the overlapping segregations in the United States, South Africa and Israel-Palestine were being surreptitiously defined in relation to each other.

There are ongoing debates among urbanists about the relationships that exist between urban public space, culture, and political formations, and the extent to which “circuits of flow and association” are differentially aided, or impeded, by city layouts.
The specific urban layout of Greenwich Village, and its bohemian folk revival in the early 1960s, converged in unexpected ways with the civil rights moment, ultimately facilitating the “blockage” of those discourses in which the steadfast popular opposition to apartheid in South Africa and segregation at home could have any bearing upon the politics of Israel-Palestine.

The bohemian folk revival at Greenwich Village had its early beginnings in migration patterns, and real estate values. The first migration wave into the Village, transforming it into a boom town, was the flight of “people of substance” from epidemics in Manhattan in the 19th century (Ware 1935: 9-10). A second wave of mass-migration into the Village occurred with rapid early 20th century industrialization -- when the Village, a center of transatlantic shipping, became “invaded” by poor Euro-Americans, mainly Italian, Irish and Eastern European groups, who found employment on its waterfronts and piers. Meanwhile, the Village’s south ward, known as the “Negro Plantations”, grew into an overcrowded slum area composed of breweries, factories and industrial tenements (ibid.: 10).

Greenwich Village did not follow a “usual pattern from rural, to suburb, to residential fringe, to high-class residential, to business and slum areas,” due to the banal fact of its diagonal streets that blocked the thorough ways, causing the main line of city development to follow circuitous routes (ibid.). In 1917, a new subway brought the Village within a 10-minute ride to Wall Street, and connected it with the boroughs. Traffic arteries were cut through to reach the narrow, crooked streets. Thus, by 1930 – right in the Great Depression -- the Village was “one of the most ‘passed-through’ and accessible parts of the city,” and realtors were turning to the area because high-class expansion was blocked at the edge of Harlem (ibid.: 15). Rita Barnard (1995) calls attention to the paradoxical reconcilability of “Depression” with abundance and consumerism. This has to be kept in mind, because throughout the 1930s, Village apartments were advertised and let on the basis of charm and quaintness (attracting artists and bohemians), and apartments were remodeled with improvements -- ornamental railings, baths, terraces, and RCA radio outlets (Ware, ibid: 50) to compensate for the age of the buildings. During the ‘30s, Greenwich Village developed as an “elegant landmark district” -- an “ethnic neighborhood” of “historical character” (Banes, ibid: 15).

This was the introduction of bootlegging and speakeasies, poolrooms, cafes and ‘mixed’ gender night clubs, which proliferated along the waterfront, allowing the
Village to acquire an ‘exotic’ reputation (ibid.: 50). By the 1930s, “the gangster was added to the Village picture” -- and “sightseers were assured that they could observe notorious underworld characters in the appropriate speakeasies” (ibid.: 96). Ironically, perhaps, it was the Hollywood-manufactured, masculinist image of bootlegging gangsters that would fire the Drum imagination of the 1950’s (Nixon 1994), when the young Makeba arrived at Sophiatown (the “Little Harlem”). Fleming (2009: 3) argues that the multiracial South African production of King Kong had “significantly shaped jazz, R&B and folk music … and aided in the creation of the World genre.” The Greenwich Village folk music scene was linked to apartheid in unexpected ways.

The Greenwich folk scene was in other crucial ways linked to South Africa, via the cultural transformations of the Great Depression. In 1939, John Steinbeck wrote The Grapes of Wrath, the best-selling novel about poor, rural white families fleeing the 1930s dustbowl and looking for work and meaning. Little known is it was the hyper-canonicity of Steinbeck’s novel that sparked the Greenwich folk revival scene, when the ‘Okie’ Woody Guthrie began composing neo-folk songs about Steinbeck’s protagonists, Tom Joad and Casy. At that time Alan Lomax, then in charge of the Archive of Folk Song at the Library of Congress in Washington, had hailed Guthrie as “an authentic chronicler of the Dust Bowl who flawlessly spoke the folk idiom” (Powers 2014: 25). On March 3, 1940, a large “Grapes of Wrath” music concert was staged in New York, featuring such folk artists as Guthrie, Pete Seeger and Huddie ‘Leadbelly’ Ledbetter; proceeds went to (Euro-American) migrant farm workers. This group formed the core of the Greenwich Village folk revival scene.

In February 21, 1950, the New York publishing firm Scribner’s would arrange a cocktail party in honor its bestselling authors, Alan Paton and John Steinbeck (Alexander 1994: 250). Alan Paton had admired the author of The Grapes of Wrath; when he had first read the novel, he had been working on social reforms to alleviate the so-called ‘poor white problem’ posed by rural Afrikaners who were contesting British power in South Africa (essentially dividing white rule – [ibid.]). Paton’s biographer, Peter Alexander, has sought to explain Paton’s fascination with the novel: “The Grapes of Wrath, with its dirt-poor farming family fleeing the dust-bowl for the promised land of California, seems to have appealed to [Paton] as a profound myth of that journey and that search which are central to Cry, the Beloved Country.” Both novels resolve class issues through Christian redemption.
Guthrie’s neo-folk songs, with their Christian symbolism, would eclipse Steinbeck’s canonical novel itself (Powers 2014: 23). The folk music scene of Greenwich Village expanded, and folk singers met in Village hubs, sharing between them musical managers, attorneys and record labels. One rising entrepreneur was Harold Leventhal. Leventhal had arrived at Greenwich Village on the crest of an internal migration wave in the 1930s that was characterized by the greater mobility of Jewish groups, and white flight from ethnic enclaves. Leventhal had lived in the Bronx as a youth, and returned to New York City after WW2, by when the demographics of Greenwich Village had radically shifted. Harlem had been predominantly labor-unionist and Yiddish-speaking until the 1930s (Gurock 1979). Between 1921 and 1930, the Jewish population of Harlem had decreased from 178,000 to only 5,000; by 1930, 165,000 of New York’s 328,000 African Americans were living in Harlem (ibid.: 49; 146). It would be mainly from upwardly mobile, leftist, Jewish migrants of a Depression-era upbringing that Greenwich Village’s folk-scene record producers, concert managers and legal representatives would emerge. It is noteworthy that Leventhal, who was also Makeba’s concert manager, is often credited as having had “a big part in the shaping the liberal thinking of the music business”. Alongside Leventhal’s shaping of “liberal thinking” through a promotion of civil rights and anti-apartheid songs, he also promoted Israeli folk artists, “reflecting his longtime devotion to Israeli culture” (Bikel 2005).

Another Greenwich Village-based entrepreneur was Moses Asch, who had begun by releasing albums of Jewish folk music, then expanding to jazz and educational socialist material (Donaldson 2015: 61). Asch started Folkways Records in 1948 after looking for a wider niche, and would go on to produce major civil rights and anti-apartheid labels in the 1960s. In the 1965 Folkways album *South African Freedom Songs*, tracks by (individually uncredited) South African singers would include “Tshotsholoza Mandela (Go Underground Mandela)”; “Umboso Ka Verwoerd (Verwoerd’s Regime)”; and “Sikalela Izwe Lakithi (We Protest for Our Land).” There was a bonding of heterogeneous causes under a liberal record. The grafting of civil rights and anti-apartheid songs to Israeli music and culture buttressed the Israeli Embassy in Washington’s own efforts, throughout the 1950s and ’60s, to strengthen Israel’s ties to African American dissidents: “It is important that we define what our specific objectives are towards [the Black] population, and accord them the appropriate treatment...[although] despite the high birthrate [they] will remain a
minority...[and although] many more years will pass until this racial minority recovers from the[ir] economic and educational backwardness,” the Israeli consul wrote (Aderet 2013). Civil rights leaders like Paul Robeson and Martin Luther King, Jr. had been wooed to visit Israel multiple times. Simultaneously, the very urban structure and demographics of the Greenwich folk scene made it amenable to the fusion of civil rights, anti-apartheid, and Jewish nationalist activism under a banner of progressive liberalism.

This was reflected in the Zionist songs that found their way into many of the repertoires of civil rights. As shown elsewhere, “Israeli folk songs such as ‘Hava Nagilah’ were a staple of 1950’s folk music,” (the song was made a hit by recordings done by Pete Seeger, Theodore Bikel, and Harry Belafonte [Kaufman 2012:171]). By 1950, when “Greenwich Village folk music was suddenly coming out of living-room radios across America” (Dunway 2010:91), Seeger’s version of “Tzena Tzena” provided a “demilitarized, de-nationalized, and desexualized” meaning of the original Hebrew. The Hebrew lyrics for “Go out, girls, and see soldiers in the settlement / Do not hide yourself away from an army man,” were changed in Greenwich Village to “Come and dance the hora” (Harvey 2004: 9-10). In 1952, WLIR, a New York radio station, had a weekly program called the ‘American-Israeli Festival’, proclaiming to air what it purported were “Native songs” in Hebrew (Billboard, Aug. 9, 1952: 6).

Through music and the folk revival, the memory of Palestinians, as early as the 1950s, were obliterated from Greenwich Village.

