

# Neoliberal Apartheid

PALESTINE/ISRAEL AND  
SOUTH AFRICA AFTER 1994

Andy Clarno

The University of Chicago Press CHICAGO & LONDON

# Racial Capitalism and Settler Colonialism

Two of the most significant social transformations of the late twentieth century began just months apart. In September 1993, Yitzhak Rabin and Yasser Arafat shook hands on the White House lawn, unveiling the “Oslo peace process” between Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO). The following April, Nelson Mandela cast his ballot—along with millions of other Black South Africans—in the first democratic election of the postapartheid era. These moments of hope remain powerful symbols of the simultaneous transitions that have reshaped social relations in Palestine/Israel and South Africa over the last twenty years.

The transitions have had remarkably different impacts on the political freedom of Palestinians and Black South Africans. Dismantling the apartheid state freed Black South Africans from political domination by the white minority. The South African state was democratized and deracialized and Black South Africans gained formal legal equality. This victory in the struggle against white supremacy has made South Africa a beacon of hope for millions. Palestinians, on the other hand, won neither freedom nor equality through the formation of the Palestinian Authority (PA). The State of Israel remains a settler colonial state, retains full sovereign control over the entire territory of Palestine/Israel,<sup>2</sup> and continues to colonize Palestinian land and displace Palestinian people.

Scholars and activists increasingly turn to South Africa to make sense of current conditions in Palestine/Israel, to explore strategies of resistance, and to conceptualize possible futures. For many observers, South Africa represents a principled rejection of settler colonialism, a model of a one-state solution,

humanity. In addition, the Palestinian Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions (BDS) campaign has made tremendous gains building on the tactics of the South African antiapartheid movement. As Ali Abunimah argues, "The hope held out by South Africa is that when Israelis and Palestinians finally do concede that separation is unachievable, there is an example of an alternative to perpetual conflict."<sup>3</sup>

As Palestinians draw inspiration from South African liberation, it is productive to consider not only the achievements of the liberation movement but also its limitations. Postapartheid South Africa remains one of the most unequal countries in the world. A small Black elite and a growing Black middle class have emerged alongside the old white elite, who still control the vast majority of land and wealth in the country. The Black poor have been relegated to a life of permanent unemployment, informal housing, and high rates of HIV/AIDS in the townships and shack settlements of the urban periphery. Upper- and middle-class South Africans—white and Black—surround their homes with brick walls and electric fences, put gates around their neighborhoods, and hire private security companies for protection. Racialized anxieties about "Black crime" have led residents' associations and private security companies to develop cutting-edge strategies for regulating the presence of the Black poor in wealthy neighborhoods.

Strikingly similar socioeconomic changes have occurred in Palestine/Israel. While a Jewish Israeli business elite accumulates tremendous wealth, working-class Israelis face cuts to social welfare and attacks on union labor. At the same time, a small Palestinian elite with close ties to the PA has grown rich, but the vast majority of Palestinians confront unemployment, land confiscation, and constant repression. With restricted access to the Israeli labor market, Palestinians from the West Bank increasingly depend on jobs with the PA, informal economic activities, and undocumented work in Israel and the settlements. Meanwhile, the State of Israel is building a series of walls and fences around Jerusalem and other Palestinian communities in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. A racialized discourse of "Palestinian/Arab/Muslim terrorism" has shaped the emergence of a network of coordinated security forces—involving Israel, the United States, the European Union, Jordan, and the Palestinian Authority—that police Palestinians in the West Bank.

Given the divergent political transitions, what accounts for the simultaneous development of extreme inequality, racialized poverty, and advanced strategies for securing the powerful and policing the poor in South Africa and Palestine/Israel over the last twenty years? And what does this teach us about

*liberal Apartheid*, I address these questions through a comparative analysis of the simultaneous transitions in South Africa and Palestine/Israel since the early 1990s. Situating these transitions in a global context, *Neoliberal Apartheid* is the first comparative study of postapartheid South Africa and post-Oslo Palestine/Israel. It addresses the limitations of transformation in South Africa, highlights the political economy of Palestine/Israel, and argues that a new form of "neoliberal apartheid" has emerged in both South Africa and Palestine/Israel. Overall, *Neoliberal Apartheid* examines how the shifting relationship between racism, capitalism, colonialism, and empire has generated inequality and insecurity, marginalization and securitization in South Africa, Palestine/Israel, and other parts of the world.

#### SOUTH AFRICA AND PALESTINE/ISRAEL

Israel is not consistent in this new anti-apartheid attitude . . . they took Israel away 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.

SOUTH AFRICAN PRIME MINISTER HENDRIK VERWOERD,  
*Rand Daily Mail*, 1961

For nearly fifty years, scholars and activists have drawn comparisons between Palestine/Israel and South Africa.<sup>4</sup> In the early 1970s, Palestinian intellectuals pointed to similarities between the Bantustan strategy in South Africa and Israeli proposals for Palestinian "autonomy" in the West Bank and Gaza Strip.<sup>5</sup> By the 1980s, critical Israeli scholars had declared Israel an "apartheid state"<sup>6</sup> and suggested that Gaza was "the Soweto of the State of Israel."<sup>7</sup>

The comparisons grew increasingly common after 1994. Human rights organizations began denouncing the "Bantustanization" of the West Bank<sup>8</sup> and Edward Saïd drew attention to the racism and segregation that were entrenching an "Israeli apartheid system."<sup>9</sup> In 2001, the comparison gained global prominence at the World Conference against Racism (WCAR) in Durban, South Africa, where the NGO Forum issued a powerful statement that declared Israel an "apartheid state."<sup>10</sup> Since that time, scholars, activists, and even a former US president have drawn comparisons between South Africa and Palestine/Israel in an effort to understand and challenge Israeli apartheid.<sup>11</sup>

All of the recent comparisons focus on South Africa *before* 1994 and Palestine/Israel *after* 1994.<sup>12</sup> Overall, they demonstrate that the regime of political domination in Palestine/Israel today is an updated—and potentially more

legal system in the occupied territories, with Israeli settlers subject to Israeli civil law and Palestinians subject to Israeli military rule. They document the formal legal discrimination against Palestinians who became citizens of Israel after 1948. They trace similarities between the South African “pass laws” and the permit regime that the State of Israel uses to classify, track, and control the movement of Palestinians from the occupied territories. They explain the parallels between the fragmented Palestinian enclosures in the West Bank and Gaza Strip and the Bantustans in apartheid-era South Africa. They argue that a Palestinian state comprised of these isolated enclosures would be both illegitimate and unviable. And they demonstrate that the UN International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid applies to Israeli practices in Palestine/Israel today.

Building on these insightful and productive studies, *Neoliberal Apartheid* advances the comparison in two ways. First, whereas most research on Palestine/Israel concentrates on the political dynamics of state violence, my research analyzes the political economy of settler colonialism and racial capitalism. In doing so, it engages with well-established traditions of South African scholarship and contributes to an emerging body of critical political-economic scholarship on Palestine/Israel. Exploring the connections between capitalism and colonialism allows for attention to the role of neoliberal restructuring in the Oslo process. This not only extends the analysis of Israeli rule, it also helps situate Palestine/Israel in the global context and emphasizes connections between struggles.

Second, this study brings the comparison into the present by analyzing South Africa after 1994. While many scholars and activists recognize the limitations of liberation in South Africa, comparative studies have not yet analyzed these limitations or considered their implications for Palestine/Israel. By setting aside the postapartheid era, existing comparative studies often bolster the myth of the “new South Africa” and the assumption that deracializing the state is equivalent to decolonization. In this book, I challenge that assumption through a study of marginalization and securitization in postapartheid South Africa.

