OPEN LETTER

THE ARQOV – MEHIA ROCK ART PARK AND BEDOUIN CULTURAL HERITAGE RESERVE

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN *

This letter is a reaction of the Janabib people of the Negev Highlands to the proposed National Park that is about to be inaugurated in the Har Mehia – Har Arqov area of our traditional territory. On one hand, we welcome the decision and are proud that our cultural heritage is considered worth to be protected and presented to the public. On the other hand, we are deeply concerned about the possibility of being separated from the areas that were marked by our ancestors with their rock engravings and wusum. We find it cynical that our traditional territorial markings and narrative rock engravings should be used as an excuse to restrict our adherence to a way of life that produced the cultural artifacts planned to be legally protected. Therefore, we have decided that, as the autochthonous inhabitants of the territory designated to be a National Park, we will adopt a unanimously supported stance based on empirical data accepted by both parties in this debate. Because, as already mentioned, we are inclined to support the project and co-operate in its execution, we have decided that Mr. [REDACTED], who has worked for the last two decades as a ranger with the Nature Reserves and Parks Authority would serve as our representative. He is motivated by a wish to reconcile his professional and tribal obligations. Moreover, he enjoys the trust and respect of the Avdat Janabib and also that of the Nature and Parks Authority.

In this letter we formulate our vision, recommendations, and conditions regarding the Park, and our role in its inauguration. A ten-point-draft is presented, with inserts from academically-accepted research that is listed in the references. The letter is signed by a number of Janabib Elders.

* Copies of this letter sent to the following recipients:
- International Federation of Rock Art Organizations (IFRAO)
- Negev Rock Art Center
- Israel Nature and Parks Authority
- Ramat Negev Regional Council

1. In order to declare a National Park, a protocol must be observed. In our case, literature dealing with the rock art of the area must be collected and, in case that these prove to be worth protecting, the legal frames must be outlined, discussed and accepted. The discussion should involve those who, according to the mentioned literature, seem to be connected to the cultural artifacts evaluated as being worth to be protected. In the following paragraphs we will attract attention to our historical relationship to the said cultural artifacts. We will do this by relying on the literature that would justify the inauguration of a National Park. Therefore, there will be no misunderstandings or conflicts of interest.

Archaeologists and other researchers identify engravings from previous centuries that are “outside the influence of modern, European societies” (Heyd 2005, 39; cf. Haines 2012) as “rock art” – this includes wusum. Rock art is also what the proposed National Park intends to make the public familiar with.

2. According to the same literature, the Janabib Bedouin are clearly the autochthonous population of the area designated for protection. Although our oral history differs from the official one, we will adopt the latter, as a compromise.

Throughout much of the past millennium and a half since the end of the Byzantine era the Negev desert accommodated pastoral nomads of unknown tribal identity whose migratory paths took them from Arabia across the
Negev, into the Sinai and beyond, and back again to the Sinai and Negev, where wusum engraved during the first period of occupation were recognized as valid territorial markings, and to which new ones were added as a reconfirmation of ancestral rights (Abu Rabi’a 2001: 1–6; Galilee, Kark, and Kressel 2013; Isaac 1990, 1992; Sharon 1975). This pattern seems to be the case for the Janabib, whose oral traditions narrate a >1,400 years history (Bailey 1989).

Without entering a debate, we can confidently state that in the recent centuries the Negev was predominantly occupied by Bedouin tribesmen, even while this region was administered by a succession of Turkish, British, and Israeli governments. Beginning in the nineteenth century, economic, geopolitical, and administrative forces progressively restricted the movement of the local Bedouin populations, causing them to undergo critical processes of sedentarization (cf. Marx 2012, 2009).

3. The Negev Rock Art Center, according to our information, is in the process of joining the International Federation of Rock Art Organizations (IFRAO). In order to do this, they must accept and respect one of the basic rules of IFRAO, namely: whenever a relationship between the rock art of a specific area and its inhabitants can be established, the said population should be considered the traditional owner of the rock art and any decision regarding their property should be discussed with them and adopted only with their consent (on the IFRAO guidelines, see www.ifrao.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/ethic.doc)