A consolidating hegemony anchored in civil rights and anti-apartheid activism expedited the recession of Palestinian voices. Until 1967, Greenwich Village could facilitate an almost hermetic blockage of apartheid and segregation as having bearing upon Israel-Palestine. Even South Africans and other anti-apartheid artist-activists were regularly appearing at joints such as the Village Gate or the Village Vanguard with Zionist tunes in their repertoires. Billboard (1963: 10) was “happy” to inform its readers that the Village Gate “has shed its recent jazz policy” by featuring Makeba, a “folk artist” whose “repertoire included songs of Israeli, Jewish and Spanish origin.”

Other examples of how Zionism became linked to civil rights were Nina Simone’s 1962 cover of the Zionist classic, “Eretz Savat Halav u’Dvash”--The Land of Milk and Honey” --and her 1963 “Vaynikehu.”; Belafonte’s “Laila, Laila,” (in an album that also featured performances by Masekela and Makeba) Belafonte’s 1960 hit “Hine Ma Tov,” describing a mythical dwelling together in harmony; Lena Horne’s 1953
“Now!,” a sexualized civil rights hit to the tune of “Hava Nagilah” (Bennett and Kun, 2008); and Makeba’s 1965 “Erev Shel Shoshanim,” a 60s Israeli pop-chart hit originally composed in pre-1948 Palestine (Kean 1993). In various ways these songs showcased tropes of an ancestral Jewish desire for the land, the promise and bounty of the land, and inferences of an entitlement to it (Spagnolo 2013).

Yet tensions were in the air. In May of 1963, Makeba and Belafonte canceled their scheduled Tel Aviv Israeli Independence Day concert. And although Makeba did finally perform in Tel Aviv the following year, by 1967 the repositioning of apartheid and Israel-Palestine vis-à-vis each other fracturing old and trusted alliances. Makeba and Belafonte, who had been working together for years, experienced an irreconcilable break in which Israel-Palestine was a central player. At a time when SNCC, with many African member states at the UN, had proclaimed their solidarity against Zionism as a form of imperialism and racial segregationism in Palestine, Makeba and Belafonte were unable to agree about continuing with the Hebrew repertoire. The exact arguments are murky, but seem to have degenerated into the intimate issues of control and hurt feelings, rather than ideological matters per se. According to Makeba, “some African delegates at the UN” asked her to drop the Israeli songs; she refused; she informed Belafonte that she had refused; and he misunderstood, immediately blasting her in the media and cutting her from his shows (Hostetter 2004: 182). In other words, both Makeba and Belafonte, for unspecified reasons, refused to stand united with the pan-African front regarding the question of Palestine. But by 1967, the analytics of segregation in Israel-Palestine had gained enough traction to be able to wreak their own damage.

Ryan Irwin has said that apartheid was “a physical and imaginative place that focused political differences and epistemological contradictions, and revealed points of commonality and divergence” between cultural figures, political leaders, and activists” (Irwin 2010: 323). Like a lens concentrating and transforming energy, the analytical juxtapositions of apartheid and Israel-Palestine heightened the existing frictions between Makeba and Belafonte -- personal, business or imaginative -- to the burning point. When they parted ways, Makeba chose to accept the offer of President Sékou Touré to visit independent Guinea (Hostetter ibid.: 182).

“Apartheid moves things” (Bethlehem 2013). And it is no exaggeration that the mobilization of apartheid as a trope and analysis of Israel-Palestine really moved the course of things, the course of individual lives, the course of private and intimate
relationships, and the course of a larger history. For Makeba’s own part, her symbolic status had become a tentatively “less palatable commodity across racial boundaries and across a political spectrum in the United States” (Feldstein 2013: 79). Suddenly Makeba, who had been uncontroversially involved in Civil Rights integrationist organizations such as NAACP and SCLC, was moving towards their antithesis -- Black Power and anti-Zionism -- through her future husband Stokely Carmichael. And even in the couple’s 1968 marriage, the mobilization of apartheid in relation to Palestine was again moving "things. It moved the folk music industry from its infatuation with Makeba, as a safe icon of anti-apartheid resistance, to its outright ejection of her. Makeba’s shows were cancelled at once; Carmichael has implied suggestively that she was blackballed from the industry “in an organized campaign,” in a cultural war waged by the opponents of the Palestinian struggle (Carmichael and Thelwell 2003: 653). Makeba’s personal trajectory then moved to Guinea.

The relay of segregation as a unit of analysis for understanding Palestine – originally carried over from the PRC to Carmichael and SNCC in 1965 -- had in the space of three years, as of its own volition, fomented a mass movement of Black Consciousness and anti-integrationism and transformed lives in profound ways. The foregrounding of knowledge-power and their relations to space cut through the heavily policed cultural spaces of the Greenwich Village folk scene, threatening the “soundtrack of the Civil Rights movement.” In the ashes of a taken for granted integrationism sprung new relationships, new working arrangements and new assumptions. Black Consciousness picked up and moved out of the Village to Harlem, where the Black Arts movement was started (Anadolu-Okur 1997: 38-39). The shift to Harlem, the “Black aesthetic” and the “concept of soul” (Kelley 1997) would be embodied, in the brink of the 70s, by figures such as Baraka, Larry Neal, and James Brown, who had “induced catharsis by his spontaneous evocations of ‘I’m Black and I’m Proud’” (Anadolu-Okur, ibid.). The call for transnational Black unity intercrossed with an aesthetic-epistemic praxis of disjunction and fragmentation at “home.”

In September 18, 1968, at the height of the Black revolutionary moment, Maxwell T. Cohen, Makeba’s lawyer, who had been favorably reputed for his defense of Greenwich Village folk music venues against governmental attempts of “taste-control” (Powers 2008: 91), appealed to Carmichael on the subject of Israel and the Middle East. In his letter, he advised Carmichael that “the only acts of Genocide in the world today are perpetrated by the very people you champion” (presumably
Palestinian ‘terrorists’ and their sympathizers).\textsuperscript{82} He advised Carmichael that he was gullibly allowing himself to be “subsidized” to act against Zionism, whereas Jews were naturally aligned with “Negroes,” and were their historical protectors (ibid.) The admonition of an ignorant and gullible Carmichael has bearing here inasmuch as it took place in the context of, on one hand, the whirlwind of Black Consciousness, and, on the other, the rise of the international human rights regime, which was battling out the discrepant cultural definitions of ‘crimes against humanity’, the ‘crime of Genocide’, and the ‘crime of apartheid.’ If anything, the debates show that terms had not yet been inscribed with reliability into the hegemonic discourse.

Meanwhile, if “Hava Nagila” and “Eretz Savat Halav u’Dvash” became smash folk chart hits, this success was not be mirrored by folk tunes about the return to Palestine, in Arabic. Palestine freedom songs weren’t included in the usual folk revival repertoires of singers such as Seeger, Belafonte and Makeba, and weren’t recorded by the same leftist labels that promoted, simultaneously, songs about civil rights, songs about a Jewish Jerusalem and songs about South African land rights.\textsuperscript{83} Joseph Massad, tracing Arabic radio hits from 1948 on, shows that Palestine-themed songs were sung by the most important Arabic-speaking musicians of the 1950s and 1960s, whether they were Egyptian, Syrian, Algerian, Lebanese or Palestinian (Massad 2003: 23). In the late 1950s, songs playing on the radio across the Middle East region expressed their confidence of the Nasserist revolution; post-1967 songs expressed the despair of defeat but, on the other hand, their hope in the Palestinian guerrilla movement that was then emerging (ibid.: 21). This popular music was circulated not only to homes through the radio, but also “through guerrilla radio transmitters in vans that drove around Amman and other areas of Jordan, broadcasting guerrilla news and nationalist songs… [which] became so popular in the region’s refugee camps that most people knew them by heart” (ibid.: 31). The Egyptian singer Muhammad ‘Abd al-Wahhab sang for the liberation of Palestine and had a very popular 1949 hit “Filastin”, matched by a 1952 song about the Egyptian Revolution and its hopes of liberating Palestine and Algeria (ibid.: 22). In the 1960s, internationally acclaimed artists like the singer Fairuz in Lebanon and Umm Kulthum in Egypt made songs about Palestine (ibid.:28), effectively “recording a geography irrevocably changed with the razing of Palestinian villages and the appropriation of Palestinian towns by the conquering Israelis. Towns like Acre, Jaffa, Lydda, Majdel,
Ramleh, Safad, and Tiberius, not to mention numerous villages… [became] concrete references to the homes to which people could not return” (ibid.: 32).

