



CAMBRIDGE STUDIES IN LAW AND SOCIETY

Security Theology, Surveillance and the Politics of Fear

NADERA SHALHOUB-KEVORKIAN

CAMBRIDGE

SECURITY THEOLOGY, SURVEILLANCE AND THE POLITICS OF FEAR

This examination of Palestinian experiences of life and death within the context of Israeli settler colonialism broadens the analytical horizon to include those who “keep on existing” and explores how Israeli theologies and ideologies of security, surveillance and fear can obscure violence and power dynamics while perpetuating existing power structures. Drawing from everyday aspects of Palestinian victimization, survival, life and death, and moving between the local and the global, Nadera Shalhoub-Kevorkian introduces and defines her notion of “Israeli security theology” and the politics of fear within Palestine/Israel. She relies on a feminist analysis, invoking the intimate politics of the everyday and centering the Palestinian body, family life, memory and memorialization, birth and death as critical sites from which to examine the settler colonial state’s machineries of surveillance, which produce and maintain a political economy of fear that justifies colonial violence.

NADERA SHALHOUB-KEVORKIAN is the Lawrence D. Biele Chair in Law at the Institute of Criminology, Faculty of Law and the School of Social Work and Social Welfare, Hebrew University of Jerusalem. She is a long-time anti-violence, native Palestinian feminist activist and the Director of the Gender Studies Program at Mada al-Carmel, the Arab Center for Applied Social Research in Haifa.

CAMBRIDGE STUDIES IN LAW AND SOCIETY

Cambridge Studies in Law and Society aims to publish the best scholarly work on legal discourse and practice in its social and institutional contexts, combining theoretical insights and empirical research.

The fields that it covers are: studies of law in action; the sociology of law; the anthropology of law; cultural studies of law, including the role of legal discourses in social formations; law and economics; law and politics; and studies of governance. The books consider all forms of legal discourse across societies, rather than being limited to lawyers' discourses alone.

The series editors come from a range of disciplines: academic law; socio-legal studies; sociology; and anthropology. All have been actively involved in teaching and writing about law in context.

Series editors

Chris Arup *Monash University, Victoria*

Sally Engle Merry *New York University*

Susan Silbey *Massachusetts Institute of Technology*

A list of books in the series can be found at [the back of this book](#).

SECURITY THEOLOGY,
SURVEILLANCE AND THE
POLITICS OF FEAR

Nadera Shalhoub-Kevorkian



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781107097353

© Nadera Shalhoub-Kevorkian 2015

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2015

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data

Shalhoub-Kifurkiyan, Naderah, author.

Security theology, surveillance and the politics of fear / Nadera Shalhoub-Kevorkian.
pages cm. – (Cambridge studies in law and society)

ISBN 978-1-107-09735-3 (hardback)

1. Palestinian Arabs – West Bank – Social conditions – 21st century. 2. Palestinian Arabs – Gaza Strip – Social conditions – 21st century. 3. Military occupation – Social aspects – West Bank. 4. Military occupation – Social aspects – Gaza Strip. 5. West Bank – Colonization. 6. Gaza Strip – Colonization. 7. Israelis – Colonization – West Bank – History – 21st century. 8. Israelis – Colonization – Gaza Strip – History – 20th century. 9. Israel-Arab War, 1967 – Occupied territories. 10. Palestinian Arabs – Government policy – Israel. I. Title.

DS119.76.S535 2015

956.95'3044 – dc23 2015006867

ISBN 978-1-107-09735-3 Hardback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

To Mike

CONTENTS

<i>List of tables</i>	page ix
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	x
1 Introduction: Settler colonialism, the politics of fear and security theology	1
The settler colonial framework	5
The politics of fear	7
Historicizing Israeli fear and security theology	11
Security theology within global racial politics: us/them	16
Everydayness	19
2 Price tagging Palestinians: Alternative methods of surveillance and control	21
A history of body and mind control in colonial security policies	24
Body, land and mind control	28
What is Tag Mehir?	29
Tag Mehir's violence: The political economy of surveillance	33
Psychosocial trauma, surveillance, security and fear: Borrowing meanings from the colonized	36
The writings on the wall: Necropolitics in security discourse	41
Conclusions	44
3 Israel in the bedroom: Citizenship and entry law	47
The Citizenship Law in context	50
The Law as a tool for framing and racialization	53
"Security" concerns about the claim to return	53
Demographic policy and population control	56
The judiciary as political	57
On children, securitization and the law	61
Necropolitics and the manufacturing of the feared Other	64
Conclusions	69
4 Hunted homeplaces	73
Homeland: Mapping geographies of violence	74
The Nakba Law as memory surveillance	78
The erasure of home as homeland	82