The number of Janabib wusum in the Avdat area is inconsistent with what was the demographic reality in the vicinity of Avdat before the establishment of Israel and during its first years of statehood. Based on oral accounts (Bailey 1980) and government records (Marx 1977; Stewart 2011), in the Negev Highlands of the early 1940s, the Janabib tribal unit consisted of a mere 264 people, compared to the nearly 12,000 members of the Azazmeh tribal confederation who, by and large, had command of the region (Schmidt and Eisenberg-Degen 2015). Interestingly, Janabib wusum are similarly disproportionately distributed on panels at Har Mehia, where there are 196 instances of the Azazmeh wusum and 67 belonging to the Janabib (Eisenberg-Degen 2012). As the Janabib were such a small group, these numbers seem to indicate that both Har Mehia and Avdat were under their control, i.e., a part of their specific territorial habitat. By the same token, being a significantly bigger group, the Azazmeh territories likewise spanned over a much larger expanse. Azazmeh Bedouin tribal units were dispersed throughout the entire Negev Highlands and, while present in the region, were apparently not the dominant force in these two locations (ibid.). Moreover, while the Azazmeh and Janabib were known to have lived in relatively peaceful coexistence, the Janabib occupied this particular area prior to the Azazmeh. Thus, it is possible that the high numbers of Janabib wusum reflect their attempts to express to the incoming Azazmeh their ownership of local territorial holdings (ibid. ibid., Bailey 1989). Conversely, the Janabib burial site at Be’er Hafir is a generation older than the Azazmeh burial site at Be’er Oded.

Bedouin in the Negev had mostly been left to their own devices and therefore were able to maintain their own internal property agreements that operated in parallel with official Ottoman ones (Stewart 2011). Shaped by limited literacy, disinterested governance, and the erratic climatic and topographical limitations of the barren desert terrain, in the absence of firm physical borders (fencing), Bedouin land ownership agreements were generally acknowledged in the field by prearranged natural indicators. These “landscape anchors” (Meraoit 2011) – prominent mountains, dry riverbeds (wadi), trees and rocks and/or localized man-made markers, possibly even rock art sketches of the agreed plot division (Lancaster and Lancaster 2011) – conveyed land usage rights and lent the landscape a clearly defined structure. It should be noted that while clear and understood among the Bedouin, similar to other forms of graffiti, tribal tattooing, or rock art, these symbols were essentially unfamiliar to outsiders (Norman 2011).
4. Rock art is only a restricted aspect of the culture that produced it. In the case of the engravings that the Negev Rock Art Center, the Israel Antiquities, Nature and Parks Authorities consider worthwhile protecting, they are clearly the products of pastoral nomadic ethnic groups with a cultural background similar to the present-day autochthonous inhabitants of the area. Moreover, the bulk of the engravings were etched in rock immediately after the Byzantine period. In addition, there is an arguable continuum in the motifs used during the Bedouin period and those preceding it.

Figure 1. Continuity of motifs (Eisenberg-Degen and Rosen 2013)

During the Middle Ages, seasonal nomadic herders, i.e., Bedouin, were the region’s only consistent human occupants (Babenko et al. 2007; Rosen et al. 2005; Sharon 1975) who were apparently displaced by another wave of Bedouin migration during the final quarter of the Ottoman Empire (c.1800–1918).

Toward the end of the eighteenth and into the nineteenth century, the absence of firm governance and the attraction of available and potentially lucrative arable land, lured various Bedouin hamulot (tribal units, hamula in the singular) to settle in the peripheral Negev Highlands (Kressel et al. 1991). These groups, first from the Tiyaha-Dhullam (Janabib), and later from the Azazmeh tribal confederations, migrated into the Negev Highlands either from the Hejaz in Northern Arabia, or from the Sinai. Here, they industriously repaired and adapted earlier run-off irrigation farming terraces that for centuries had lain in disrepair along the riverbed (wadis) in the region (cf. Abu Rabi’a 1994; Ashkenazi and Avni 2012). Some of these run-off terraces were restored by Bedouin who have arrived shortly after the Byzantine period. The oral history of the Janabib claims that their forefathers arrived in the area precisely at this time (Bailey 1989). Judging by the migration patterns described above, some of the 18th century arrivals might have been a return to lands already claimed by wusum engraved prior to the said time. The 4 lines of the Janabib occur in heavily patinated instances, but also as freshly engraved markings.

5. We insist upon presenting our culture as a whole, and not only fragments of it. Rock art symbolism in our area deals with the basic values of our traditional economy, i.e., grazing and watering rights, territorial demarcations and beliefs regarding the seasonal renewal of the economical basis. Moreover, some of the engravings are found next to burial sites and other ritually important locations.