Fairuz, who had in her repertoire about ten songs about Palestine and Jerusalem (the Palestinians had adopted her ‘Sanarjiou,’ or ‘We Will Return,’ as their own anthem—Stone 2008: 155), and about whom the Palestinian poet Mahmud Darwish had said she had done more for Palestine artistically than anyone, with her songs on Al Quds (now occupied Jerusalem) being “arguably the epicenter of the Palestinian resistance song and poems in general” (Stone, ibid.: 156) — was able to perform in New York City in 1971 without ruffling a feather of controversy. It is likely that she excised the Palestine songs from her U.S. repertoire altogether.84 Fairuz’s 1971 cross-country U.S. tour was sponsored and organized by the Forum for Arab Art and Culture, a San Francisco-based student group, while, at the same time, a documentary film of the tour was funded by a U.S. information agency, to be distributed to Arab states.85 Ultimately, in the revolutionary years of 1968 to 1971 Fairuz was able to sing in the very belly of Black Power, pan-Africanism and radical anti-apartheid solidarity, in cities as diverse as Algiers (where, according to Kathleen Cleaver, “a close bond grew between Fatah and the [Black] Panthers” (Cleaver 1998: 21386), Chicago, the San Francisco Bay area, and Detroit, without stirring significant cultural exchanges between Black Consciousness and the Palestinian resistance.

But as Black Consciousness spread between Harlem and other ghettos, so too, did the apartheid analysis of Israel-Palestine. Oakland, home of the Black Panther Party, was a particularly important site for circulations of the apartheid analysis to Palestine and back. Several factors combined to make Oakland a locus for such circulations, chief among them being the city’s location in the manufacturing backwaters of San Francisco. Post-industrial urban sprawl arguably enabled Black communities facing regimes of sociospatial control to develop multiple cultural arteries that bypassed the blocked discursive routes posed by spaces such as Greenwich Village. Black Panther intellectuals responded to the Bay Area’s police regime with theorizations of the prison industry, and Feldman posits that, “for many in the black freedom movement, the uneven development of deindustrialized urban space, captured in [the] image of the carceral continuum, had its representational correlates in other colonized sites in the Third World including, significantly, Israel/Palestine after the June War” (2008: 209). Much of Angela Davis’s work in Oakland centered on urban space. Since Palestinian existence in Israel-Palestine was
increasingly bound by virtual separations and physical fences, walls, enclosures and carceral spaces, it makes it all the more imperative to revisit the circulation and hypocirculation of Black Consciousness as a praxis against segregated space.

**Detroit and on.**

Thus far I have been tracing how different urban contexts, with their individual legacies of historical segregation and resistance, have been conducive to the organization of knowledge and power. I now go on to trace how “apartheid” as a signifier was mobilized as an analytical frame at the very height of the revolutionary moment that shook Detroit in the late 1960s. However, it is at first necessary to rewind a bit to the year 1948 -- a year which has come to symbolize extreme inter-city segregation in South Africa and Israel-Palestine. That year, 1948, was also significant to Detroit’s intra-city transformations, initiating a drawn-out process that directly affected the course of African American and Arab American solidarity. At the time, Detroit was in the midst of pursuing restrictive covenant legislation that racially restricted the sale or use of real estate. When such restrictions proved increasingly difficult to attain, in 1948 the city also initiated steps to forcibly evict the city’s poorest, mostly Black residents from their homes, under ‘urban development’ models (Goodspeed 2004: 3). As a result, between 1950 and 1953, “tens if not hundreds of thousands of people would be forced to move into… [districts] already short of housing, to make way for city bulldozers” (ibid.: 55). Detroit’s Black Bottom and Paradise Valley, which had been Black ghettos, had ceased to exist by the 1960s. Through the “Detroit Plan” and subsequent legislation, ‘Motor City’ in the 1950s managed to evict residents and demolish homes in a legal process called “eminent domain”, leaving owners of properties and renters uncompensated and forced to find housing in already overcrowded areas at higher costs; the appropriated real estate was then ready to be auctioned to private investors (ibid.: 20; 39). In effect, the racial cleansing of areas had begun as soon as the Michigan Supreme Court ruled in 1948 that the city could sell ‘slum’ neighborhoods, deemed too dilapidated, to private developers (ibid.). Thus, “an entire neighborhood was torn down for little more than the simple reason it looked run-down,” in many cases “physically demolishing Detroit’s African-American economic community” (ibid.: 2,4).
There grew various forms of resistance against the threats of demolitions in Detroit and against the municipal strategies of rooting out and rooting in. Grassroots movements proclaimed “a political return to the ghetto” (Dillard 2007: 197), forging the segregated space as the very base of knowledge-power. At Black Bottom and Paradise Valley, the social and economic life served “to incubate small businesses, musicians, and entrepreneurs” (Goodspeed 2004: 29), so that social spaces precipitously slated for destruction “incubated” jazz and blues clubs, which formed all along Paradise Valley; it was in this dense urban cartography that Berry Gordy founded his Motown Records, at the turn of the 1960s (ibid.). Local bands performed Black Consciousness. And resistance took off at the workplace as well. At the auto plant, repertoires of ghetto collective action merged with Pan-African and post-Marxist intellectual movements (Ray 2003). As will be shown, the city’s “movement culture” (Dillard 2007: 126) derived added impetus with the circulation of the 1967 SNCC newsletter, which unblocked new flows of debate about Palestine.

Detroit, “the capital of Arab America” (Howell & Shryock 2003: 443), contained the largest Arab and Arab-American population in the United States in the 1960s and 1970s (Abraham & Shryock 2000: 18). While the first wave of Arab immigrants came to the U.S. around WWI, and were generally Christians from Lebanon and Syria (McAlister 2005: 37), the second, numerically small wave (by U.S. standards), was of Palestinian refugees of the 1948 war and the racial cleansing of Palestine (ibid.: 38). The latter immigrants differed in being largely Muslims and in retaining strong ties to Palestine, in terms of culture and identity politics (ibid.). With the loosening of immigration laws in the mid-1960s, and through a process of chain migration, Arab-speaking immigrants became “the fastest-growing ethnic community in the area” (McAlister 2005: 38-39).

Detroit was also an important center of the Nation of Islam (NOI). Founded in the inner city by W. D. Fard during the Great Depression era as a radical, counter-integrationist, race-conscious Black Muslim movement, from 1934 to 1975 the NOI was headed by Elijah Muhammad (born under the “slave name” of Poole, in Georgia); Muhammad had earlier joined the Universal Negro Improvement Association founded by the separatist Marcus Garvey (Dillard 2007: 48). In the Great Depression and its aftermath Muslim developed the NOI from a minor movement in Detroit to a major organization to be reckoned with, with chapters across the U.S. In addition to the movement’s already existing school where “they taught the knowledge ‘of our
own’,” and a military wing called the Fruit of Islam (Hatim 1951: 57), the NOI under Muhammad came to possess substantial assets, such as a farm and various businesses (ibid.: 62-62) and, from 1960, it owned what was to be the largest and highest-circulating Black newspaper in the U.S., Muhammad Speaks (Gardell 1996: 64).88

Muhammad Speaks became an anti-integrationist venue challenging some of the most established ‘ground rules’ of the American discourse on Israel-Palestine. Jabaily (2005: 209) analyzes these ‘ground rules’ as, first, the universality of the Judeo-Christian religious discourse, which the NOI challenged through the exploration of Islam;89 and, secondly, the analysis of African American and Jewish Americans as having mutual interests, which led to the conclusion that Blacks should “support Jewish nationalism and the state of Israel.” Carmichael later credited Muhammad Speaks as having been his single news source on Palestine: “It was the early sixties before I encountered—in the pages of Muhammad Speaks—any discussion of Palestinian rights and resistance. This was before there was any mention on the American left of the injustices being done to the people.” (Carmichael and Thelwell 2003: 557).90

In the buildup of race and class tensions and the uprisings of 1967-1968, Detroit was considered America’s chief industrial city struggling in a rapidly de-industrializing environment. Nicknamed ‘Motor City,’ it would become, instead, ‘Murder City’ (Georgakas & Surkin1998: 4). By the late 1960s, Detroit led the U.S. “and perhaps the world” in homicides and “crimes of violence” (ibid.). Malcolm X had begun his work there in 1953, when he was as assistant minister of the NOI Temple Number One in Detroit (he had later relocated to Harlem.) Ten years later, he chose Detroit for his famous “Message to the Grassroots,” delivered on November 10, 1963. The “grassroots” constituted an audience of auto-industry families caught in segregation’s feedback loops, and already equipped with repertoires of fierce resistance in areas such as Black Bottom. The “message” was a counter-assimilationist response to King’s “I Have a Dream” given speech a few months previous. Malcolm prescribed Black Consciousness as the remedy against the colonization of the mind; he combined irony, parody, and comedy (in a revolution, “you don’t do any singin,’ you’re too busy swingin”; and “You didn’t come here on the Mayflower.”)91 Through the very ambiguity of form and style, Malcolm’s “off-the-cuff chat between you and me,” “in a language that everybody here can easily understand” rendered segregated neighborhoods ontologically divided. Motor/Murder
City’s segregation was revealed as having an epistemological basis – a basis that had to do with the people’s own, unconscious, reproduction of their enclosure as “exceptional” (Feldman 2008: 206).