Through a political-economic analysis of the simultaneous transitions of the last twenty years, *Neoliberal Apartheid* provides an account of the diverging trajectories of state transformation and the converging processes of social and economic restructuring in South Africa and Palestine/Israel. In doing so, it situates Palestine/Israel and South Africa within the shifting post-Cold War world historical context—including contestations over the hegemony of

and the resurgence of social movements against capitalism, racism, war, and empire.<sup>13</sup>

## SETTLER COLONIALISM AND RACIAL CAPITALISM

Two fields of critical interdisciplinary scholarship provide the foundations for my analysis of the transitions in South Africa and Palestine/Israel: settler colonialism and racial capitalism. Settler colonialism provides an important framework for analysis because of its focus on land, race, and the state as well as the questions that it generates about “decolonization.” Considering racial capitalism is indispensable because it focuses analytic attention on the connections between racism, capitalism, colonialism, and empire; the shifting articulations between race and class; and the impacts of neoliberal restructuring.

### Settler Colonialism

Settler colonialism is a form of colonization marked by ongoing efforts to displace local populations and expropriate their land in order to establish or expand a society dominated by settlers. Common in the 1960s and 1970s but rare in the 1980s and 1990s, studies of settler colonialism have reemerged in recent years, especially within the fields of indigenous studies and Palestine studies.<sup>14</sup>

At the core of settler colonial projects are *land, race, and the state*. Colonization, in this sense, refers to the process of establishing control over land through displacement, expropriation, and settlement.<sup>15</sup> Settler colonialism operates through racial projects that devalue and dehumanize “native” populations, provide “ethical” or “legal” arguments for dispossession, and contribute to the formation of racialized structures of settler domination. Among the most important of these structures is the settler state, which provides a powerful tool for dispossession, exploitation, and domination.<sup>16</sup>

In work that helped spark the revival of settler colonial studies, Patrick Wolfe explains that settler colonial projects prioritize the “elimination of the native” in order to build a settler society on expropriated land.<sup>17</sup> Lorenzo Veracini adds that settler colonialism is distinct from other forms of colonization because it is premised on the elimination rather than the exploitation of indigenous populations.<sup>18</sup> Although Veracini and Wolfe acknowledge that the logic of elimination intersects in complex ways with capitalist demands for labor, much of the recent scholarship has emphasized colonization *rather than* capitalism.

ies.<sup>19</sup> As Omar Jabary Salamanca, Mezna Qato, Kareem Rabie, and Sobhi Samour point out, the analysis of Zionism as a settler colonial project is part of a broader reorientation of scholarship and activism away from a narrow focus on the occupied territories toward a more comprehensive focus on Israeli practices toward Palestinians inside Israel, in the occupied territories, and in the diaspora.<sup>20</sup> The settler colonial paradigm has informed new research on the mass displacement of Palestinians in 1948, racial formation and contestations over citizenship among Palestinians who became citizens of Israel after 1948 (also known as 1948 Palestinians), the urban landscape of Jerusalem, and permanent war and securitization.<sup>21</sup>

South Africa, on the other hand, holds an ambiguous place in recent studies of settler colonialism because Europeans sought to exploit and not just expel the African population. Yet there was never a simple opposition between colonization and exploitation. Although the exploitation of cheap African labor became a defining feature of South African capitalism after the discovery of gold and diamonds, the growing demand for labor did not replace or diminish the settler colonial demand for land. Indeed, South African history reveals the importance of analyzing the context-specific relationships between capitalism and colonialism in settler colonial states.

A few critical scholars have recently begun exploring these relationships.<sup>22</sup> Glen Coulthard, for instance, builds on Karl Marx's concept of "primitive accumulation" to analyze dispossession in settler colonial states.<sup>23</sup> He argues that settler colonial projects require us to rework Marx's theory by demonstrating that dispossession is an *ongoing* process that cannot be reduced to violence and is not necessarily progressive. Situating settler colonialism in relation to capitalism, Coulthard reveals that settler colonial dispossession is a strategy for simultaneously eliminating an unwanted population and accumulating land and wealth.

In addition, Taiaiake Alfred, Audra Simpson, Alyosha Goldstein, Glen Coulthard, and Elizabeth Povinelli have critiqued a late twentieth-century paradigm of settler colonial rule that involves the "recognition" of indigenous subjects and their incorporation into forms of limited self-government.<sup>24</sup> Like "color-blind" racism, recognition is a neoliberal form of rule that operates through symbolic denials of ongoing racial domination. My analysis of (de)colonization in South Africa and Palestine/Israel treats these strategies as important components of neoliberal apartheid.

Finally, Jodi Byrd, Shona Jackson, Barbara Krauthamer, and Lisa Lowe have studied the complex interconnections between dispossession and exploita-

European settlers.<sup>25</sup> Jackson, for instance, highlights the importance of labor for claims to "indigeneity" by the Creole descendants of formerly enslaved African and indentured South Asian workers in Guyana.<sup>26</sup> Holding positions of power in the postcolonial state, members of the Creole population employ a discourse of belonging grounded in labor that establishes their connection to the land while reinforcing the marginalization and ongoing displacement of the indigenous population. Rather than treating dispossession and exploitation as mutually exclusive or establishing strict distinctions between settler colonialism and other forms of colonialism, I follow these scholars in highlighting their interconnections.

In *Neoliberal Apartheid*, I analyze Israel and South Africa as settler colonial states, with attention to the relationship between colonialism and capitalism. Rather than focusing on the initial moment of colonization and state formation, however, I concentrate on the process of "(de)colonization."<sup>27</sup> In the 1980s, South Africa and Israel stood out as settler states that survived struggles against colonial rule that transformed Africa and the Middle East between the 1950s and 1970s. By the early 1990s, however, South Africa and Israel had begun negotiations with representatives of national liberation movements—the African National Congress (ANC) and the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO). Many hoped that these negotiations would fulfill popular demands for decolonization.

As Patrick Wolfe points out, "settler colonialism is relatively impervious to regime change."<sup>27</sup> What constitutes decolonization in a settler colonial state? My analysis concentrates on questions of *land, race*, and the *state* because of their centrality to settler colonial projects. In terms of the state, South Africa and Palestine/Israel have followed fundamentally different trajectories over the last twenty years. While the South African state was democratized, Israel remains a settler colonial state within which Palestinians in the occupied territories exercise a limited form of neoliberal self-government. Analyzing the questions of land and race reinforces the conclusion that the Oslo process has entrenched rather than reversed settler colonialism in Palestine/Israel. Considering land and race in South Africa, on the other hand, highlights the incomplete nature of decolonization in the postapartheid state. Although the state no longer actively colonizes the land of Black South Africans, the vast majority of land remains in the hands of the old white elite. And South African social structures remain highly racialized. In using the term "(de)colonization," therefore, I am referencing the continuation of colonization in Palestine/Israel and the limits of decolonization in South Africa.

The revival of settler colonial studies thus provides an important foundation for my research. To fully appreciate the relationship between racism and capitalism in settler colonial projects, however, requires engaging with emerging scholarship on racial capitalism. Despite overlapping subjects of inquiry, settler colonialism and racial capitalism remain largely separate fields of study. *Neoliberal Apartheid* reframes the conversation by considering the relationship between the (de)colonization of settler colonial states and the neoliberalization of racial capitalism.

### Racial Capitalism

Our struggle for national liberation is directed against the system of racial capitalism which holds the people of Azania in bondage for the benefit of the small minority of white capitalists and their allies, the white workers and the reactionary sections of the black middle class.

