Land Disputes Between the Negev Bedouin and Israel

ABSTRACT

The conflict between the State of Israel and the Negev Bedouin over land is not new; State vs. nomadic land ownership is an on-going dispute originating as early as the Ottoman Empire. Illegal construction and land use are its widespread expressions, making it difficult for the State to supply basic needs to its citizens. Furthermore, the dispute creates obstacles to the development of the Negev for the benefit of all its inhabitants. This article will try to lay out the Government’s approach, as the author perceives it, to the resolution of the land dispute, through reaching financial settlements with various Bedouin individuals and tribes. Monetary and land compensation have both been offered, along with the revival of the Land Title Settlement procedure, as part of a new Government policy.

This article is intended to tell the side of the story which is usually untold. The dispute between Israel and the Negev Bedouin has received considerable attention in the public square and in scholarly literature. Bedouin are portrayed by many as nomadic people whose rights have been continuously ignored and violated by the State of Israel. This article offers a far more complex picture and nuanced analysis. My view is a consequence of having become familiar with the relationship between the Bedouin and the State in the course of my work in the District Attorney’s office, Southern District, first as a rank-and-file attorney and then as Head of the Land Title Settlement Unit.

The conflict over land between the state of Israel and its Bedouin citizens—that is, some of the Bedouin citizens—is a complex issue. The legal aspects are only part of the story. There are also historical, social,
financial, cultural, and ethnic issues. Moreover, particularly in the recent past, complaints have been lodged under the impact of an increasingly manifest nationalist temper. All these issues must be surveyed if we want to understand the nature of the dispute.

It is undeniable that Israel acted without sufficient sensitivity toward its Bedouin citizens, especially in the first three decades of statehood. However, the situation began to change markedly in the 1970s. While addressing complaints regarding an equitable distribution of national resources is far from complete, this is not the case with regard to the dispute over Negev lands. As I will explain, according to State legislation, the lands of the Negev are State lands; therefore, the claim that Israel is stealing the Bedouin’s lands is patently not true. In the following, I shall present an alternative perspective. This account is succinct and must therefore offer pertinent generalizations. I would add that we are also dealing with individuals—individual Bedouin—and that not all of the generalizations apply in each individual case. Detailed arguments regarding the situation of the Bedouin in general, and of particular instances, are readily accessible in the numerous briefs that have been filed in the courts and adjudicated there.4

HISTORICAL ISSUES

Land disputes between nomads—in our case the Bedouin—and state authorities, are not specific to Israel, and exist in many countries with nomadic populations. The conflict started long before Israel was established. Neither the Ottoman Empire nor the British Mandate recognized the ownership of nomadic Bedouin over land in the Negev.5 The State of Israel not only followed previous attempts and reforms carried out by previous legislators to settle land ownerships, but also adopted the existing Ottoman and British land laws regarding those issues.

Until the beginning of the 20th century, the Bedouin of the Negev wandered between Saudi Arabia, the Sinai, and the south of Palestine. Each tribe was dispersed throughout the territory where it grazed its flocks, sometimes thousands of square miles, which the tribe influenced or controlled. The extent of the territory (Dira) depended on the power of each tribe, and from time to time the tribes fought over the control of territory.6 In that early period, there were no permanent towns or villages in the Negev.7 Beer-Sheva, the first settlement, was founded around 1900 by the Turkish authorities.8 As I will explain later, Israeli law, which is based on earlier Ottoman and British legislation, precludes granting owner-
ship rights over these huge territories to private individuals. Today, the Bedouin’s private legal claims of ownership of these territories are handled by the Land Title Settlement Unit.

Before the War of Independence, about 65,000 Bedouin lived in the Negev. After the war about 11,000 remained. The rest went to Egypt or to the western and eastern banks of the Jordan River. Between 1951 and 1966, the Bedouin, like most of Israel’s Arab population, lived under military authority in the northeastern area of the Negev called “The Sayig”.

In 1968, the first Bedouin town—Tel-Sheva—was established just east of Beer-Sheva, initially for the settlement of only one tribe by the government. In the thirty years that followed, Tel-Sheva was expanded to include others, while another six towns were built, thereby providing the opportunity for all who wished to settle communally.

Today, almost 100,000 Bedouin (62% of the total Bedouin population) live in planned, urban towns, all of these built with government funds. They were planned for “low-rise construction.” The members of the Bedouin community mentioned above were allocated large lots—about 800–1000 sq. meters each, free of charge. It should be noted that this is
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typically double the area of State land which other Israelis may normally purchase for a residence. The remaining 59,000 Bedouin (38%) reside in hundreds of illegal clusters over an area of more than half a million dunams (a dunam is 1000 sq. meters or one-quarter acre). Many of these clusters are obstructing the planned development of the greater Negev area.