To show that enclosure in Detroit was not exceptional, a broad map of geo-strategic and economic interests had to be redrawn – via a history that did not yet exist, and was simultaneously unknown (just like name X militated against knowledge and history)92: “Once you face …as a fact [that ‘you’re not wanted’], then you can start plotting a course that will make you appear intelligent, instead of unintelligent.” From the first ontological recognition (“you represent a person who poses…a serious problem for America, because you’re not wanted”) would come not only the ability become conscious (“intelligent”) of one’s unconscious decisions, but also the ability to re-imagine the overlapping systems of segregation in global cities, one impacting the other. When, in 1964, Malcolm seized the opportunity to visit a Palestinian refugee camp in Gaza, it was far more than simply an act of ‘solidarity,’ or of Muslim ‘unity’: it was a strategy of knowledge-power-space. In fact, the visit to Khan Younis generated little immediate ‘Muslim solidarity’, but it was important as a performance in the production and dissemination of knowledge, and the reorganization of space. Mobilizing oppositional cartographies, it relocated minorities as global majorities (Daulatzai 2012: xvi). It enabled a defamiliarization of the state of being an urban subject: of what exactly was one a subject? And what was that space which constituted one as a segregated subject? The very performance of the visit to a Palestinian camp thus represented a medium through which urban segregation at home was challenged.

In Detroit’s opening political landscape, integrationists and their calls for ‘freedom’ were no longer deemed relevant: “This is the twenty-seventh time I have been arrested--and I ain’t going to jail no more!... The only way we gonna stop them white men from whuppin’ us is to take over. We been saying freedom for six years and we ain’t got nuthin’. What we gonna start saying now is Black Power!” (Cleve Sellers, quoting Carmichael, in Carmichael and Thelwell 2003: 507). Detroit, framed by home demolitions, large Arab populations, artistic autonomy, workplace tensions, and traditions of political dissidence, was amenable to the outburst of the Black Power movement in 1966. Between 1967 and 1973, Detroit became the scene of uprisings, protests and labor strikes expressing rage against the city’s racial practices, as well as stands of solidarity with Palestinians. Time Magazine (August 4, 1967) reported that
“[i]n the violent summer of 1967, Detroit became the scene of the bloodiest uprising in a half century and the costliest in terms of property damage in U.S. history. At the weeks’ end, there were 41 known dead, 347 injured, 3,800 arrested. Some 5,000 people were homeless…while 1,300 buildings had been reduced to ashes and bricks, and 2,700 businesses sacked” (quoted in Georgakas & Surkin1998: 13). The uprising surged for five days, when the inner city was ‘occupied’ by Detroit police, the National Guard and the U.S. army (Ray 2003). In 1968, only weeks after King’s assassination, Detroiters led a strike against a process of “niggermation,” or the automation of Black assembly line workers (Marable 1998:x). Racial tensions permeated the auto unions as well, and the UAW (United Auto Workers) became simply known as “U Aint White” (Ray, ibid.). With increasing tensions between low-wage Black workers and white supervisors, auto workers held a wildcat strike at Dodge that same year, with “between three and four thousand workers” participating in it (ibid.).

Alongside this, the circulation of counter-knowledges about Palestine by the Organization of Arab Students (OAS) was intensifying its pace in the post-1967 political landscape (Pennock 2014: 63). The OAS staged rallies at the University of Michigan and at Wayne State University in Detroit, sponsoring teach-ins on Israel-Palestine and featuring speakers such as Palestinian professor of political science Ibrahim Abu-Lughod (ibid.), who, at the same time, was also working closely with Edward Said on what were to be the intellectual seeds of Orientalism, Said’s seminal 1978 work on the racial epistemology of empire (Feldman 2015: 148).93

Wayne State University was located in the sector of Detroit having the largest working-class and Muslim Arab American population, and “was distinctive for involving more Arab American students and [having] closer ties to the Arab American community than did other OAS chapters” (Pennock, ibid.: 65). In 1968-69, the student newspaper of Wayne State, the South End, infamously published a series of articles sympathetic to Palestinian guerrilla fighters against Israel. John Watson, the paper’s editor, was concurrently a member of the League of Revolutionary Black Workers, a coalition of revolutionary union movements (such as DRUM, the Dodge Revolutionary Union Movement) that militated against “U Aint White” unions (Ray 2003; Pennock 2014: 69). Some of the articles published under the editorship of Watson included a 1968 interview with Hasan Nawash about strategies of Palestinian mass mobilization, a 1969 editorial by Nabeel Abraham about the links between the
PLO and Third World liberation struggles, and a 1969 article submitted by Fatah through the OAS (ibid.: 69). As Pamela Pennock has discovered, the South End also co-sponsored OAS rallies in Detroit against appearances of Menachem Begin in 1968 and Yitzhak Rabin in 1969 (ibid.). Watson was eventually pressured by the university to ‘resign’ as editor (ibid.), yet in a Detroit long embroiled in grassroots struggles against segregation and racial cleansing, sympathy for Palestinian subjectivity had already become culturally interlocked with the Black Consciousness movement.

By the late 1960s, Detroit had become the major exchange point between Sayegh’s PRC in Beirut, the OAS, SNCC, revolutionary unions, and the Black Panther Party. At its annual 1967 convention, OAS leaders expressed their support for SNCC, passing a resolution on “the underlying similarities between the continuing struggle of the Palestinian Arabs in Occupied Palestine against Zionist invasion and exploitation, and the ever-increasing resistance of the Afro-Americans in the United States to a power structure of inequality” (the “Resume of Resolutions, 16th Annual Convention [1967],” cited in Pennock 2014: 56). In 1967 the OAS invited Stokely Carmichael to its next convention (ibid.).

In 1968, Carmichael delivered the keynote speech at the OAS’s annual convention at Ann Arbor (Yaqub 2015: 16). Thus began a relationship, anchored in Detroit, between Black Consciousness and the Palestinian resistance, and in particular among students who would become the Palestinian resistance’s leading academics and intellectuals. In 1979 Said and Abu-Lughod became the first editors of the academic journal, Arab Studies Quarterly (Feldman 2015: 165), although, interestingly, the journal rarely broached upon South Africa or apartheid.44 Perhaps relatedly, the apartheid analysis did not circulate at the Palestinian grassroots until at least the mid-1980s (and more profoundly, in the post-Oslo era), as demonstrated by a boom in Palestine-apartheid posters, writings and media events. But the point to be driven at is that if Orientalism had shaped “debates about the relationship between knowledge and power” (Feldman 2015: 148), it had done so in part through contact with Black Consciousness, and through its contact with Black Power’s analyses of urban segregation, in the late 1960s and early 70s.

At the 1969 Detroit national convention of the Association of Arab American University Graduates (AAUG), Abu-Lughod, then serving as president, had declared that the Association would “stand united with our Black Brothers in the United States, South Africa, Rhodesia and in Mozambique and Angola”; he also acknowledged “the
support of the Black community” (Yaqub 2015: 16). Meanwhile, throughout the year, OAS flyers were being distributed in Detroit reproducing Fatah and PLO tropes and mottos, such as the motto “The Struggle Goes On,” adapted from a publication of the PRC (Pennock 2014: 64).

In October of 1973, the AAUG newsletter aired rage at the fact that the largest local branch of the UAW had just purchased $300,000 in Israeli bonds, without the approval of union members (Georgakas & Surkin 1998: 65). Arab workers had some leverage at the time, because of their numbers, and because of the multi-racial alliances that were being forged against the so-nicknamed “U Ain’t White” union (ibid). Rhetorically, they asked how Black workers would react if the labor union bought bonds supporting apartheid in South Africa (ibid.). Some 3,000 workers marched on Detroit; and then, only two weeks later, ideological fury broke out again on the streets, as the union leader Leonard Woodcock accepted a ‘Humanitarian Award’ from the Zionist organization, B’nai B’rith (ibid.: 66). Auto workers walked off their jobs and staged protests outside the ‘Humanitarian Award’ banquet, which, running at the cost of $100 a plate, incensed class tensions as well (ibid). Work at Dodge was shut down for the first time since the 1968 wildcat strikes.95

In May of 1978, the OAS joined the All-African People’s Revolutionary Party (AAPRP) to stage a march in Washington, DC, with veteran Black Consciousness leaders Bobby Seale (formerly of the Black Panthers) and Carmichael (now a major figure in the AAPRP). “After denouncing Zionist racism in front of the Israeli embassy, the demonstrators marched to the South African embassy to rally against apartheid…A year later [1979] a slightly smaller group of African- and Arab-American activists (again including Carmichael) returned to the Israeli and South African embassies to renew the denunciations” (Yaqub 2015: 19).

Thus, by the turn of the 1980s, the Palestinian resistance and the Black Consciousness movement were more organizationally equipped to rework the nervous articulations of apartheid relative to Palestine. Mainstream leaders were relatively better positioned to discuss Israel-Palestine and even to meet Palestinian fighters and visit refugee camps; in 1979 the dismissal of Andrew Young, the African American Ambassador to the UN who had participated in discussions with PLO representatives, caused an uproar in minority constituencies (Wyatt Tee Walker, an integrationist and a former SCLC leader, had responded that “the Palestinians are the niggers of the Mideast” [Yaqub 2015: 21]). The mobilization of the apartheid analysis was also
ignited by parallel protests and massacres in Soweto and in the Galilee in 1976, the invasion of Lebanon in 1982 and the Palestinian uprising of 1987. The boom in the apartheid analysis was also responsive to an authoritative sanction given to it by Jewish Israeli intellectuals of the left, such as Uri Davis (Israel: Apartheid State? [1987]). And the apartheid analysis of Palestine gained greater purchase globally with the cumulative successes of anti-apartheid movements (e.g., the British AAM). Moreover, universities began to open departments in ethic studies, African American Studies and cultural studies (Weaver 2013: 18). But at the same time, by the end of 1981, South African official discourse had ‘purged’ as much as possible every mention of race (McClintock 145). There was a lesser “need” for segregation when Africans were constituted in separate “states” (ibid.). And Israel-Palestine seemed to many an economic “miracle”. Paradoxically, hence, the apartheid analysis of Palestine was gaining purchase with the advent of a ‘race-blind’ ideology, and a shift to deregulation and privatization.