THE AZANIAN MANIFESTO, 1984

During the 1970s and 1980s, South Africa was the focus of urgent debates about the relationship between racial domination and capital accumulation.<sup>28</sup> A dialogue between Marxists and radical intellectuals from the Black Consciousness Movement generated an innovative analysis of apartheid as a system of “racial capitalism.”<sup>29</sup> Codified in the 1984 Azanian Manifesto, the critique of racial capitalism included the role of the white working class and parts of the Black middle class in supporting the white capitalist elite and the racial state. Unless racism and capitalism were confronted together, South African radicals predicted, postapartheid South Africa would remain divided and unequal. The transition has lent support to their thesis. In the words of the late Neville Alexander, “what we used to call the apartheid-capitalist system has simply given way to the post-apartheid-capitalist system.”<sup>30</sup>

In deploying the concept of racial capitalism, I draw on decades of struggle and scholarship. Intellectuals involved in abolitionist, antiracist, anticolonial, Third Worldist, communist, transnational feminist, and antiglobalization struggles have offered penetrating critiques of the interlocking systems of racism and capitalism.<sup>31</sup> Among the most important early scholars, W. E. B. Du Bois, C. L. R. James, and Eric Williams stand out for demonstrating that industrial capitalism was built on a foundation of colonialism and slavery.<sup>32</sup> Within American sociology, black radicals such as Du Bois, St. Claire Drake, Horace Cayton, and Oliver Cromwell Cox established a foundation for academic research on the entanglements of racism and capitalism.<sup>33</sup> Beginning

in the 1980s, Cedric Robinson drew on their work to articulate a theory of racial capitalism.<sup>34</sup> Although debates about the relationship between racism and capitalism have not produced a unified theoretical framework, they have generated a set of powerful tools that I draw on in my analysis of racial capitalism in South Africa and Palestine/Israel.

At the core of the concept of racial capitalism—as I use the term—is the recognition that racialization and capital accumulation are mutually constitutive processes that combine in dynamic, context-specific formations.<sup>35</sup> The study of racial capitalism thus draws attention to the colonial conquests, imperial rule, and coercive labor regimes that have always been integral to the accumulation of capital and the formation of racialized social structures.<sup>36</sup> Although there is debate about whether racism preceded or emerged alongside the capitalist world economy,<sup>37</sup> capitalism consistently operates through racial projects that assign differential value to human life and labor.<sup>38</sup> Yet racism cannot be reduced to an effect of capitalism; rather, processes of racial formation are relatively autonomous from and constitutive of capital accumulation.<sup>39</sup> While white supremacy may intensify exploitation by devaluing Black labor, it can also generate “necropolitical” projects that equate the security of the white population with the elimination of Black, indigenous, or other devalued populations.<sup>40</sup>

Analyzing racial capitalism challenges us to recognize the centrality of two crucial but often-overlooked aspects of capitalism: *accumulation by dispossession* and *coercive labor regimes*. Dispossessing people of their land and resources is not merely a precursor to capitalism but rather a constant, normal strategy of capital accumulation—from the English commons and the conquest of the Americas to the Iraqi oil fields and the privatization of public goods.<sup>41</sup> In South Africa and Palestine/Israel, therefore, forcible dispossession is not merely a settler colonial strategy but also a racialized process of capital accumulation. Similarly, violent forms of labor exploitation such as slavery, sharecropping, indentured servitude, debt peonage, convict labor, and sweatshops are not aberrations but integral features of capitalism.<sup>42</sup> Alongside the forcible *exploitation* of racially devalued populations, racial capitalist strategies often involve *exclusionary* efforts to reserve jobs for privileged groups. The histories of racial capitalism in South Africa and Palestine/Israel demonstrate the shifting relationship between coercive exploitation and exclusionary protection.

Moreover, racial capitalism generates complex interconnections between dispossession and exploitation. Sometimes dispossession leads directly to exploitation, as demonstrated by the enclosure of the English commons or the transatlantic slave trade.<sup>43</sup> Yet dispossession can also generate abandonment,

expulsion, or genocide rather than exploitation.<sup>44</sup> As Saskia Sassen explains, global capitalism today operates through a “logic of expulsion” that increasingly dispossesses people of jobs, homes, lands, and welfare benefits.<sup>45</sup> In much of the world, including South Africa and Palestine/Israel, neoliberal restructuring has intensified both exploitation and abandonment by producing surplus populations that exist at the margins of the capitalist economy where widespread structural unemployment exacerbates the exploitation of the precariously employed.

To analyze specific formations of racial capitalism, I draw on the concept of “articulation” as developed by Stuart Hall.<sup>46</sup> Like the concept of intersectionality, articulation provides a framework for analyzing interlocking structures of oppression and exploitation.<sup>47</sup> Building on the work of Antonio Gramsci,<sup>48</sup> Hall emphasized the double meaning of articulation: “joining up” and “giving expression to.”<sup>49</sup> Based on the first meaning, Hall analyzes the “complex unities” formed by the interconnection of relatively autonomous racial and capitalist projects. Rejecting the notion of a constant or stable relationship between race and class, this framework draws analytical attention to the concrete connections between specific racial and capitalist projects within particular historical conjunctures. In doing so, it recognizes that racial and capitalist projects often operate independently or in contradictory combinations. Racial projects that operate through logics of elimination or genocide, for instance, do not articulate easily with capitalist logics of exploitation.<sup>50</sup> They might, however, align with exclusionary racial capitalist projects to protect well-paying jobs for the privileged. Analyzing the articulation between racial and capitalist projects (even when contradictory) facilitates an exploration of the interlocking (though unstable) aspects of an overall social formation. This is what Hall refers to as a *complex unity*.

Drawing out the second meaning of articulation as expression, Hall encourages attention to the ways that people make sense of their subjectivity—as well as the ways that political actors manipulate this subjectivity.<sup>51</sup> Complex social realities that are shaped by combinations of racism and capitalism often find expression in discourses that do not account for this complexity. Because these discourses shape political, ideological, and economic struggles, they are integral to an analysis of racial capitalism. Gillian Hart, for instance, argues that the hegemonic project of the African National Congress (ANC) government in postapartheid South Africa depends on its ability to rearticulate popular currents of nationalism.<sup>52</sup> Likewise, discourses of Palestinian nationalism have been rearticulated in recent decades with different political currents emphasizing the centrality of race, class, religion, and/or nationality. In discussing

securitization, I analyze the racialized discourses about “Black crime” and “Palestinian/Arab/Muslim terrorism” that articulate anxieties rooted in long histories of racial capitalism and settler colonialism and exacerbated by neoliberalization and (de)colonization.

In South Africa and Palestine/Israel, the transitions of the 1990s rearticulated the relationship between racism, capitalism, colonialism, and empire. Central to both transitions was the promise that “deracialized” neoliberal capitalism was integral to decolonization: neoliberal restructuring would facilitate the democratization of the South African state and the emergence of an independent Palestinian state. In practice, however, restructuring has led to a shift in the state form with partial decolonization in South Africa and a continuation of settler colonialism in Palestine/Israel; a rearticulation of the relationship between race and class within contexts of expanding inequality and racialized poverty; and an increasing reliance on violence to police the racialized poor and secure the powerful. Echoing concerns Frantz Fanon raised about the “pitfalls” of national consciousness, my analysis draws attention to the incorporation of the Black and Palestinian middle and upper classes into the regimes of neoliberal racial capitalism.<sup>53</sup>

#### THE NEOLIBERALIZATION OF RACIAL CAPITALISM

*Neoliberal Apartheid* presents an analysis of the neoliberalization of racial capitalism in South Africa and Palestine/Israel over the last twenty years. Neoliberalism is a political-economic theory that has been described as “market fundamentalism.”<sup>54</sup> Insisting that market competition is the most efficient mechanism for generating prosperity and protecting individual liberty, neoliberal economists reject the Keynesian notion that governments should provide social safety nets or promote full employment. Overturning the Fordist principle that businesses can maximize profits by increasing wages and promoting mass consumption, neoliberals encourage corporations to search the world for the cheapest labor and production costs. Neoliberal projects, therefore, include free trade, privatization, deregulation, corporate tax breaks, and cuts in social spending; attacks on unions, welfare, and affirmative action; and the promotion of individualism, self-responsibility, and entrepreneurialism. The global diffusion of neoliberal policies since the 1970s has led to the rise of multinational corporations, the growth of finance capital, spiraling inequality, and environmental degradation. Although popularly understood as a withdrawal of the state from the economy, neoliberal restructuring requires state intervention to support market competition and to address the crises that it generates.