Wusum, Bedouin tribal insignia, serve as a form of communication between parties not present at the same place at the same time. Therefore, a legal extension must be taken into consideration. A single wasm may have several meanings that are interpreted based on the media upon which it is found:
‘... A wasm, when engraved on a rock, serves as a landmark of that tribe, when marked on a camel it will serve as camel brand; and when placed on a document it will serve as the signature of that tribe’ (Khan 2000:104).

The Bedouin employed these multifunctional symbols to designate territorial boundaries, sign documents, mark graves, and brand property such as tents, campsites, and animals (Bent and Bent 1900; Hilden 2010; Wendrich 2008; Wilkinson 1977). Avinoam Meiir (1997) suggests that the prominence of agriculture in the Bedouin economy helped forge a Bedouin sense of “territoriality” – a conviction that was less central to the Bedouin mentality and conduct in their previous more mobile phase as pastoral nomads. Inspired by their successes with desert horticulture, the Bedouin became more rooted in the region and consequently began placing greater emphasis on the demarcation of tribal boundaries and natural resource usage rights.

6. Therefore, we propose that the Park should rather function as a Reserve dedicated to conserve the autochthonous population’s culture, including their flocks and dwellings, their traditional way of life, etc. We strongly oppose the artificial separation between cultural products and the people who have produced them. Unfortunately, there are precedents for such cases, all over the world. The good news is, that learning from such mistakes, the present-day world-wide approach recognizes that people and their artifacts cannot be separated. The IFRAO rules mentioned above are meant precisely to avoid / correct such mistakes. We are in the process of collecting legal precedents of such instances and consulting with IFRAO.

7. We recognize and accept that since 1950 the territory on which the Park would be inaugurated is “state land.” We do not intend to enter any debate: the status quo, i.e., present legislative realities are the starting point that should be accepted by both sides. We do not have any claims that could endanger the status quo. However, in our view, cultural artifacts, even if located on state land, should be treated as “property.” “Cultural ownership” was recognized in many parts of the world.

In the second half of the nineteenth century, mounting European interest in the Suez Canal encouraged the Turkish administrators, who until that time had maintained a relatively low regional profile, to infuse political stability into the peripheral Negev. Seeking to reign in the competing tribal factions and make order of Bedouin land and property holdings, in 1858 the Turks enacted the Ottoman Land Law which required the Bedouin to formally register their territorial alliances and pay taxes to the Turkish authorities for the right to own land. Yet, fearing that
their cooperation would lead to increased taxation and potential conscription into the armed services of the Sultan, many avoided compliance with these regulatory measures or else only partially reported their land assets (cf. Bailey 1990; Goering 1979; Kark and Frantzman 2012). In one response to the Ottoman demands, the Bedouin updated and honed their methods for determining plot boundaries, grazing rights, and water source usage. Whereas once elementary geographical indicators or simple *rujum* (rocks piles and cairns) sufficed to ratify territorial agreements, in the new system, confirmation of land transactions, property ownership and land tenancy contracts among the Bedouin was undertaken with more apparent signifiers such as the planting of trees, erecting stone fences, ploughing deep channels or engraving their clan/family emblems, i.e., *wusum*, on certain rocks (Meir 1997).

The Bedouin sense of territoriality gained further ground during the British mandate (1922–1948). Despite some initial successes, with having larger problems to contend with in the center of the country, the understaffed British officials failed to achieve their goal before departing from the region in 1948, at the termination of the mandate (Kark and Frantzman 2012).

Indeed, the conversion of the Bedouin from free-ranging pastoral-agrarians to reluctant members of a generally urbanized and landless working class mostly occurred in the decades subsequent to the establishment of Israel.

In 1950 “Israel registered all the Negev as state land” (Marx 2009) and expropriated most of the Bedouin land holdings. By the mid-1960s, national-Zionist development strategies encouraged the inclusion of the Bedouin into the country’s expanding workforce. To facilitate this process, the government reallocated the majority of the Negev Bedouin into planned urban settlements mostly on the northern and eastern Beer-Sheva plains which is where, in varying states of semi-urbanization, political limbo, and socioeconomic disparity, they largely remain (Dinero 2010, 1999; Kressel 2003; Marx and Meir. 2005; Yahel 2006).

Currently, in the far reaches of the Negev Highlands, a few extended families from the Azazmeh and Janabib tribal units have managed to tenaciously cling to certain land parcels, basing their ownership claims on oral agreements from previous eras.