IV. Discussion

Although nowadays the apartheid analysis seems to have penetrated even mainstream conversations about Israel-Palestine, there is insufficient understanding of how the apartheid analysis was circulated/blocked in the past, why it is used in specific ways now, and what relationship has existed between its analyses and ongoing segregation itself. It should be noted that the last decade has seen the unprecedented rise of popular mass movements linking together Black Consciousness and Palestinian struggles. Examples include the Black-Palestinian Solidarity Movement, the Malcolm X Movement (which identifies as pan-Asian-African), Students for Justice in Palestine, and the Bay Area Intifada. Joint campaigns and exchanges of knowledge connecting ‘Gaza and Ferguson’ have been launched since 2014. Texts, music, blogs and plays are seeking links between the movements. At the time of writing (occupied Jerusalem, 1015) I have knowledge of a still-germinating and amorphous core of student activists in the West Bank, East Jerusalem, the Galilee and Gaza, that has begun to struggle for a single state democracy specifically by connecting the people to Black Consciousness; several of these young activists have returned from sponsored speaking tours in the U.S. and South Africa, where they had encountered the ideas of
Black Consciousness. This thesis hopes to provide more room in which to explore this new wave of solidarity and its relationship to the shifting contours of urban landscapes and disciplinary, segregated spaces.

The opening of this thesis foregrounded an enigmatically formulaic Palestinian anti-apartheid solidarity campaign of 1980, in order to ask questions about how “apartheid” had been mobilized in the 1950s-1970s as a mode of discussing Israel-Palestine. One of the conclusions afforded by this exploration has regarded urban settings as vital points of exchange in the transnational circulation of the signifier “apartheid” and the postcolonial reorganization of segregated spaces. Oppositional frameworks for repositioning Israel-Palestine vis-à-vis South Africa had at first traveled circuitous by-routes before finally opening up the channels of debate in the public sphere. Tel Aviv of the early 1950s facilitated apartheid as a trope of realism, and its mobilization of stereotypes of South Africa effectively blocked apartheid as an analysis valid to Israel-Palestine. New York and the human rights arena provided an alternative, if also circuitous, route whereby the apartheid analysis of Israel-Palestine could be related, via pamphlets, circulars, position papers, and UN interventions. Yet apartheid analyses waged by the Palestinians at the time were not only overwritten by liberal discourses (as at the UN) and civil rights assumptions (as at Greenwich Village), but they were also limiting in their own analyses, language-use and assumptions of integrationist values. Thus, while the Palestinian resistance had been drawing structural links between Israeli segregation and apartheid since at least the mid-1960s, the conversation remained embedded in the very language-ideologies against which it had sought to militate. Through the Black Consciousness movement, however, the relation between apartheid and Israel-Palestine became mobilized from within urban communities that were themselves struggling day to day with extreme sociospatial control. Put another way, connections between anti-Zionism and anti-apartheid were circulated through Black Consciousness as a factor of theorizations of knowledge-power-space.

Indeed, Black Power’s answer to hyper-segregation in the post-civil rights era was to maneuver the conversation epistemologically and ontologically (if one wills, spatiologically) towards a meta-critique of the exercise of power and knowledge through the ordering of space. Israel-Palestine figured strongly in this equation precisely because the very knowledges that were formed around its regimes of separation became revealed, in the immediate aftermath of the 1967 war, as generated
by a consistent shared set of assumptions and knowledge-practices, such as the Black dependence on a “white press.” Anchored in the urban ghetto at the confluence of the two binary ideologies of integrationism and separatism, Black Consciousness offered an emancipatory praxis of spatial reorganization that drew upon the chiasms of overlapping regimes of segregation at home, in South Africa, and in Israel-Palestine, and it deployed tactics such as juxtaposition and improvisation in its contestations of eurocentric signification. Black Consciousness forged a critique of “race-free” liberalism as a politics of displacement, location, exclusion, enclosure, imprisonment and territorial remapping.

If so, one of the far-reaching observations respecting the hypo-circulation of apartheid as a mode of analysis for Israel-Palestine is that the popular Palestinian resistance itself had not proffered as of primary concern the deconstruction of the binary oppositions between integrationism and separatism. Whatever the reason, it is a fact that residential desegregation per se has not been clearly defined either as a policy framework, or as an aim of the popular struggle, in Israel-Palestine. One might posit various explanations for this: theoretically, different prescriptions against racial segregation entail responses to different historical doctrines of separation, and vice-versa. The regimes through which Palestinians have been systematically evicted and segregated were, and continue to be, maintained by two doctrines: “separate and not equal”, and “separate but equal” (the latter clothed in purported “cultural” considerations or “security” needs). By this theory, the Palestinian popular base has not yet faced, in everyday terms, the contradictions posed by integrationist doctrines. Another, more phenomenological, approach would seek to lay bare desires and apprehensions surrounding residential exclusion and its potential erosion. Such an approach is premised on the notion that segregation’s status quo protects communities in paradoxical ways, and that the ghetto is inherently both prison and refuge at the same time (Monterescu 2015: 5).

The ways in which “apartheid” had been codified and mobilized over the years continues to shape local space. Therefore it becomes incumbent to render extreme segregation in Israel-Palestine legible to ourselves, particularly as choices with regard to space are not necessarily made “consciously,” i.e., with an awareness of the ramifications of collective unconscious behavior. This thesis has proffered circulations of ideas on knowledge-power-space as a medium through which to read Zionist and anti-Zionist mobilizations of “apartheid” as a trope and mode of reference.
Notes

1 The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Research Council under the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP/2007-2013) / ERC Grant Agreement no. 615564.


3 Below is a distribution of the apartheid/Palestine posters found in Dan Walsh’s well-researched Palestine Poster Project Archives:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>151[…</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures are appended to give some indication of probable distributions of published Palestinian anti-apartheid graphics, and are not definitive. Special thanks to Dan Walsh for his help.

4 The PLO, indeed, placed great emphasis on visual communication – not just as propaganda, but also as support for Palestinian culture through the visual and graphic arts. The artist Kamal Boullata (2003:27) remembers not only the “Beirut office … [where they] designed political posters and supervised the layout and illustration of countless PLO pamphlets and publications,” but also the “Dar al-Karameh” gallery in Beirut, a “meeting place hosting seasonal exhibitions of young talents emerging from the camps.” Palestinian colored posters, graphic work and art reproductions were as a rule highly invested works, and “became fixtures in almost every home in the camps, and indeed wherever Palestinians resided” (ibid.).

5 Dan Walsh, in a personal communication with me (June 29, 2015), in answer to my query about whether the writing in the poster was part of the original graphics or was later superimposed on the face of the poster.

6 Regarding the notion that specific economies and histories of extreme segregation lent to different “styles of apartheid,” Carmichael remembers: “there were important differences [between Alabama and Mississippi]. Alabama had much larger cities and heavy industry unheard of in Mississippi, the earth around Birmingham…had deposits of coal and iron ore…what Birmingham at that time really reminded me of was Johannesburg. South Africa: black miners doing the most dangerous and dirty work for a fraction of the pay of white miners, many of whom were trained in explosives and racism: once militant and progressive unions now hopelessly compromised; a racist, capitalist establishment referred to locally as “the big mules”; a history of violent class warfare; and an instinctively violent police force, used in the thirties to break unions and bust workers’ heads, now content to brutalize the to break unions and bust workers’ black movement. Rigidly segregated, this was South African-style apartheid.” (Carmichael and Thelwell 2003: 442; my italics.)

7 The PRC was looted during Israel’s invasion of West Beirut in September 1982; the infrastructure was demolished by a fatal car bomb in early 1983 (Feldman 2015:31-32).

8 For example, (Younis 2000:103-104) offers a synthesis of the “first phase” of African resistance to apartheid [my emphasis]:

[The African elite's] real powerlessness… was due to the lack of leverage …The sole function of the traditional African elite was social control, and for the educated elite it was to act as a moderating influence in African politics. Recognizing their resource weakness, they endeavored to compensate with the pressure of numbers that the African majority could provide. But mass mobilization was alien to the elite leaders…Furthermore…[t]heir problem was in misreading the class interests behind white domination, a misreading that was consistent with their preferred vision of evolutionary change and practiced tactics of appeals and deputations. But their repeated appeals to the British reflected the elite's additional misreading of the relationship between British imperialism and the settler-colonial project, attributing conflicts to ideological differences over color rather than to competition between capitals—foreign and national—over the benefits to be derived from the subordination and exploitation of the African majority… [However,] a new African
militance was beginning to appear from two sources: African workers flexing newfound leverage and a new generation of educated Africans disillusioned with the early ANC leaders' patience and tactics.