In recent years, scholars of racial capitalism and settler colonialism have focused on the racial dynamics of neoliberalism. The neoliberal “color-blind” mantra of individual achievement and meritocracy, along with the liberal multicultural politics of “recognition,” denies the continued significance of racism and enables assaults on corrective policies such as welfare, affirmative action, and land redistribution. It is no surprise that neoliberal critiques of “big government” push back most aggressively against programs perceived as racially redistributive—such as affirmative action, reparations, or indigenous land claims.<sup>55</sup> In addition, neoliberal policies often combine a formal commitment to legal equality with a privatization of racism. Rather than institutionalized state policies, therefore, continued segregation in housing and education as well as the ongoing dispossession of native communities are portrayed as simply the outcomes of “individual choices” exercised through the market.<sup>56</sup> And, in a groundbreaking study, Jodi Melamed traces the ways that the US government promotes the combination of neoliberalism and multiculturalism as a solution (or *the* solution) to racism and colonialism. As her work makes clear, “neoliberalism remains a form of racial capitalism.”<sup>57</sup>

Building on this scholarship, my research focuses on the concrete processes of neoliberal restructuring. As Neil Brenner, Nik Theodore, Jamie Peck, and Adam Tickell have argued, neoliberal projects do not simply replace one hegemonic ideology with another.<sup>58</sup> Rather, neoliberal restructuring—or *neoliberalization*—is a context-specific process of social change in which market-based projects attempt to transform entrenched patterns of social organization. Neoliberalization, therefore, is an uneven and contested process that is never complete. Rather than pure expressions of neoliberal ideology, the products of neoliberal restructuring are hybrid formations. Moreover, neoliberal projects are internally contradictory and generate struggles and crises that in turn must be managed. Initial rounds of neoliberalization to “roll back” Keynesian policies often result in a social, political, or economic crisis. When they do, policy makers generally respond with a second round of neoliberalization to “roll out” market-based strategies for containing the crisis. In a context of deepening inequality, for instance, the growth of the private security industry is a neoliberal response to a crisis generated by neoliberal restructuring. As a result, Peck argues, the uneven process of neoliberalization is shaped by constant interventions and innovations to manage the tension between markets and order.<sup>59</sup>

My research opens new ground by analyzing the neoliberalization of racial capitalism. Studying the process through which racial capitalist regimes are restructured along market lines means analyzing the articulation between

neoliberalization and racialization. As Michael Omi and Howard Winant point out, neoliberal projects *are* racial projects.<sup>60</sup> At the same time, neoliberal projects intersect with a range of other projects—including racial, colonial, and imperial projects—that are not primarily about capital accumulation. This requires attention to the complex formations that result from the articulation of simultaneous projects to rework or defend existing social relations. Because neoliberalism is widely promoted as an antidote to racial inequality, neoliberal projects are often combined with projects to extend formal equality, partial autonomy, or even nominal independence to historically subordinated populations. Rather than eliminating racism, these projects restructure relations of domination. The neoliberal racial capitalist regimes produced by the articulation of these projects are generally characterized by two features: *marginalization* and *securitization*.

In *Neoliberal Apartheid*, I analyze the relationship between the neoliberalization of racial capitalism and the (de)colonization of settler colonial regimes in South Africa and Palestine/Israel. Until the 1980s, South Africa and Israel were settler colonial states managing racial Fordist economies defined by state support for industrial and agricultural production, racialized welfare states, and split labor markets. Since the 1990s, neoliberal restructuring in both contexts has been coupled with political negotiations to overturn or at least restructure colonial domination. Studying the transitions, therefore, requires attention to the shifting colonial strategies and racial projects that have occurred alongside neoliberal restructuring. The South African state was democratized, but the neoliberalization of racial capitalism has placed important limits on decolonization. In Palestine/Israel, on the other hand, neoliberal restructuring has been coupled with an aggressive Israeli settler colonial strategy that involves the extension of limited autonomy to the Palestinian population in the occupied territories.

In both South Africa and Palestine/Israel, neoliberalization and (de)colonization have generated social formations marked by: extreme inequality, racialized marginalization, advanced securitization, and constant crises. I refer to this combination as *neoliberal apartheid*. In the following chapters, I explore each of these features in detail through ethnographically grounded analyses before developing the concept of neoliberal apartheid in the conclusion. First, however, I want to briefly discuss the two processes at the heart of neoliberal apartheid: marginalization and securitization. While processes of restructuring are context specific, many readers will recognize aspects of neoliberal apartheid in other locations.



### Inequality and Marginalization

Throughout the world, neoliberalization has exacerbated inequality and generated extreme forms of marginalization.<sup>61</sup> Wealth and income are increasingly concentrated in the hands of a transnational class of billionaire capitalists. While the corporate elite and the upper strata of the middle classes reap the rewards of neoliberal wealth redistribution, the ground collapses beneath the lower middle classes, the gulf between rich and poor grows wider, and the poorest of the poor live precarious lives in a world without stable employment or support from the state.

The racial dynamics of this inequality are complex. First, the neoliberalization of racial capitalist systems has led to the growth of middle and upper classes among historically subjugated populations.<sup>62</sup> The expansion of the black and Latino middle classes in the United States is matched by the growth of middle classes and elites in parts of the Global South—from China and India to South Africa and Palestine/Israel. The lifting of explicit racial barriers to higher education, employment, and finance along with the political independence of formerly colonized countries and shifting immigration policies have created opportunities for some members of racially subjugated populations to benefit from neoliberal restructuring. Taken out of context, the shifting racial composition of the middle and upper classes is often used to demonstrate that neoliberal capitalism can end racial discrimination. While upward mobility can provide these emergent classes with relief from some forms of oppression, they nevertheless confront ongoing discrimination due to the continued prevalence of racism. Moreover, their class mobility is coupled with expanding inequality between rich and poor and the growing instability of the middle classes.

Second, neoliberal restructuring has transformed existing patterns of racialized exploitation.<sup>63</sup> In advanced industrial countries, deindustrialization; cuts in public sector employment; the privatization of public services; and attacks on unions, welfare, and affirmative action force workers to compete with one another for low-wage, precarious jobs in the expanding retail and service sectors. Workers of color—especially women—are particularly vulnerable to these changes. As multinational corporations shift production to low-wage manufacturers in the Global South, countries compete for investment by promising low wages, long hours, no unions, and tax breaks, and by articulating racial, national, and gendered notions about the work ethic and capabilities of workers. Flows of capital are heavily influenced by these racial formations, which mark some populations as highly exploitable and others as lazy, undisciplined,

or simply redundant.<sup>64</sup> Migrant workers and slum dwellers are particularly targeted for superexploitation.

Finally, one of the most important impacts of neoliberal restructuring is the production of racialized surplus populations.<sup>65</sup> Much of the world has experienced rapid population growth alongside decreasing capitalist demands for labor due to advances in automation and robotics, the shift from productive to financial investments, the regional concentration of low-wage manufacturing, and the global crisis of subsistence farming. Several billion people now live precarious lives at or beyond the margins of the wage system. Racial formation shapes the production of surplus populations by differentially valuing human life and marking some people as disposable. Yet it is important to recognize that even populations experiencing extreme levels of unemployment are not beyond the dynamics of racial capitalism.<sup>66</sup> The disposable poor remain valuable both materially and symbolically. Competition for jobs ensures the availability of a low-wage workforce, informal economic activities involve intense exploitation, and the need for food, shelter, and other basic necessities subjects the poor to predatory practices by merchants and landlords. In addition, as symbols of danger, the racialized poor are integral to the expansion of security regimes. The first part of this book examines the dynamics of marginalization in South Africa and Palestine/Israel, with a focus on the expansion of racialized poverty and the relationship between exploitation and disposability.

An overwhelmingly urban phenomenon, the racialized poor are concentrated in slums, ghettos, favelas, banlieues, and refugee camps. Facing economic, political, social, and physical violence on a daily basis, the lives of the urban poor are defined by multiple, intersecting forms of precariousness. Fragmented and abandoned, they endure tremendous suffering. Their subjectivities are complex. People invest their hopes and fears in everything from the seductive promises of neoliberalism and the apparent stability of low-wage jobs to the exercise of domination over family members, neighbors, strangers, and racialized Others. Yet the poor also develop innovative and exhausting strategies to survive. They move between precarious low-wage jobs, long-term unemployment, and a host of tactics—often dangerous, degrading, and unsanctioned—to make ends meet. They build homes without permits, provide support for one another, and push back against the forces of marginalization.