Even as “the Mandate showed flexibility with property registration in the Negev, allowing oral testimony claims (Kark and Frantzman 2012, 76), the Israeli government is both politically and culturally removed from this previous historical reality and has so far declined to accept oral agreements as testimonial evidence. In the absence of written documentation, the accuracy of the Bedouin claims remains unresolved (cf. Bailey 1978; Boteach 2008; Shamir 1996). Nonetheless, as to their assertions, our findings indicate the plausibility that former Bedouin residents of the Negev demarcated publicly their family land holdings with *wusum* (Schmidt and Eisenberg-Degen 2015).

8. The autochthonous people of the Avdat – Mehia area (the Janabib Bedouin) could contribute to the scientific understanding of the rock art corpus here. Without their co-operation, any attempt to understand the rock art will be futile and senseless. Unfortunately, if not involved, extremist elements will try – out of frustration, and feeling that they are robbed of, and separated from their culture – to damage the engravings of their own forefathers. This will result in a tremendous loss, not only for the Janabib, but to the nation as a whole. Let us not forget that nomadic pastoralism and its values were common to all the Semitic groups that have once roamed this desert, including the forefathers of Bnei Israel. Rock art may thus become the link that could unite the present populations of the Negev. So why divide them even further by cynically misusing a common heritage?

Shasu [undifferentiated], Nabataeans and Thamudic tribes were all nomadic herders of North Arabian origin who made the Negev Highlands their home and marked its rocks with their signs attesting the claim. These ethnically and culturally related entities arrived wave after wave. Bedouin dominated the ethnographic landscape even through the
Idumaean, Nabataean, Roman and Byzantine stable periods (Fabian 2005). The rock art reflects the same preoccupations as those of the contemporary Bedouin, the last arrivals in this pattern.

9. In addition to the points outlined above, the Janabib would take upon themselves the maintenance of the Park (marking trails, signposting, cleaning) and guiding. Would-be Janabib and Park guides could adopt a unified position in presenting the rock art to the public. Special courses would be organized in order to achieve this. Unfortunately, at the moment, guides who do not have any understanding of rock art, or who think that they know more than qualified researchers do are presenting the public with unrealistic and, in many cases, fantastic theories without any scientific backing. Continuing to exclude the rightful owners of the rock art, any approach, however academically-backed, will remain incomplete.

10. In return, we are ready to enter compromises. We would commit ourselves to stop territorial expansion and to improve the 3rd World conditions under which our unrecognized settlements suffer. Inside the Reserve, we would revert to traditional and ecological building. Bedouin tents and stone structures would replace the shanties. Rubbish would be recycled and used as filling material for adobe buildings. Of course, we are aware that certain standards will have to be observed. Such norms and standards will be reached through future negotiations.
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EVICTING THE BEDOUIN TO PRESERVE THEIR HERITAGE?

Editorial

THIS ISSUE: HERITAGE – SHAKING THE BEDUIN TRADITION OF UNDERSTANDING YOUR HERITAGE?

The letter is written on behalf of the Genaby tribe in the Negev region, presenting their stance regarding the national park intended to be established at the nature reserve – Mount Arukov, which is part of their historical and traditional land.

On one hand, we commend the decision to establish the park and celebrate the fact that our cultural heritage is considered worthy of preservation and display for the public. On the other hand, we are very concerned with the possibility of our heritage, which our ancestors marked on the rock paintings and stones of the tribes (“Wassam”), being used as an excuse to limit our tradition of our way of life that created these marks. Therefore, we, the residents of the place where the park is intended to be established, decided to take a stance on the matter, which we all support, based on the facts and agreements on both sides.

Since we are inclined to support the project and be part of its implementation, as mentioned, we decided to ask Mr. [institutions name], who worked as a caretaker in the Ministry of Nature and Parks (henceforth referred to as MTP) for more than twenty years, to represent us in all matters concerning this issue. He is motivated by a desire to balance his professional and cultural duties, and also enjoys the respect and faith of the Genaby tribe in the area where he worked and the MTP.

In this letter, we present our vision and recommendations, as well as conditions for the park and our participation in its establishment and implementation. These are presented in a document of ten points that we drafted, accompanied by appropriate references to academic studies, which are recorded in the notes at the end of the document.

This letter and the signed copy by several heads of the tribe.

Copies of this letter were sent to the following:
- IFRAO International Federation of Rock Art Organizations
- Rock Art Center in Negev
- Ministry of Nature and Parks
- Negev District Council

1. In order to proclaim a national park, we must follow the rules. In the case at hand, we must look to professional books and studies on rock art in the area and determine, first of all, whether they are indeed worthy of preservation. If so, we must agree and then proceed to follow the guidelines and legal framework required. The discussion, according to the rules, must involve those who are culturally linked to the paintings that the park seeks to protect and show.