A similar class analysis is brought to bear in relation to the Palestinian resistance:

"while peasants and migrant workers could wreak havoc through rioting, they lacked leverage with which to force either the British or the Zionists into aborting their colonization designs. What they had was the means to pressure their traditional leaders into increasingly more militant stands… the leaders' inability to conceive that Britain could give their country away… Naive about the relationship between British imperialism and the Zionist movement, they imagined that they could persuade Britain to abandon its support for Jewish colonization of Palestine… the early leaders were easily duped by British concessions meant only to secure their cooperation until a particular wave of unrest had passed. The problem, ultimately, was the elite's ambivalence regarding British imperialism, armed and organized peasants, and non-Zionist Jews. (236)

9 That the Black Consciousness movement, as a subject, is referred to in the past tense is not intended in any way to suggest that the movement has “ended” or is “in the past”; the form is used merely in keeping with certain conventions of framing.

10 Stokely Carmichael changed his name to Kwame Turé in 1978. For consistency, this paper will refer to him throughout as Carmichael.

11 It would be beyond the present scope to locate the genealogy of early Black Consciousness thought in postcolonial writing.


13 Carmichael recycles variations of this statement at three different points in his autobiography, *Ready for a Revolution* (Carmichael and Thelwell, 2003:103; 113; 161). It comes from a comedic character called Junebug Jabbo Jones, created by SNCC around 1964. The character was at first invented to ridicule pompous professors at Howard University, but then came to symbolize the entire civil rights movement. The original quote attributed to Junebug is: “Effen yo' doan unnerstan' the principle of eternal contradiction, yo' sho ain't gonna unnerstan' diddly about Howard University. Nor about black life in these United States neither.” For more on Junebug, see: Lori Herring. (February 10, 2003). “Junebug Tells All,” *The Jackson Free Press*.

14 For example, Gaines (2012:196) has written of the cultural significance of the emergence of Black-owned radio stations in the 1960s.

15 See, for example, Carmichael’s internal debates on Marxism and ‘African socialism,’ in Carmichael and Thelwell (2003:600, 788).

16 In fact, according to Brady Thomas Heiner (2007:317), “it was only after [Michel Foucault] had witnessed evidence of the racially fashioned class warfare transpiring in the USA during that time, and had begun to inform himself about the radical anti-racist struggles being undertaken in the context of that war, that Foucault began to theorize power relations in any kind of explicit way. It wasn’t until he had read the writings of the Black Panthers that Foucault began to formulate the genealogical method of critique.”

17 “Black Art is the aesthetic and spiritual sister of the Black Power concept.” (Neal 1968:29).

18 Gaines (2012:197) references Paul Gilroy’s body of work on the “antiphonal aesthetics and political meaning of African American soul and hip-hop.” Kelley (1997) notes that, “as debates over the black aesthetic raged, the concept of soul was an assertion that there are ‘black ways’ of doing things, even if those ways are contested and the boundaries around what is ‘black’ are fluid.”
Batia Mishor, Editorial Secretary to Am Oved, was unable to locate the precise month of the book’s release in 1953. This makes it difficult to determine the chronology of events: was the second Hebrew edition published in consequence of the Habima production’s success?

The researcher David Fachler has examined the Teatron monthly in an unpublished report. He writes that in the July 1953 Teatron edition, the review of Habima’s Za’aki “seems to be mixed and not especially laudatory. The next month in August after the play attracted the attention of the top echelons of the Israeli government, the inside pages of the magazine were filed [sic] with photographs from the production as well as backstage. In addition there was a short note referring to the fame this production was receiving.” This helps in corroborating the claim that the play was not received especially well until interest in Cry was displayed by those in the “top echelons” of government. (Thanks to David Fachler for the use of his unpublished and unprinted work.)

Gurfein, Rivka. (April 7, 1952). “Cry the Beloved Country” (review), in: Al Hamishmar. (Hebrew.)

Ben Gurion, David. (July 2, 1953). Diary. (Ben Gurion Archives).


The author was probably the well-known music critic Azaria Rapoport. The article was called, "Cry the Beloved Country at Habima" (Ma’ariv, May 4, 1953).


“Za’aki va’ada umlala: Kibbutz nose’a le’hatzaga”/ “Cry the Beloved Committee: A Kibbutz Goes to the Theater”. (June 25, 1953[?]). Kibbutz newsletter, with a faded date. (Thanks to the research of Nitzan Tal, “Apartheid: The Global Itinerary” project, research in progress.)


Assaf, Oded (Tel Aviv University) -- “Oneg Shabbat” blog. http://onegshabbat.blogspot.co.il/2012/11/blog-post_29.html. Accessed 6/27/15. Note: The ‘Ron Choir’ was formed in 1945, at the initiative of the Communist Party; Konrad Mann was its director/conductor. The choir’s repertoire included Eretz Israel, Soviet and labor songs.


Maariv. (August 14, 1953)."The National Psychosis of Cry the Beloved Country”.

[Rapoport, A.?]. (May 4, 1953).’Cry the Beloved Country at Habima’. Ma’ariv.

Ben Haim, Shaul. (July 24, 1953). “Hakshim giyu sheyesh teatron ba’olam”. Yediot Ahronot;
Teatron, Vol. 2 (August 1953).

Ben Gurion himself, by that time, had long been familiar with Paton’s novel, which reached him via a South African Zionist channel, as well as through the Am Oved translation. Back in February 6, 1952, Ben Gurion had sent a letter to South African United Party member and Zionist activist Bertha Solomon in Johannesburg, thanking her for a copy of Cry the Beloved Country. In Johannesburg Solomon was mainly involved, very much like Paton in his early years, with the “Poor White Problem,” a Depression-era legacy of poor rural white farming populations, and tension between the two ruling white groups. The transfer of the book between Solomon and Ben Gurion probably took place in Jerusalem, where Solomon’s daughter and diplomat son-in-law were living.

From Sisulu’s own recollections of their arrival in Tel Aviv, in I Will Go Singing (2001:86): “It was midnight and we were pushed from pillar to post. Immigration officials did not know what to do. Ultimately interpreters were brought in and we explained the position that the South Africa regime was fascist and therefore we could not apply for passports. Then we were introduced properly to the officials, I as Secretary General of the ANC and Duma as Secretary General of the Youth League. We were kept until the early hours of the morning and then taken to the Ambassador Hotel in Tel Aviv with expenses fully paid for. We stayed for two weeks.” This vague account of events has the ANC leaders being kept at the airport until the early morning, which contradicts Ben Haim (July 24, 1953), who is very specific about Sisulu and Nokwe’s going to a Habima “50th performance of Cry”, and a celebration party, on the very night of their arrival, as if straight from the airport.

Bar Yosef (2013) has called attention to the fact that on Thursday, the evening of July 2, 1953, Ben Gurion and Dayan had photos taken of themselves and their wives together with the cast backstage during an interval. In his diary entry for that day Ben Gurion also mentions having gone to an after-show celebration party for Habima (Ben Gurion’s Diary, 1953. Ben Gurion Archives - http://bg-idea.bgu.ac.il/). Both the VIP appearance at the play and at the reported celebration party afterwards would have fomented the Israeli “psychosis of Cry the Beloved Country,” as reported in Maariv one month later.

Sisulu (2001:87), in his recollection of his second fortnight’s visit to Israel, describes his interaction with “Arabs” as mediated by the Communist Party, who “took us to the slums where the majority of Arabs lived.” Sisulu remarks that, “The CP was very critical about discriminatory practices against the Arabs...[who were] the object of greater scrutiny and interrogation.” Leaving aside the downplayed “discrimination” against Palestinians living under a military rule at the time, it appears that Sisulu’s exposure to Palestinians was obtained through the Israeli communist party—which was predominantly Euro-Israeli.

In Billboard of April 6, 1963, Azaria Rapoport relayed that, “the Manhattan Brothers, a group of South African performers,...are doing great business...at the Tel Aviv Zabra night club, where they close the show every night. Their star, Nathan Mdledle...[is] raising the roof.” (Rapoport, A., Apr 6, 1963, Billboard Magazine.) The Zabra nightclub was an off-mainstream joint owned by Jacob Zilbering, who had ties to gangs and underworld dealings. In his memoir, Joe Mogotsi recalls that the group “took part in a charity walk from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem to mark a Jewish festival.” The entirely Jewish-oriented Israel trip is also described in pp.77-78 in: Mantindane : ‘He Who Survives’ : My Life with the Manhattan Brothers, by Joe Mogotsi with Pearl Connor ; edited by John Patterson and Lars Rasmussen (2002).