The existing towns could accommodate most of the Bedouin population. As shown in the table below, there are approximately 3,700 vacant developed lots available for occupancy by Bedouin families. Another 4,000 lots can be readily developed upon demand. Nevertheless, the Government decided to build an additional nine Bedouin settlements and to expand the existing towns. All together, these towns, occupying tens of thousands of dunams, will eventually enjoy the best infrastructure and services that Israel offers its citizens. In light of past experience, the new villages are planned in full consultation with representatives of the prospective population, who provide input on their diverse wishes and needs. Furthermore, in December 2003, a new regional council (Abu-Basma) was appointed (by Avraham Poraz, the Minister of Interior) for the newly formed Bedouin settlements of the Negev, to ensure a high standard of municipal services to these new villages.

ILLEGAL CONSTRUCTION

Many residents of the Negev sometimes feel that they live on a different planet from the rest of Israel. No wonder it is sometimes referred to as the “Wild South.” The “wildness” is manifest above all in the illegal construction and the invasion of state lands by some Bedouin.

Until recently, Bedouin lived in tents, and later in temporary huts. Most of the Bedouin accepted the government’s offer and built their houses
in towns, while others began building illegal structures, hiding their building blocks under existing temporary structures to hoodwink government inspectors. Now, sad to say, some of them build without concealment or hesitation. We are facing three to four new illegal buildings every day, in all more than 1,500 a year. Although most of the illegal buildings display low standards of construction, some of the newer buildings are neither small nor modest. We see a lot of large scale houses—300 sq. meters with expensive construction. The picture below even indicates a home with a swimming pool. The buildings are sometimes constructed well beyond existing settlements and some jut out from hilltops. The large investments in many such structures serve as proof that owners fear neither prosecution nor demolition.

These illegal buildings are not just for residential purposes. There is also illegal commercial construction (pictures 3) throughout the Negev, including gasoline stations (pictures 4), stores, and supermarkets, all erected on public lands. In other words, thousands of Bedouin are breaking the law.

The State is of course obligated to provide education, welfare, medical treatment, health, and security, to all its citizens, but it is almost impossible to provide these services to each Bedouin family that settles down illegally, in one of the small clusters, often far from the road, on a hilltop, or otherwise dispersed wherever they choose in the Negev.
While most have taken advantage of the special terms offered by the state and have built their homes and businesses legally, a significant minority clearly feel they are not obliged to obey Israeli law. As a consequence, to put it bluntly, there is no feeling of law and order in the open lands of the Negev.

This rampant flouting of the law is taking place despite the fact that every Bedouin citizen living in the Negev—and no one else—22—is entitled to receive a free plot of building land from the state (800–1,000 sq. meters) on condition that he settles in one of the legal Bedouin towns. That is one of the unique provisions of a policy that offers incentives to Bedouin to move to these legal towns.23

The government provides the land free of charge, while the families receive significant compensation for any abandoned attached structures such as buildings and sheds. Compensation is awarded both in monetary terms and in land, as quantified by construction and crop value. In addition, grants are awarded to families who choose to move to existing or new towns.24

It is important to note that compensation is given irrespective of the economic situation of the family, its income, or its assets. What is more,
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it is given regardless of the fact that, in the eyes of the law, the recipients were trespassers on the land that they might abandon. Moreover, as will be explained later, those with individual ownership claims over land receive higher compensation both in money and in land. Despite all these incentives, the government has not succeeded in putting an end to illegal settlement.

THE BASIS FOR BEDOUIN RESISTANCE

The core issue is a fundamental dispute over title to lands in the Negev. Although the State’s position is that lands in the Negev belong to the State and, as such, it is public land, some Bedouin maintain that the land belongs to them. Accordingly, they refuse to move elsewhere and they prevent others (especially other Bedouin) from settling on the land they claim as their own. That happens even where they are not actually occupying the specific lands to which they claim ownership. It must be emphasized that not all Bedouin claim ownership of land. However, there are about 2,700 claims with over 650,000 dunams in dispute. Moreover, many Bedouin simply ignore the law that prohibits construction without approved plans and building permits. Illegal building is not limited to land in which ownership is disputed; it occurs with no hesitation throughout the northeastern part of the Negev. Furthermore, we should not forget that the Bedouin have a long history of living outside permanent settlements, and have not adjusted to State legislation—from the Ottoman and British periods to the present. Some Bedouin want to preserve their traditional way of life. They have their own traditional code, which is often unlike the law of conventional or modern states. Moreover, living outside an established town can be considered as worthwhile due to direct and indirect factors:

First, there is no need to pay for the land. Second, there is no limit on how much land can be taken [see illustration 5]. Third, one can build whenever one chooses. There is no bureaucracy of any sort, and therefore no need to obtain building permits or pay for them. Fourth, there are no municipal or governmental property taxes of any kind. Fifth, some of the illegal clusters have become almost inaccessible to any official representative, including the police, due to violent resistance. It is not rare, in the Negev, to see a chase by a police car that stops at the edge of a Bedouin cluster, as if it were extra-territorial. The sixth factor is indirect, and relates to different aspects of the official compensation policy:
the above-mentioned decision that every Bedouin who moves to a legal town gets compensation for abandoned attached structures (including illegally built houses)\textsuperscript{30} can become the incentive for illegal construction. Ironically, this obtains due to the steady increase in the compensation rate,\textsuperscript{31} both for abandoned attached structures and for settlement of ownership disputes. Some believe it may be worthwhile to reject government offers, remain stubborn, and mark time in the hope of a more lucrative arrangement in the future.

The seventh factor is that, due to ministerial policy, between 2000 and 2001 there was almost no enforcement of the law regarding illegal building in the Bedouin sector.\textsuperscript{32} Hence, during this period there was a steep rise in illegal construction.

Support and encouragement for remaining in the illegal clusters comes both from inside and outside the Bedouin community. First, there are several active non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and others that share the belief that the illegal actions are justified and that the authorities will eventually accept the Bedouin demand to keep most of them at
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their present location. Second, there is an intra-Bedouin phenomenon whereby some of the Bedouin who already live in towns prevent other Bedouin from joining them, as they want to keep the vacant lots for their own families and their descendants.

It is important to clarify that under Israeli law, any citizen can buy a lot (lots for building individual houses are usually expensive) and build a house after acquiring a permit from the planning authorities. These permits are granted within typical regulations defined by urban planning legislation. Appreciating this, it is easy to imagine how a citizen of any town in the Negev feels when he is brought to court and punished for adding a balcony to his three-room second-floor apartment without a permit, while from his window he can see the Negev covered day after day by thousands of illegal structures. There is, of course, a feeling of frustration among the general public because of what might seem to be unequal enforcement of the law.

The consequences of these illegal settlements are severe and extensive. Their existence makes it hard to plan new settlements for Bedouins or for others. They create many problems regarding the expansion of existing towns; and they generate difficulties in planning national projects due to the unplanned and irrational way in which the Negev is being settled.

Many attempts by state authorities to develop necessary and basic infrastructure are challenged in court by the representatives of the illegal builders, trying to stop or delay such work. For example, the building of a major and essential road south of Rahat was delayed; obstacles have been created to the laying of high power lines to Eilat; and construction has been impeded for sewage and water pipes that were planned for exclusive Bedouin use. The main road to the Bedouin town of Keseifa is too narrow due to the resistance of a Bedouin family, and so on, and so forth. Such illegal behavior takes no account of the fact that the intended beneficiaries of the project may be Bedouin. This situation clearly requires change.

WHY ARE OWNERSHIP DISPUTES OVER NEGEV LANDS ONGOING?

It is a fundamental principle, concerning land ownership, that one cannot transfer (willfully or not) more than one has—meaning that if a person has ownership rights he can pass ownership or less (leasing for instance) but if he only has leasing rights he cannot transfer ownership. The decision as to whether ownership rights exist over land is taken on the basis
of substantive law. This law obliges the ownership claimant to prove an allocation from the authorities—whether the Ottoman authorities, the British Mandate, or the State of Israel. When founded, the State of Israel did not change previous laws regarding land ownerships. As I will explain, it continued to implement the existing laws: the substantive land law and the procedure land law. While the first is basically an Ottoman law with British adaptation and additions, the latter is mainly a British creation—The Land (Settlement of Title) Ordinance 1928.

The Land Title settlement aims at investigating the transfer (called the “chain”) of rights according to specific procedures until it reaches back to the allocation’s source. The outcome of the process is “Title Registration” which is decisive, conclusive, and open to the public.

In Israel, ownership disputes are settled according to special land legislation. As explained, the Israeli legislators adopted the Mandatory law, which in turn had adopted the substantial Ottoman law. According to that legislation, the majority of the Negev is State land since it was classified by the Turkish definition as mewat land. This classification means that unless one proves specific allocation of land rights, he cannot be granted ownership. The Bedouin ownership claims are not based on legal grounds but rather on their own tradition and the period of time they have occupied the land, with limited documentation. All disputes over land ownership are settled by court decision and some cases regarding the Negev land were brought to the courts.