In the following paragraphs, we direct attention to our relationship with the rock art mentioned. This is done through professional literature that justifies the establishment of the park. We do so in order to avoid misunderstanding or conflicts of interest.

Archaeologists and other researchers have identified hundreds of previous carvings that “outside the influence of modern European society,” as rock art. As such, the Genaby Bedouin tribe are clearly the owners of the land on which the park is intended to be established, and the issue is not whether to protect them, but rather how to protect them and make them known.

Based on the professional literature, the Genaby Bedouin tribe are undoubtedly the owners of the land, although their tradition does not always coincide with the official position. Therefore...

Bibliography: Shalom and Yaron Yaron, "The Genaby tribe: the heritage of the land of the Bedouin."
The Arqov – Meheia Rock Art Park and Bedouin Cultural Heritage Reserve

To the community of the Arqov – Meheia Rock Art Park and Bedouin Cultural Heritage Reserve:

In recent years, since the end of the Byzantine era, nomadic tribes have settled in the Negev desert, who are not clearly defined, with the majority of the Bedouin tribe moving from the northern Arab desert to Sinai and back at various times.

In those times, when the Negev was first settled, it was marked with "wayam," a Bedouin tribe's recognized and powerful marker as a mark of territory. After that, it was marked again and again with "wayam" as a renewed assurance.

It seems that this pattern also exists in the Gebi tribe, whose tribal tradition extends until recently.

In 1911, before our time, we can indicate with confidence that in recent centuries, the Negev has been primarily settled by Bedouins, even under the Turkish, British, and Israeli regimes. From the beginning of the 20th century and onwards, economic, geopolitical, and political forces increasingly limited the Bedouin populations, causing them to undergo a critical settlement process.

3. The Rock Art Center in the Negev, to the best of our knowledge, is currently undergoing a process of joining the International Federation for Rock Art Organizations (IFRAO). In order to do so, they must adhere to and accept one of the fundamental laws of IFRAO, which states: if it can be recognized that there is a connection between rock art in a specific area and the residents there, there should be a recognition of the population that owns those rock art, and they should be consulted in any decision that affects them.

Several "wayam" of the Gebi tribe in the area of Abu Dabieh do not equate with the demographic data in the area before the establishment of the State of Israel and its first few years. Based on oral evidence and official records, in the early 20th century, the Gebi population counted only 460 people, compared to nearly 44,111 of the Hazazama tribe who dominated the area.

Interestingly, the Gebi "wayam" and the Hazazama are painted differently on either side of Mount Vital, where there are 16 "wayam" of the Hazazama and 66 of the Gebi tribe.

It seems that the Gebi "wayam" count is not in line with the demographic data in the area before 1911. It is known that between the Hazazama and Gebi tribes there were close ties, where the Gebi were in those places before the Hazazama. It is possible that the large Gebi "wayam" count in Abu Dabieh and Mount Vital is a result of highlighting territorial boundaries before the Hazazama approached. On the other hand, the Gebi burial site in Bir Cifr is older than that of the Hazazama in Baris El Dweid in several generations.

The Bedouins in the Negev were abandoned by the authorities and were able to maintain cultural rights, similar to those of the Ottoman government.

These "wayam" are essentially "fields," "wadi beds," dry riverbeds, ravines, trees, rocks, and human-made symbols, perhaps even rock art that were used to demarcate territory and divide and conquer land, in an organized and defined manner. It should be noted, like other forms of tribal symbols, such as graffiti, tattoos, and cave paintings, while these symbols were bright and clear to the locals, they were not known to strangers.

Rock paintings are just one form of the culture that created them. In the case of rock art, those who wish to preserve the Rock Art Center in the Negev, the Antiquities Authority, and the R'TG are certainly the product of nomadic ethnic groups with a similar cultural background to those who live there today. The overwhelming majority of the rock art was chiseled immediately after the Byzantine period. One can see continuities in the motifs in the rock art from the Bedouin period to those preceding it.

During the Middle Ages, pastoral nomadic relationships – the Bedouins – were the only ones who settled the place on a regular basis. It is likely that during the last 200 years and onwards, due to the lack of control and presence of land, some of the tribes that were once present in the area returned to the Negev after the Byzantine period.

The Gebi tradition also states that their ancestors came to the area at this time.

4. At the end of this letter, we wish to mention that we are still working on this project and we will update you on any new developments.
EDITORIAL

EVICTING THE BEDOUIN TO PRESERVE THEIR HERITAGE?