Baldwin’s engagements with Israel-Palestine lasted throughout his career, shifting as he became one of the leading proponents of Black Consciousness (Feldman 2008: 203). He first came to Tel Aviv as the guest of the Israeli government, in 1961 (Feldman 2015:vii); he was “driven to the Negev desert in the south, the Dead Sea to the east, the Jerusalem hills, Tel Aviv’s famed cafes, Haifa’s art colony in the north, and a kibbutz near the Gaza Strip in the west,” writing, “Israel and I seem to like each other” (Baldwin, "Letters from a Journey," Harper's Magazine, May 1963: 48. Cited in Feldman, ibid.). Crucially, as Feldman shows, Baldwin’s time in Israel moved him towards a new aesthetics related to Black Consciousness, as he realized he “required a different kind of writing practice, one hinged on readerly interpretation.” According to Elinor Rogosin, Baldwin stayed with the Lionel Rogosin family in their Zahala home in the early 60s; she indicates that Baldwin was passing through Israel on the way to write an article on Africa for the New Yorker. (Elinor Rogosin. 2011. Chasing Love: A Mother's Journey. iUniverse Publishing).

Lionel Rogosin was an important anti-apartheid figure: in 1960, after the making of the anti-apartheid film Come Back Africa, Rogosin had been active in financing and helping both Bloke Modisane’s and Miriam Makeba’s escapes from South Africa.

“Belafonte Visits the Holy Land: Singer is Inspired by Shrines and the People of Israel”, in Ebony, December 1960: 166.

Ebony’s cover shows an orientalizing picture of a Western-style Belafonte riding a camel pulled along by a ‘native’ (Palestinian Bedouin) -- over which there is a large side-caption about ‘freedom coming to
83 million Africans’. *Ebony* states that Belafonte “talked to Arabs and Jews and investigated kibbutzim, synagogues and churches;” however, the Palestinian voice is absent. The final paragraphs of the article relay that, “as a sensitive observer, Harry was troubled by indices of apartness” in Israel -- but there is no effort to understand the logic of Israel’s “indices” of apartness.

43 While in New York, Makeba worked a cultural activist against apartheid; she also made statements at the UN.

   Meanwhile, her musical repertoire from her years in the Greenwich Village folk scene had continued to feature Zionist and Israeli songs. In 1963, Makeba and Belafonte were scheduled to guest star together in an Israeli Independence Day gala event in Israel (*Billboard*, April 6, 1963:78). Though this performance was eventually cancelled, Makeba did do six concerts in Israel in October 1964 (Louis Harap. December 1964.. “It Happened in Israel”. *Jewish Currents*, Vol. 18/11:9). For all intents and purposes, she had performed to a segregated charter audience of Tel Aviv, because at the time, Palestinian citizens were targeted under military rule where movement was restricted. Makeba’s Tel Aviv performances were held, according to the 1964 program bill, under the patronage of Golda Meir.

   Makeba’s former husband musician Hugh Masekela has stated that Makeba and Meir were friends during that period (source: Maskela, speaking in an interview in Mika Kaurismäki’s documentary film, *Mama Africa*, 2011). Makeba did not meet Palestinian resistance groups during her tour.

44 ---*Davar*, Nov 5, 1971 (also published in *Yediot Ahronot*, June 1, 1971 (cited in Oz Frankel 2012:97).

45 Nasser’s overthrow of the Farouk monarchy in 1952 led to “the exodus of many of [Egypt’s] foremost businessmen, industrialists and bankers... most chose Beirut [due to]... a key factor -- a government eager to welcome what turned out to be an extraordinary influx of the world’s corporate and financial representatives. Simultaneously, booming economies in Europe and the United States were developing a new interest in Middle East markets. The result, for Lebanon, was still another wave of immigrants added to the already extensive AUB group...” (Hoye and Mullin 1982).

46 As many as 19 AUB alumni were delegates to the signing of the United Nations Charter in 1945.


48 Clarno is citing the *Rand Daily Mail* of 23 Nov 1961. Full quote: “Israel is not consistent in this new anti-apartheid attitude. Otherwise they would have been prepared to be swamped and destroyed by the Arabs around them. But they took Israel from the Arabs after the Arabs had lived there for a thousand years. In that I agree with them. Israel, like South Africa, is an apartheid state” (my italics.) Interestingly, most scholars skip over the sentence emphasized above, as if it bears little importance. The ways in which Verwoerd’s 1961 analysis had been circulated to Sayegh, and how Sayegh construed Verwoerd’s analysis, is pending further archival research.


   “Nowhere in Asia or Africa — not even in South Africa or Rhodesia — has European race-supremacism expressed itself in so passionate a zeal for thoroughgoing racial exclusiveness and for physical expulsion of ‘native’ populations across the frontiers of the settler-state, as it has in Palestine, under the compulsion of Zionist doctrines” (24-25).


51 Carmichael and Thelwell (2003: 555); cf the discussion of this in the preceding section.


55 Wagner-Pacifici’s analytics of circulation are grounded in Austin’s (1975) notion of speech acts.


57 In fact, Carmichael (2003:558) describes three distinct “shockers,” namely, that:

1. “a great deal of the most incisive and persuasive critical writing was by Jewish writers who… opposed the militaristic expansionism underlying Zionist policies.”

2. “the principal Zionists—Herzl, Ben-Gurion, Begin…the Stern Gang [and] Zionist ideologues … openly reveal[ed] the naked colonialist intention at the heart of the Zionist enterprise.”

3. “the [third] shocker was … the close military, economic, and political alliance between the Israeli government and the racist apartheid regime in South Africa. Now this was a real shock since I knew that during World War II, the Afrikaner nationalists had fervently supported the Third Reich and had cultivated close associations with and had even organized themselves along the lines of the German Nazi Party.” Arguably, the “shocker” was realization of the force of the overlapping segregations, such that Israel’s segregation of Palestinians was perforce attached to both Nazism and apartheid in South Africa.

58 Malcolm X was one of the first revolutionary leaders to visit the Palestinian camps. Che Guevara had visited Gaza, on June 18, 1959, going to several Palestinian refugee camps. (Guevara’s visit is researched by Yoav Di-Capua; see: “Che in Gaza: Searching for the Story Behind the Image.”)


Feldman (ibid.) further implies that Minor’s Palestinian commitment may have come by way of Latin America -- which would elongate the circuitous route of transfer between the Palestinian struggle and Black Power. This long route is also suggested by Carmichael: “Our sister [Minor] had studied Latin American affairs and Middle Eastern history in college, after which she took a job in South America. There she met Palestinians who had been expelled from their homeland by the Zionist military. She began to investigate the issue” (2003:558).

The Carmichael-Thelwell autobiography does not shed much more light on the speculations, aside from the aforementioned and crucial data that SNCC’s Palestinian activity preceded the 1967 war by at least two years (ibid.: 558-59).

In an interview, (September 16, 2011:25) Kathleen Cleaver has stated that the research for the SNCC newsletter was actually undertaken by Jack Minnis, with Minor only drafting it up afterwards.


62 Given this, further research in the Arabic Palestinian archives is needed to understand how descriptive analyses of segregation had effectively operated at the Palestinian grassroots.
Ibrahim was at that time a representative of the PAC in London and was also representing South Africa on the Secretariat of the Afro-Asian Journalist Association.

Toynbee’s career had been closely associated with the British Foreign Office.


In his chapter, “Daniel Patrick Moynihan and the Quandary of Race,” Feldman (2015:43) discusses the career of U.S. liberal policymaker Daniel Patrick Moynihan, and the cultural knowledges Moynihan was promoting to overwritten Palestinian apartheid analyses at the UN.

Bartos and Hitchens (1994:1): the UN headquarters complex conjured a distant universe of “suits, briefcases and portfolios.”

According to Miriam Makeba’s autobiography. [See also “Electric Jive”:


“The integrationism, or Black Power (although that may be a shock to anyone who has been following the career so leveled by his own sadness. ‘He was never a depressed person while he was in South Africa,’ she said. But in Manhattan, he confessed to her that his mother had been institutionalized for mental illness when he was young and he feared going the same way she had.” From: Telephone interview of R.L. Brown with Nadine Gordimer, 4 November 2010, in: Brown , Ryan Lenora. (2011). “A Native of Nowhere: The Life of South African Journalist Nat Nakasa, 1937-1965”. Kronos 37(1).


Jewish Women’s Archives. (http://jwa.org/teach/golearn/apr10)

Of the better established 1960s Greenwich Village folk music venues, the Village Gate opened in 1958, and was owned by Art D’Lugoff; the Village Vanguard opened in 1935, and was owned Max Gordon; the Bitter End opened in 1961, and was owned by Fred Weintraub; the Cafe au Go Go opened in 1964, and was originally owned by Howard Solomon who sold it in 1969 to Moses Baruch. The Folklore Center opened in the 1960s and was run by Israel Young. The “Cafe Wha?” operated from 1959 to the late 1960s, and was owned by Manny Roth; it was then taken over by Menachem Dworkman. Other Greenwich Village folk hangouts included: Cafe Figaro, The Commons, The Gaslight, Cafe Bizarre, Gerdes Folk City, and Cafe Society. Greenwich Village folk music promoters, managers and record executives included Harry (Harold) Leventhal, who served as Miriam Makeba’s concert manager; Rob Schwaed (of Schwaed-Merenstein), who likewise worked as Makeba’s manager; Moses (Moe) Asch, who started Folkways Records in 1948; and the folk concert promoter George Wein, who was headquartered in Boston, but who worked with folk singers in the Village scene and co-founded the Newport Folk Festival with Pete Seeger and Theo Bikel. Though this may attest to an over-representation within the Greenwich Village folk revival music industry of Jewish owners/managers, it is impossible on this basis to determine the extent to which the respective music venues were the agents of Zionist (or counter-Zionist) activism in New York.