Marginalization does not inevitably generate resistance.<sup>67</sup> Yet the last twenty years have witnessed spontaneous uprisings and organized movements throughout the world as the racialized poor target the forces of capitalism, racism, colonialism, and empire. Localized processes of political articulation give voice to the critiques and grievances of the poor and shape their struggles.<sup>68</sup>

But these struggles also circulate from city to city and region to region, generating opportunities for marginalized populations to articulate connections between their experiences, subjectivities, and desires. In recent years, these struggles and connections have helped translate the everyday crises confronting the poor into constant crises for neoliberal racial capitalist regimes. My analysis of marginalization ends with a discussion of these dynamics in South Africa and Palestine/Israel.

### Insecurity and Securitization

The insecurities of dominant classes and racial groups are rooted in a foundational contradiction at the heart of racism, capitalism, and colonialism: wealth and power are produced through domination, exploitation, and dispossession.<sup>69</sup> The working class is not only the source of bourgeois wealth but also the specter that drives bourgeois fears about crime, violence, disorder, and revolution.<sup>70</sup> And colonial and racial anxieties produced in the moment of conquest are reproduced by the structures of subjugation.<sup>71</sup>

The neoliberalization of racial capitalism has heightened these anxieties. Growing inequality has generated frustration and anger among the urban poor and the increasingly precarious working class. Their life strategies and struggles against marginalization are often disruptive and regularly produce political, economic, and social crises of varied intensity. As the neoliberal US empire loses the ability to enforce its will, the capitalist world system confronts a major structural crisis. According to Immanuel Wallerstein, it is unlikely that a new hegemon will emerge in the near future.<sup>72</sup> Although crises create opportunities for what Naomi Klein calls “disaster capitalism,”<sup>73</sup> they also exacerbate the threat of rebellion and other disruptions of property and power. In the face of repeated crises and insurgencies, the deep-rooted anxieties of the powerful become more visceral.

The racialized poor loom large in the anxieties of the powerful. These anxieties are often articulated through racialized discourses—about crime, immigration, and terrorism—that blame the poor for their own marginalization while targeting them as threats to be contained.<sup>74</sup> Symbolically transforming the marginalized into the sources of violence, disorder, and insecurity, racialized threat discourses are deployed to conceal structures of oppression and exploitation and to justify racial, colonial, and capitalist projects. As Frantz Fanon suggested, colonizers deny their own brutality by projecting desires of rape, murder, and dispossession onto a “phobogenic object” such as the black male body.<sup>75</sup> Elites disseminate these discourses to foster popular anxieties

and channel discontent away from themselves.<sup>76</sup> At the same time, economically marginalized sectors of racially dominant groups often articulate similar discourses to shore up their privileges in the face of competition over jobs, land, and status. As Stuart Hall points out, “moral panics”—such as acute anxiety about black crime—are symptoms of a deeper crisis of capitalism and the state.<sup>77</sup>

In the evocative words of J. M. Coetzee, “One thought alone preoccupies the submerged mind of Empire: how not to end, how not to die, how to prolong its era.”<sup>78</sup> Seeking to contain the crisis, neoliberals preach hard work and self-reliance; roll out new market policies; employ a range of pressure release politics; and attempt to manage demands through recognition. But even they seem unconvinced that this is enough to restore hegemony. With no other options, elites have increasingly turned to securitization or, in Coetzee’s words, ruthless and cunning repression.<sup>79</sup>

Securitization refers to the proliferation of forces, technologies, and strategies to produce security for the powerful.<sup>80</sup> Securitization, surveillance, and counterinsurgency strategies have been integral aspects of racial capitalism, colonialism, and empire for centuries.<sup>81</sup> Over the last thirty years, however, the world has witnessed an unprecedented expansion of investments in security: private security and private military companies; gated communities and fortress suburbs; mass deportation and mass incarceration; border walls and vigilante organizations; electronic surveillance and drone wars; and the dramatic growth of police, prison, border patrol, military, and intelligence forces. The last point is significant because the massive expansion of state expenditures on security has come during an era of aggressive cuts in government spending. This reveals an important connection between neoliberalization and securitization—as does the emergence of multinational private security companies, private military and intelligence contractors, and private prison operators. Indeed, Wendy Brown, David Theo Goldberg, Mitchell Dean, Jamie Peck, Elizabeth Povinelli, and Loïc Wacquant have all addressed the entanglements of neoliberalization and securitization.<sup>82</sup>

My research argues that securitization is a defining feature of neoliberal apartheid. Neoliberal security projects emerge in response to crises generated by neoliberal restructuring. Through networks of private and state security forces, they attempt to address the anxieties of the powerful by policing the marginalized. The racialized poor generated by neoliberal restructuring thus become the objects of racialized threat discourses and the targets of racialized policing. Importantly, neoliberal security regimes often rely on a low-wage labor force recruited from the same population that they target.<sup>83</sup> While

providing the symbolic justification for securitization, therefore, the racialized poor also provide the labor upon which securitization depends. But relying on the marginalized to police their own communities demonstrates the internal contradictions of these regimes. And relying on violence to shore up a fragile hegemony does not bode well for their future. Rather than resolving—or even addressing—the crises and contradictions that produce elite insecurities, securitization tends to deepen the marginalization and suffering of the racialized poor. As contradictions intensify and struggles expand, crises become permanent and structural. In turn, the powerful demand more security and racial capitalism grows increasingly unstable. Securitization and crisis, therefore, are best understood as self-perpetuating products of the neoliberalization of racial capitalism. The second half of this book explores the dynamics of neoliberal securitization in South Africa and Palestine/Israel.

#### METHODS

*Neoliberal Apartheid* is based on a combination of data sources and research methods: qualitative interviews, ethnographic observations, archival documents, and photographic research. My overall approach to research and the questions that drive this study are informed by the rich tradition of comparative historical sociology.<sup>84</sup> With a focus on capitalism, racism, colonialism, and empire, my work contributes to what Julia Adams, Elisabeth Clemens, and Ann Orloff describe as the “third wave” of historical sociology.<sup>85</sup> My approach to data collection draws on the methods of comparative urban ethnography.<sup>86</sup> From 2001 to 2006, I spent more than thirty months conducting ethnographic and archival research in Palestine/Israel and South Africa. In 2012 and 2013, I completed more than two hundred interviews and eight months of ethnographic research that make up the bulk of the data that appear in this book. The innovative combination of comparative historical sociology and comparative urban ethnography is one of the unique features of this project.

I have been traveling to Palestine/Israel since 1996 and to South Africa since 2002 as both a scholar and an activist. Over time, I have developed extensive networks of friends and colleagues that facilitated my ethnographic and interview research. In South Africa, my research on marginalization would not have been possible without the incredible help of two tireless research assistants: Thabo Mopasi and Obed Peñja. Born and raised in Alexandra, they remain intimately involved in the daily life and politics of the township. With their support, I interviewed government officials, developers, property owners, employed and unemployed workers, social movement activists, and people living

in squatter camps, occupied factories, government houses, hostels, and private homes. In Palestine/Israel, my research on marginalization branched out from my home away from home: Dheisheh refugee camp in Bethlehem. Friends and colleagues in every Palestinian city, village, and refugee camp in the Bethlehem area helped facilitate interviews with Palestinian officials, NGO employees, community organizers, activists, former political prisoners, farmers, laborers, and unemployed workers. I also met with Israeli settlers as well as Israeli anti-occupation activists and NGOs.