The conclusion that the Bedouin do not have ownership rights over their past pasture territories was upheld by the Supreme Court after earlier decisions by the district court. In a ruling relating to 6 cases, the Supreme Court accepted the State’s argument that the Bedouin have no valid claim to ownership of Negev lands located near Dimona, a development town to the east of Beer-Sheva.

Nevertheless, the State agreed to take into consideration the strong attachment that the Bedouin have towards the land they occupied. Hence, in spite of this unequivocal legal ruling, the government decided, as State policy, to adopt a compromising approach towards the private ownership claims of Bedouin. Therefore, beyond the letter of the law, the State offered them money and land compensation with regard to their claims. Accordingly, any Negev Bedouin who has an ownership claim can receive money and land compensation if he withdraws his claim, with no need to prove its validity. As shown, today the compensation is in terms of land—between 20 and 30% of the claim (for claims of more than 400,000 sq. meters). For the rest of the claim, they can receive monetary compensation. The amount
changes from one type of land to the other. The sums are universally very high.  

A complicating factor arose in 1977, just a year after the government’s move to accommodation, when there were elections and a changeover of government with the Likud coming to power. Shortly afterwards, the peace agreement with Egypt was signed. It obliged Israel to withdraw from the Sinai Peninsula and therefore to move air bases from there to the Negev. In 1980, the Knesset passed a law which included evacuation of the land for the proposed airbase, and granted the Bedouin higher compensation only for the area related to the airbase. Some Bedouins consequently hoped that the compensation rate for lands outside the airbase would rise to the same high level as for the area designated for the base. This was an accurate assessment. It proved worthwhile to exercise patience as the compensation rate increased over time. The last increase was made but a few years ago.

In sum, from 1978 until 2003, agreed settlements of claims were achieved with regard to over 140,000 dunams, most of them in the area of the airfields; 650,000 dunams remain in dispute.

**AVOIDING CONFRONTATION**

Although there was no specific government decision on this matter, for a long time the State of Israel did not confront the Bedouin and refrained from enforcing its rights over disputed lands. During this same period, the face of the Negev was changing. Some of the land claimants exploited the time to strengthen their possession of the land, including the uncontrolled building of illegal construction.

When I came to work at the District Attorney’s office in the Negev, several years ago, I started to ask why there were no title settlements in the Negev, as required by Israeli legislation. The answers I received were far from satisfactory. I familiarized myself with the extent of the problem and my colleagues and I have initiated the revival of the land title settlement process according to legislation. Our office saw it as a necessary trigger that, amongst other things, could change the unacceptable and tense situation in the Negev.

We initiated a new policy in 2001. In June 2002, Mr. Elyakim Rubinstein, the Attorney General—now a Supreme Court justice—brought the subject before the government, which appointed Ms. Tzipi Livni, who would become Minister of Justice, to formulate a plan. In 2003, the
Government approved a broad investment plan regarding the Bedouin of the Negev.68 This important Government plan can be seen, in practice, as the turning point regarding the Bedouin issue.

According to this government plan, more than NIS 1 billion are to be invested in the expansion and improvement of the Bedouin towns, as well as in the land title settlement process, law enforcement, and other important issues relating to the Bedouin. A special budget of hundreds of millions of shekels was allocated to compensate Bedouin moving into towns. Mr. Ehud Olmert, then Deputy Prime Minister, was appointed to follow and inspect the progress of this Government plan.69

In July 200570 an extra sum was added and in October, as part of the new Government Plan for Developing the Negev and Galilee,71 special attention was given to the Bedouin population. According to these plans, billions of shekels are to be invested to effect the required changes, and one can only hope that they will materialize in a relatively short time. Our role has to do with reinitiating the land title settlement procedure, almost 30 years after it was suspended.

Since 2004, the Unit which I head has brought to court more than 130 cases and more will follow.72 We have already won about 40 rulings in favor of the State, relating to about 25,000 dunams. Parallel to the court
procedures compromise agreements have been signed over an additional 4,000 dunam. Large parts of the land whose title will be registered in the name of the State will be used in the coming years for the benefit of 16 Bedouin towns and communities: the building of the nine new ones and the expansion of the seven existing ones. Moreover, some of the land will be used for new industrial zones.

Currently, the Ministry of Justice is working along with other authorities to implement the Government decision regarding land issues in the Negev. This is done by enforcement of the law, by legal procedures, or alternatively by compromise, which is the preferable way to end this dispute. But as history shows, and according to my experience, the parallel method of implementing the legal procedure is essential as it encourages compromise and agreed-upon settlements.
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