Bikel was later one of those who, with much fanfare, withdrew funds from SNCC after the 1967 publishing of its newsletter on “The Palestinian Question” (Blackman 2012:220). Bikel’s Greenwich Village home had been a civil rights hangout where Nina Simone, Lorraine Hansberry, Stokely Carmichael and James Forman had met often (Feldstein 2005:1353). Within a few years, all four moved toward a more radical counter-integrationism, or Black Power (although Hansberry died young, in 1965.)

It is also noteworthy that, in 1952, the performer Lena Horne, “a veteran of plenty Hadassah benefits in the States,” went to Israel to sing Hebrew tunes, for the “people just emerging from the kind of bondage Negroes have been struggling so long to emerge from” (Bennett and Kun, 2008).

There were many instances of anti-apartheid activism being incorporated seamlessly into the liberal integrationist ideology of the folk music genre; one example is Makeba and Belafonte’s (1965) anti-
apartheid album, recorded for Moses Asch’s Folkways. Of specific relevance were the liner notes and the song ‘N’demnyama’ (Beware Verwoerd) referencing the South African prime minister, and ‘Khawleza,’ about the fear of police terror of children and families (Harvey 2004.).

In 1966 Makeba and Belafonte received the Grammy Award for “Best Folk Recording” (Jet, March 31, 1966) for an album, An Evening with Belafonte/Makeba, singing against apartheid.

76 Billboard 15 Jun 1963:10: “Happy days have returned to the Village Gate, which has shed its recent jazz policy to welcome one of the finest folk artists to play there, Miriam Makeba […] There was good reason for the [good] response. Miss Makeba, in the period since her last engagement, has developed a considerable amount of new material, some of it international in origin. Her repertoire included songs of Israeli, Jewish and Spanish origin…”

77 The story of “Hava Nagila” holds interest in the context of the folk revival. “Hava Nagila” was originally designed to unite the ‘Yishuv’ after WW1 and the Balfour Declaration (Loeffler 2010:409-410); from Palestine it circulated to the Jewish-American folk song repertoire. In the 1960s, three New York Jewish songwriters (Comden, Green and Styne) wanted “to mix Lena Horne’s sexuality, civil rights, and Zionism” (Ghert-Zand 2012); later, Cuban filmmaker Santiago Alvarez chose Horne’s “Hava Nagila” for his film montage about Civil Rights struggle (ibid.) The film speaks to civil rights integrationism, and even heralds the American ‘founding fathers’.

According to Bennett and Kun’s blog, Lena Horne performed both “Now!” and the original “Hava Nagilah” at a major SNCC rally (Bennett and Kun, ibid.), effectively fusing civil rights and Zionism/Israeli segregation. Similarly, Harry Belafonte recalls that the two numbers for which he was best known were “The Banana Boat Song” and “Hava Nagila.” (Ghert-Zand, 2012).

78 Billboard (April 6, 1963:78) notes that “Miriam Makeba and Harry Belafonte are going to guest star in an Independence Day event, Israel.” However, the visit never took place.

79 Hostetter is citing Miriam Makeba, in Makeba, My Story, 1989:143-145.

80 It is safe to say that Makeba tried to distance herself from Israel-Palestine controversies, which nevertheless seemed to catch her up. When she married Carmichael, who was a controversial figure largely because of his view of Zionism as Western imperialism, she claimed that “[t]he man’s activities do not interest me, only the man himself.” (ibid.; Feldstein 2013b:79-80). In her New York days she adapted a liberal civil rights integrationism that was as un-controversial as possible: “I never interfered in the affairs of a country where I was being hosted. I did raise funds for different movements—for NAACP… for Dr. King; I joined various artists to raise funds because they were for good cause...” (Mabuza-Suttle 2005). The NAACP and the SCLC were precisely the ‘good causes’ to which Black Consciousness arose as an antithesis.

81 In 1955, the Village Voice reported the rising anger of residents at the fact that public spaces were taken over by hippies (Powers 2008); residents’ anger led to attempts to close down the most popular Village venues. In 1960, Cohen represented the cafes in court, objecting to what he termed a form of governmental “taste-control” (Powers 2008:91). By the mid-1960s Cohen would represent major folk-scene figureheads, such as Dizzy Gillespie, Langston Hughes and Miriam Makeba.

82 Letter from Maxwell T. Cohen to Stokely Carmichael, September 18, 1968. NYPL Archives.

83 For instance, Folkways Records produced The Sounds of Jerusalem by Yehuda Lev in 1959 (Billboard 16 Nov 1959:31), and the following year, in 1960, it released a four-song EP, South African Freedom Songs. In 1965, the label released This Land Is Mine: South African Freedom Songs (its tracks include “Sikalela Izwe Lakithi /We Protest for Our Land”).

84 William Tracy (1972) wrote of Fairuz’s 1971 performance in Houston, Texas, that the program was “especially tailored for America’s restless, TV-honed viewers”. Christopher Stone (2007) has observed that “Fairouz and company seem to pick when and where to sing her… Palestinian songs with equal care. In looking at reviews of some of her concerts throughout the years, it becomes clear that Fairouz, or those responsible for song selection, always knows her audience quite well. When she sings in Jordan or the Gulf, for example, where most of her audience is Palestinian, she breaks out the favorite Palestinian songs… When she toured the US in 2003, however,
it appears that she did not sing for Palestine—a fact that was noted on at least one Palestinian website that surmised critically that in the post September 11 atmosphere Fairouz was concerned about controversy. Similarly, Fairouz’s February 2005 concert in Montreal only contained one song “for” Palestine …

85 Far from stirring controversy with songs of a Palestinian homeland, Fairouz’s U.S. tour was even promoted by a “United States Information Agency,” which had sponsored the production of a documentary on Fairouz’s U.S. tour, to be distributed throughout the “Arab world”. (William Tracy 1972).

86 Cited in Feldman 2015:85. Restrictive covenants were “clauses in deeds to houses that restricted sale or use by others, usually African-Americans or Jews.” Source: Wayne State University: “1900-1949 Timeline - Detroit African American History Project”.

88 Circulation figures show the rapidity of the newspaper’s increasing popularity: “January 1962 – 150,000 circulation; February 1962 – 175,000 circulation; March 1962 – 200,000 circulation with 800,000 readers; April 1962 – 225,000 circulation with 900,000 readers; May 1962 – 300,000 circulation with 1.2 million readers: June 1962 – 310,000 circulation with 1.25 million readers; July 1962 – 360,000 circulation with 1.4 million readers…” (Smith 2002:64, endnote 2).

89 In this regard, it is interesting that the favorable reception of Alan Paton’s Cry the Beloved Country in the 1950s (in Israel) could be so dependent on a reading of the text as denoting the universality of the Judeo-Christian discourse.

90 The quote in context: “There's been one issue in particular—the question of justice for the Palestinian people—on which I seem to have made my most implacable enemies...This issue first surfaced publicly in 1967, just as I was stepping down from the SNCC chairmanship, but the roots were planted much earlier […] At Bronx Science, I attended study camps with the Young Socialists and Young Communist groups. We sang folk songs at these sessions. Here I learned to sing ‘Hava Nageela’ and to dance the hora. During the fifties, these young-left groups were unquestioningly pro-Zionist […] There was no discussion at all of the rights of the Palestinian people. None. Not in those circles. So it never occurred to me then, that there might be another side to the story. It was the early sixties before I encountered—in the pages of Muhammad Speaks—any discussion of Palestinian rights and resistance. This was before there was any mention on the American left of the injustices being done to the people. And as for the corporate media, forget it. Unless it was to characterize the Palestinian resistance as ‘terrorists.’” (Carmichael and Thelwell 2003:557).


92 Sohail Daulatzai posits “the Nation of Islam’s radical geographic remix of Black origins” (2012:1).

93 Said has stated that, “Until 1967, I didn’t think about myself as anything other than a person going about his work . . . . I was in New York when the Six Day War broke out and was completely shattered. The world as I understood it ended at that moment. I had been in the States for years but it was only now that I began to be in touch with other Arabs. By 1970 I was completely immersed in politics and the Palestinian resistance movement” (Edward W. Said, quoted in Tariq Ali, “Remembering Edward Said, 1935-2003”, as cited in Feldman 2015:147).

94 One of the journal’s earliest published articles treating explicitly of the issue of Palestine’s apartheid was: Brice Harris. (1984). “The South Africanization of Israel”. Arab Studies Quarterly 6(3).

95 Meanwhile, the union paper predictably denounced the mass-demonstrations against the purchase of Israel bonds, stating that Israel was “the only country in the Middle East with a free democratic labor movement and a freely elected Labor Party government” (Georgakas & Surkin1998:66).
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