In our opinion, fully preserving a community's civilization means presenting it in full, not just parts of it. The rock paintings in our area deal with basic economic values in our traditional society, such as water rights and irrigation, land marks, religious beliefs and more. Moreover, some of the rock paintings are located close to burial sites and other places of religious significance.

Wassam, the Bedouin tribal mark, served as a form of communication between parties who are not in the same place at the same time. Therefore, it is important to consider the legal implications associated with it. Wassam alone may have different meanings, depending on the element it appears in:

"...Wassam is inscribed on rock indicates ownership of the land of the same tribe, whereas it is marked on a camel it indicates ownership of the same camel. When written in a document, it serves as a signature of the same tribe.

The Bedouins used this multi-meaning symbol to mark land boundaries, sign documents, mark graves and mark property such as tents, camps and Bedouin law (Abiven Amram 0116). It is suggested that the importance of agriculture contributed to the design of the "ownership" of the Bedouins, a belief that was not central to the way they thought and practiced in their nomadic period. Encouraged by their agricultural success, the Bedouins settled in the area and as a result, the emphasis on distinguishing boundaries of tribes and the rights of use of natural resources increased.

In light of what has been said so far, it is correct and appropriate that the park be used as a dedicated nature reserve for the preservation of the local culture, its herds and springs, its way of life and more.

We are outraged that there is no way to protect the cultural products created, and we present this protection to the IFRAO.

We recognize that since 1551: The land on which the park is to be built is a national land. We have no intention of discussing the current legal status. It is a good first step that could be accepted by both sides. We do not come to claim matters that put the status quo in danger. However, in our opinion, the products that belong to the culture that created them, also when they are located on national land. "Cultural归属" such as this is recognized in many parts of the world.

In the second half of the 20th century, Europeans interested in the Suez Canal encouraged the Turkish government, which had a relatively low profile in the Negev, to introduce political stability. In an attempt to control the tribes and factions, the Turks enacted a law in 1900 that required the Bedouins to formally declare their land and pay taxes to the Turkish government for the right to own it. But the Bedouins feared that their cooperation would lead to higher taxes and military recruitment, so many of them did not respond or declared them partially.

However, the Turkish demand caused the Bedouins to update and sharpen their methods of land division, pasture use, etc. While previously natural and fundamental signs or "rogue" (made of stones) became more precise, such as planting trees, building stone walls, deeping irrigation canals and putting tribal/familial marks (Wassam) on certain rocks.

Bedouin sense of ownership of land gained further strength during the British mandate (1922–1948). The British, the Mandate, the Miskite, Bedouin agriculture, было мотивом для колонизации и землеустройство, etc. The British, the Mandate, the Miskite, Bedouin agriculture, etc.

The land on which the park is to be established is national land. We have no intention of discussing the current legal status. It is a good first step that could be accepted by both sides. We do not come to claim matters that put the status quo in danger. However, in our opinion, the products that belong to the culture that created them, also when they are located on national land. "Cultural归属" such as this is recognized in many parts of the world.

At the end of the mandate period, the state of Israel declared all Negev land as national land, and expelled most of the Bedouins. Until mid-1961, national strategies encouraged the integration of Bedouins into the state's developing economy. To speed up the process, the state forced most of the Bedouin population to live in cities, mostly in the northern and eastern areas of the Beer Sheva. There, in various stages of urbanization, they are still trapped in a political and economic cycle, even today.

Consequently, the international community honored Israel's establishment of the national land and the return of the Bedouins to their pastures by biting down on the heels of the Negev and depose the government, supported by military means and economic sanctions. The world, the international community, sided with the national authorities, and imposed sanctions on the government of the Israel. 2009, "The economic, social and political effects of Operation Chennai on the Negev Bedouin communities". It is a comprehensive review of the economic, social and political effects of Operation Chennai on the Bedouin communities in the Negev. It is a comprehensive review of the economic, social and political effects of Operation Chennai on the Bedouin communities in the Negev. It is a comprehensive review of the economic, social and political effects of Operation Chennai on the Bedouin communities in the Negev.
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גם כשהמנדט הראה גמישות עם רישום הרכוש בנגב, באפשרו תביעות קרקע ע"פ הצהרות xxvi, правительם הישראלי, גם פוליטית וגם תרבותית, התכחשה ממציאות היסטורית זו ועד כה לא הסכימה לקחת עדויות בעל פה כבעלות תוקף ראייתי. 
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