I approached the topic of securitization from two directions simultaneously: top down and bottom up. From above, I conducted interviews with people involved in security regimes. In Palestine/Israel, I spoke to current and former Israeli military officials, members of the US Security Coordinator’s office, and a wide range of PA officials. In South Africa, I spoke to police officials, private security professionals, members of residents’ associations, and people living in wealthy neighborhoods.<sup>87</sup> These interviews helped me understand the structure of the security regimes and the mechanisms of coordination. From below, I conducted interviews and ethnographic work with Black South Africans and Palestinians who have been targeted by security regimes and subjected to arrests, intimidation, beatings, and torture. Their experiences shed light on practices and forms of violence that those in power were not always willing to discuss. In addition, I spoke with the low-wage workers employed in the bottom rungs of the security regimes: Palestinian security officers and Black South African security guards. These were among the most instructive interviews that I conducted. The experiences of these workers helped clarify the tensions, conflicts, and contradictions within the emerging security regimes.

Along with interviews and ethnographic observations, I gathered an archive of government documents, newspaper articles, court proceedings, publications, personal accounts, maps, and statistics. In South Africa, I drew heavily on the University of the Witwatersrand Historical Papers, the South African History Archive, and the Sandton Library Archive. In Palestine/Israel, I made use of the online archives of the Applied Research Institute of Jerusalem (ARIJ).<sup>88</sup> ARIJ monitors and documents Israeli colonization activities in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. The web-based archive includes reports, maps, photographs, and analyses of Israeli settlement and military activities.

Finally, I collected photographic data to document the changing landscapes of marginalization and securitization.<sup>89</sup> I used my camera as a “notebook” to record visual field notes. The camera often attracted attention and led to informal conversations and tours of neighborhoods. Whether walking alone or with others, I took pictures of the landscape and discussed the images with

associates in the field. Through this process, I was able to collect images and sharpen my analysis. Although photographs can reveal a great deal about the landscape of conflict, they rarely provide clues about how the landscape was produced. My analysis, therefore, stems primarily from data collected through ethnographic observations and interviews. Nevertheless, I present images along with the text to encourage an active engagement with the photographic evidence that informs my work.

Due to ethical concerns about confidentiality, I do not identify my interviewees by name. I know that some people hoped I would use their names when sharing their words and stories. I appreciate that desire and want to acknowledge my debt to the people that I interviewed. But the intensely conflictual context of this research demands added precaution. Therefore, I provide descriptive markers to help readers understand the subject positions and standpoints of my interviewees without revealing their names or exposing their identities. To further protect people's identities, I provide only the month and not the date of my interviews and field notes.<sup>90</sup>

As a white, American, middle-class male conducting research on conditions of racialized conflict and poverty in the Global South, I take seriously the tensions produced by my own subjectivity. Over the last twenty years, I have established extensive networks of trust and support in both South Africa and Palestine/Israel. Yet my social identity continues to shape my relationships and my research.

In Palestine/Israel, race, gender, and citizenship had the greatest impact on my work. My status as a white US citizen provided me with two privileges that Palestinians lack and that facilitated my ability to conduct research: immunity from the physical violence of the occupation and the freedom to move through checkpoints. Whiteness and US citizenship also made it easier for me to meet with American and Israeli officials, who provided key insights about securitization. The Israelis I interviewed and met informally were largely open to my project and willing to share their ideas and experiences. Nevertheless, the fact that I speak Arabic but not Hebrew and lived among Palestinians rather than Jewish Israelis created obstacles in the eyes of some Israeli officials. The importance of gender in Palestinian social relations facilitated my access to Palestinian men but constrained my interactions with Palestinian women. As a result, most of the Palestinians I interviewed are men.

In South Africa, race, class, and gender profoundly shaped my research. Whiteness and class privilege set me apart from the people in Alexandra with whom I worked most closely. But masculinity facilitated my research by reducing concerns about everyday violence in the township. And because I speak

no African languages, my research was only possible because many Black South Africans have an extraordinary proficiency in English, Afrikaans, and multiple African languages. Race and class also shaped my relations with white South Africans and the new Black elite. Without exception, white South Africans welcomed me into their homes, offices, and meetings. Some shared their racial prejudices, some performed political correctness, and some demonstrated their commitment to antiracism. This access was crucial for my research on residents' associations and the private security industry.

Toward the end of my fieldwork, I conducted a series of workshops in Palestine/Israel and South Africa to share the preliminary results of my research. Through these meetings—in churches, schools, and community halls—Palestinians, Israelis, and South Africans asked questions and discussed the connections and links between their struggles. Always facilitated by a local organization, these workshops were a way that I attempted to make sure that my research was not merely about extracting information, but also about sharing information and circulating knowledge.

#### CHAPTER OUTLINE

*Neoliberal Apartheid* explores neoliberalization and (de)colonization in South Africa and Palestine/Israel over the last twenty years through a comparative study of marginalization and securitization in the Johannesburg and Jerusalem metropolitan regions. More specifically, the geographical focus of my ethnographic research is the northern part of Johannesburg around Alexandra and Sandton and the southern Jerusalem region centered on Bethlehem.

I begin by outlining the histories of settler colonialism and racial capitalism in South Africa and Palestine/Israel and by providing an overview of the political-economic transitions since the 1990s (chapter one). Although South Africa was partially decolonized and Israel remains a settler colonial state, both transitions involved the neoliberalization of racial Fordist economies. The chapter concludes by discussing the impact of neoliberalization and (de)colonization on the Johannesburg and Jerusalem metropolitan regions. In doing so, it introduces the Alexandra/Sandton and Bethlehem areas by situating them within their broader regional and national contexts.

The book then explores the causes and consequences of *marginalization* in Alexandra (chapter two) and Bethlehem (chapter three) with a focus on three themes. Each chapter begins by analyzing the production of racialized poverty and the creative life strategies of the urban poor. While Alexandra has been transformed into a zone of concentrated exclusion for the expendable Black

decolonization in South Africa and the continuation of colonial relations in Palestine/Israel.

The chapters end by exploring the everyday lives of the low-wage workers that fill the bottom rungs of the security industry. Private security companies provide one of the primary sources of low-wage work for Black South African men, and the PA security forces are among the only employment options available to Palestinian men in the West Bank. But with low wages and dangerous working conditions, the labor force is not content. Nor does it escape the workers that they are asked to protect the wealthy and powerful by targeting their own communities. The question of racialized labor, therefore, is one of the most important sources of instability for the emerging security regimes. In the end, I question the sustainability of efforts to stabilize fragile racial capitalist regimes through securitization.

In the conclusion, I draw out the overall implications of the book. I begin by discussing the international legal definition of apartheid, which applies to Israel but not South Africa after 1994. Rather than defining apartheid as a political form of racial domination, I propose a political-economic definition that brings together an analysis of racial domination and racial capitalism. Building on this framework, I argue that the transitions of the last twenty years have generated *neoliberal apartheid* regimes in both South Africa and Palestine/Israel. Outlining the core features of neoliberal apartheid, I end by arguing that this concept captures the relationship between inequality, marginalization, securitization, and crisis throughout much of the world today.

poor, the Palestinian enclosures in Bethlehem have become sites of concentrated inequality where Palestinian elites live side by side with the poor.

Next, the chapters analyze the pressure release policies deployed to contain the crises generated by marginalization. The State of Israel and the Palestinian Authority use employment to manage popular anger, whereas the South African government introduced a flagship “developmental” project to uplift Alexandra township. But the articulation of this postcolonial project with neoliberal commitments to private property and the market has undermined its impact in ways that reveal the limits of decolonization in South Africa. In Palestine/Israel, the articulation of neoliberal restructuring to a settler colonial project has generated a unique form of “neoliberal colonization” in the villages west of Bethlehem. While demonstrating the political nature of neoliberal restructuring, these chapters highlight the limits of decolonization in South Africa and the continuation of colonization in Palestine/Israel.

These chapters end by discussing resistance to marginalization. I argue that the struggles of the urban poor in South Africa and Palestine/Israel have produced crises for the neoliberal racial capitalist regimes. This provides an important link to the second half of the book, where I analyze the neoliberal security networks that have been built to police these crises.

My analysis of *securitization* in the wealthy neighborhoods around Sandton (chapter four) and in the West Bank (chapter five) also focuses on three themes. First, the chapters highlight the emergence of new security networks in each location. In Johannesburg, these networks are defined above all by privatization. Private security companies and residents’ associations are cooperating to develop advanced strategies for regulating urban space at the neighborhood scale. In the West Bank, securitization involves an imperial network of coordinated state security forces from Israel, the United States, the European Union, Jordan, and the Palestinian Authority. Working together, these forces police Palestinians in the West Bank.

Next, the chapters explore the strategies of racialized policing deployed by these networks. In South Africa, a cutting-edge form of “preventive security” employs racial profiling and violence to regulate the presence of young Black men in wealthy neighborhoods. In the West Bank, the security forces use shared intelligence, coordinated arrests, morality policing, and other tactics against the Palestinian poor. Racialized discourses of “Black crime” and “Palestinian/Arab/Muslim terrorism” enable the expansion of security operations, provide a mechanism for policing the crisis, and demonstrate the symbolic value of surplus populations for racial capitalist projects. The centrality of race to these policing strategies highlights another important limit of

empire. While shaped by local processes of political organizing and articulation, these movements now circulate more quickly than ever before as marginalized populations articulate connections between their experiences and their struggles. As struggles circulate and elites demand more security, contradictions deepen and neoliberal apartheid regimes grow increasingly unstable.

Beyond South Africa and Palestine/Israel, it is now common to encounter aspects of neoliberal apartheid in cities, states, and regions throughout the world. At a range of scales, combinations of neoliberalization and (de)colonization have generated inequality (often with a semblance of equality), marginalization, securitization, and crisis. From the US empire to local elites, neoliberal apartheid regimes rely on violence to maintain power in the face of unprecedented inequality and racialized marginalization. Despite the proliferation of security forces, however, these regimes remain fraught with instability. Understanding the ways that Palestine/Israel and South Africa are implicated in these global processes could contribute to the constitution of broader movements against global, neoliberal apartheid.

## NOTES

### INTRODUCTION

1. In South Africa, the term *Black* refers to all people of color victimized by apartheid: African, Asian/Indian, and multiracial ("colored" in the language of the apartheid state). Driven by the Black Consciousness Movement, this inclusive redefinition of blackness emphasized a common experience of oppression to challenge the social divisions the apartheid regime instituted. See Biko 1987 [1978].
2. I use the term *Palestine/Israel* to designate all of the land between the Jordan River and the Mediterranean Sea that was part of the British Mandate and is currently subject to the sovereign rule of the State of Israel. When discussing the period prior to 1948, I refer to this territory as *Palestine*. I generally use the term *Israel* to denote the State of Israel. When I use the term *Israel* to describe a territory, I am referring to the land within the 1949 Armistice Line (Green Line).
3. Abunimah 2006, 144.
4. Other scholars have analyzed the *relationships*—economic, political, and military—between Israel and South Africa. See Adams 1984; Joseph 1988; Polakow-Suransky 2011; Stevens 1975; Stevens and Elmessiri 1976.
5. See, for example, Al-Hadaf 1971a; 1971b; 1972; and Shaath 1971. Nabil Shaath's 1971 essay rejecting Israel's attempt to create Bantustans (which he calls "Palestine-stans") in the occupied territories is particularly important as a historical document due to the role that Shaath would eventually play as chief negotiator for the PLO and adviser to Yasser Arafat during the Oslo process. His essay appeared in *Shu'ur Filastiniya*, the Arabic-language journal of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO). *Al-Hadaf* is the Arabic-language journal of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP).
6. Davis 1989.
7. Benvenisti 1984.
8. LAW n.d.
9. Said 1996, 2001, 2004.
10. World Conference against Racism 2001. See also LAW 2001.

11. See, for example, Abunimah 2006; Barghouti 2011; Bishara 2002; Carter 2006; Davis 2003; Farsakh 2005; Kovel 2007; Tilly 2005; White 2014.
12. There are a few exceptions. Three studies compare the politics of "conflict resolution" in Palestine/Israel and South Africa during the 1990s, without considering socioeconomic changes: Adam 2002; Gidron, Katz, and Hasenfeld 2002; Gilmore and Gagliano 1990. More closely related to my work are two studies that compare the impact of economic crisis on the early trajectory of political negotiations: Nitzan and Bichler 2001; Shafrir 1999.
13. On the concept of "world historical context," see Braudel 1980; Mann 1986.
14. For early studies of Israel as a settler colonial state, see Farsoun 1976; Greenberg 1980; Hanegebi, Machover, and Orr 1971; Hilal 1979; Jabbour 1970; Rodinson 1973; Sayegh 2012 [1965]; Zureik 1979. Scholars also developed several related models to explain social relations in South Africa and Palestine/Israel: internal colonialism (Slovo 1976; Zureik 1979), *hervorvolk* democracy (Farsoun 1976; Van den Berghe 1978), and the articulation of modes of production (Wolpe 1975, 1980a, 1980b; Zureik 1979). During the 1980s and 1990s, a few comparative studies continued to employ a settler colonial framework to analyze Palestine/Israel and South Africa: Abdo and Yuval-Davis 1995; Akenson 1992; Greenstein 1995; Lustick 1993; Mitchell 2000; Shafrir 1996; Stasulis and Yuval Davis 1995; Unterhalter 1995; Younis 2000.
15. Wolfe 2006.
16. Veracini 2007.
17. Wolfe 1999, 2006.
18. Veracini 2011a.
19. See in particular two special issues of the journal *Settler Colonial Studies*: volume 2 (1) (2012) and volume 5 (3) (2015). For critical commentary on this body of work, see Bhandar and Ziadah 2016.
20. Salamanca et al. 2012.
21. Abdo 2011; Abowd 2014; Collins 2012; Hassan 2011; Lockman 2012; Rouhana and Sabbagh-Khoury 2015; Salaita 2006; Shihade 2012.
22. Earlier approaches to settler colonialism, including studies of Palestine/Israel and South Africa, often analyzed the relationship between colonialism and capitalism. For classic analyses, see Fieldhouse 1966; Fredrickson 1981.
23. Coulthard 2014.
24. Alfred 1999; Coulthard 2014; Goldstein 2008, 2014; Povinelli 2011; Simpson 2014.
25. Byrd 2011; Jackson 2012; Krauthamer 2015; Lowe 2015.
26. Jackson 2012.
27. Wolfe 2006, 402. See also Veracini 2007, 2011b.
28. See Alexander 1985; Lester 1998; McKinley 1997; Mngxitama, Alexander, and Gibson 2008; Murray 1987.
29. Alexander 1985, 2008; Ally and Ally 2008; Mngxitama, Alexander, and Gibson 2008; Sizwe 1979; Saul and Gelb 1986.
30. Alexander 2002, 64.
31. For an excellent overview, see Kelley 2002.
32. Du Bois 1935; James 1938; Williams 1944.
33. Du Bois 1935; Cox 1948; Drake and Cayton 1945.
34. Robinson 2000 [1983].

35. As scholars of intersectional feminism point out, these formations are also shaped by heteropatriarchy and other axes of oppression. While I incorporate gender into my analysis at certain key points, this book is primarily about racism and capitalism. I recognize the lack of attention to heteropatriarchy as a shortcoming of the book. See Collins 1990; Crenshaw 1991; Mohanty 2003; Smith 2006.
36. Balibar and Wallerstein 1991; Bonilla-Silva 1997; Cox 1948; Gilmore 2007; Mohanty 2003; Robinson 2000 [1983]; Winant 2001; Williams 1944.
37. The core positions in the debate are outlined by Cox (1948) and Robinson (2000 [1983]). Bonilla-Silva (1997) differentiates between racial discourses that preexisted capitalism and modern racial orders (or racialized social structures).
38. Building on the work of Gilmore (2007), I conceptualize *racism* as the "group differentially vulnerable to premature death." This definition highlights the fact that racialization not only establishes symbolic differences but also infuses these differences with unequal power and value. In line with this approach, Singh (2004) argues that racial systems "stigmatize and deprecate one form of humanity for the purposes of another's health, development, safety, profit, or pleasure." I seek to capture this relationship by invoking the differential valuation of human life and labor.
39. Clarke and Thomas 2006; Winant 2001.
40. Foucault 2003; Mills 1997, 2003; Mbembe 2003; Rodriguez 2011; Vargas 2011; Wolfe 2006.
41. Coulthard 2014; De Angelis 1998, 2001; Harvey 2003, 2005, 2014; Marx 1906 [1867].
42. Cox 1948; Du Bois 1935; Harvey 2014; James 1938; Wallerstein 2011 [1974].
43. Marx 1906 [1867]; Williams 1944.
44. Mbembe 2003; Wolfe 2006; Vargas 2011.
45. Sassen 2014. See also Davis 2006.
46. Hall 1980, 1986. Hall's analysis emerged out of debates involving dependency theorists and Althusserian Marxists attempting to make sense of the relationship between capital accumulation and racial domination in Latin America and South Africa.
47. Choo and Ferree 2010; Collins 1990; Crenshaw 1991; Mohanty 2003; Smith 2006.
48. Gramsci 1971.
49. Hall 1980. For an elaboration on the double meaning of articulation, see Hart 2007.
50. Lowe 2015; Vargas 2011; Wolfe 2006.
51. On political articulation, see de Leon, Desai, and Tugal 2013.
52. Hart 2013.
53. Fanon 1961.
54. Block and Somers 2014. See also Brenner and Theodore 2002a; Brown 2015; Harvey 2005; Peck 2010a.
55. Alfred 2005; Bobo and Smith 1995; Bonilla-Silva 2001, 2010; Davis 2007; Duggan 2003; Giroux 2004; Goldberg 2008; Goldstein 2008; Omi and Winant 2015; Roberts and Mahtani 2010; Simpson 2014.
56. Goldberg 2008; Goldstein 2008.
57. Melamed 2011, 42.
58. Brenner and Theodore 2002b; Peck 2010a; Peck and Tickell 2002; Peck, Theodore, and Brenner 2009.

- of Palestine/Israel today. Nevertheless, most scholars continue to follow the convention of analyzing difference in Palestine/Israel in terms of nationality. To be sure, race overlaps with nationality and religion in Palestine/Israel. But conceptualizing difference in Palestine/Israel without attention to race has several limitations. First, it obscures the settler colonial character of Zionism. The racialization of Palestinians is a product of Zionism, a political movement to establish a Jewish state in Palestine. Zionism emerged in response to European anti-Semitic racism yet adopted Orientalist doctrines of European supremacy as well as imperialist notions that Europeans could colonize and settle non-European lands. These beliefs racialized the relationship between Zionist settlers and local Palestinians. The creation of Israel as a *Jewish state* formalized the racial character of the settler colonial state. Along with the mass displacement and enforced exile of Palestinian refugees, the Jewish character of the state depends on formal legal discrimination against the 1948 Palestinians. The occupation of the West Bank and Gaza Strip extended the racialized structure of settler colonial rule throughout Palestine/Israel. Over time, the racial hierarchy has been transformed by the mass migration of Mizrahi and Ethiopian Jews as well as migrant workers and asylum seekers from Europe, Asia, and Africa. Yet Palestinians remain the population most highly stigmatized and most vulnerable to premature death. Second, overlooking the role of race in Palestine/Israel isolates the struggle from the global dynamics of empire. Early Zionist leaders not only adopted Orientalist ideas, they also sought out—and achieved—the support of European imperial powers for the Zionist project. The racial foundations of this support are demonstrated most clearly in Theodore Herzl's insistence that a Jewish state in the Middle East would provide an "outpost of Western civilization in Asia." Similarly, the racialization of Palestinians today is closely connected to global processes of racial formation associated with the "war on terrorism." Within contemporary imperial projects, Goldberg argues that "racial Palestinianization" occurs whenever states declare an act of perpetual war and target their subject populations with securitization and death. Finally, conceptualizing Palestine/Israel in terms of nationality rather than race implies that the only conceivable solution is political separation in a two-state future. While this is in line with the dominant articulation of the Palestinian nationalist project, some on the Palestinian and Israeli left articulate a vision of coexistence in a one-state solution. Moreover, Palestinian civil society organizations have coalesced in recent years behind a three-point platform: ending the occupation of the 1967 territories, ending discrimination against 1948 Palestinians, and ensuring the right of return for Palestinian refugees. By highlighting demands for the right of return and an end to discrimination, these organizations have placed the racialized structure of the Jewish state at the center of the struggle. For other scholarship on race in Palestine/Israel, see Abu-Laban and Bakan 2011; Bakan 2014; Barghouti 2011; Elkins and Pedersen 2005; Feldman 2015; Goldberg 2008; Rouhana and Sabbagh-Khoury 2015; Rodinson 1973; Sabbagh-Khoury 2014; Said 1978, 1979; Shihade 2012; Shohat 1997; Sussulius and Yuval Davis 1995.
3. Marks and Atmore 1980; Delius 1983; Lester 1998.
  4. Ptaajje 2007 [1915]; Wolpe 1980; Van Onselen 1982; Marks and Rathbone 1982; Mamdani 1996.
  5. Bundy 1979; Marks and Rathbone 1982; Bonner et al. 1989.
  6. Dubow 1989; Mamdani 1996.
  7. Wolpe 1980.
  8. Wolpe 1980; Legassick 1974.
59. Peck 2010a.
  60. Omi and Winant 2015, 211.
  61. Davis 2006; Sassen 2014; Wacquant 2008.
  62. Lacy 2007; Pattillo 2003; Vallejo 2012.
  63. Guevarra 2010; Johnson 2015.
  64. Bonacieli, Alimahomed, and Wilson 2008; Clarke and Thomas 2006.
  65. Boggs 2009 [1968]; Davis 2006; Johnson 2015; Sassen 2014.
  66. Johnson 2015; Marx 1909 [1967], 1973 [1939].
  67. de Leon, Desai, and Tugal 2013; Povinelli 2011.
  68. de Leon, Desai, and Tugal 2013.
  69. Harvey 2014.
  70. Marx 1906 [1867]; Proccacci 1991; Abrahamsen 2005.
  71. Fanon 1961; Biko 1987 [1978].
  72. Wallerstein 2010.
  73. Klein 2007.
  74. Chavez 2008.
  75. Fanon 1967 [1952].
  76. Bigo 2002; Neocleous 2008.
  77. Hall et al. 2013 [1978].
  78. Coetzee 2004, 146.
  79. Coetzee 2004, 146.
  80. This is a broader conceptualization than the dominant definition within critical security studies that identifies securitization as the process that unfolds when authorities identify something as an existential security threat. See Buzan, Wæver, and de Wilde 1998; Wæver 1995.
  81. Browne 2015; Khalil 2012.
  82. Brown 2010; Peck 2010b; Dean 2007; Goldberg 2008; Povinelli 2011; Wacquant 2009.
  83. For a similar discussion of black women as employees and targets of the Transportation Safety Administration, see Browne 2015, 147–52.
  84. See Adams, Clemens, and Orloff 2005; Anderson 1974; Mahoney and Rueschmeyer 2003; Steinmetz 1993, 1998.
  85. Adams, Clemens, and Orloff 2005.
  86. Burawoy et al. 2000; Murray 2004; Wacquant 2008.
  87. Many of the top-down interviews on security in South Africa were conducted in collaboration with Martin J. Murray.
  88. Applied Research Institute of Jerusalem: <http://www.arij.org>.
  89. Becker 1974, 1981, 1998, 2004; Berger and Mohr 1967, 1975, 1982; Harper 1982, 1987.
  90. I take detailed notes in the field and transcribe them at night. Quotes from field notes are reproduced from these transcripts.

## CHAPTER ONE