CONTENTS

The Israeli policy of house demolitions: A “military necessity”	87
Trapped: Palestinians, their homes and colonial hunting zones	90
Maneuvering through the homespace to avoid demolition	92
The torture of self-demolition	92
Demolition day	96
Women and the attack on home	102
The meaning of home and fear of homelessness	108
The attack on the home: From topography to topology	110
5 Death and colonialism: The sacred and the profane	116
Enlivening the dead and killing the living	118
The sacred and the profane	120
Legalized spaces of difference: Court decisions on cemetery desecrations	121
The inscription of power over the Palestinian dead body	127
Nuha: Burial by stealth	128
Rasha: Losing her baby twice	131
“Sneaking” back home: Seta’s fight to return	133
May and Reham: The fight to return	136
Mundane surveillance and securitization	137
Necropolitics and the economy of the sacred and the profane	139
6 Birth in Jerusalem	144
Time and space	149
The everyday: Calculus and revolt	155
Invisibility and liminal space	159
Ontological claustrophobia: Trying to take a deep breath	164
Inscribing power over women’s birthing bodies	169
7 Conclusion: Newborns, new deaths and the “gravediggers”	172
Securitizing the political economy of fear	174
Topographies and relations of power	177
Surveillance, everydayness and “common sense”	179
The epistemology of the details	181
Gravediggers	184
<i>Bibliography</i>	188
<i>Index</i>	209

TABLES

4.1 Home demolitions in the West Bank and East Jerusalem as of September 12, 2012 (source: B'Tselem, 2012b)	page 83
6.1 Population, birth rate and natural increase in selected cities, 2010	153

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is difficult to write these words of gratitude to my wonderful friends and family in the midst of the attack on Gaza, when Palestinians are living in, dying in, challenging and surviving the settler colonial death zone. But I feel that in spite of all the dispossession around me, what I have learned from those to whom I owe this book is that we must engage with love, as thanking, acknowledging and loving is the only way to challenge the political economy of war.

Throughout the four years that I have worked on this book, I have learned a tremendous amount and have been supported by wonderful people. I am grateful to many Palestinian children, women and men who trusted me and shared their ordeals, hardships and resistance with me. I am also grateful to friends, colleagues, organizations and family who supported me throughout my research. I am profoundly grateful to a family member by choice, Professor Michael B. Preston, a man who is more than a scholar, friend and partner, a man to whom I am indebted. Professor Preston supported my work with a passionate commitment to critical race theory and critical engagement with issues of social justice in the context of accumulation of oppression. Our joint readings and discussions, and his phenomenal energy and discerning eye were the utmost power behind this book. I dedicate my work to his memory, as he passed the day this manuscript was submitted.

Special thanks are due to scholars/friends that read my writing, commented and helped with their invaluable reflections to shape my analyses, including Rosemary Sayigh, Rima Hamammi and Lila Abu-Lughod, who were always willing to find the time to read, discuss, comment and help in fine-tuning my arguments, which they did with love and care. I have enjoyed the discussions with and readings of Daphna Golan, Dorit Roer-Strier, Magid Shihadeh, Suvendrini Perrera, Joseph Pugliese, Sunera Thobani, Sherene Razack, Urvashi Butalia, Inderpal Grewal, Fionnuala Ni Aolain, Ann Stoler, Elia Zureik, Nadim Rouhana, David Myers, David Lloyd, Kathleen Barry, Ronit Lentin and Sumona DasGupta, who supported my work and were always willing to

reflect and debate with me over the past years. A special thank you goes to Professor Sally Merry for engaging with my work and for her constant support. Each of them encouraged me to bring together my work and helped me shape this book.

Very special thanks are also due to the institutions that engaged in, supported and helped me conduct research that became the foundation of the various chapters of this book, including the Women's Studies Center in Jerusalem and Mada al-Carmel – the Arab Center for Applied Social Research for supporting my research on the Citizenship Law, the Luce Foundation and Mada al-Carmel for supporting my research on Price Tag, the Hebrew University of Jerusalem for supporting my research on housing demolition and the attack on Home, the International Conflict Research Institute (INCOR) at the University of Ulster for supporting my research on death, and the YWCA of Jerusalem for supporting my research on birth in Jerusalem.

I wish to thank Professor Nadim Rouhana, the Director of Mada al-Carmel, for many great discussions, and for helping me sharpen my arguments on surveillance and fear. I am grateful to Nadim and the staff at Mada al-Carmel, including Einas Odeh Haj for her insights, Suhad Daher-Nashif for her generosity and constant willingness to find time to sit, discuss and elaborate on sophisticated elements of my theorization, Areen Hawari, Mtanes Shihadeh and Himmat Zu'ubi for engaging themselves in various ways with my research, and for providing valuable information and perspectives, insightful views and invaluable friendship. Very special thanks are also due to Sama Aweidah and Aida Isawi from the Women's Studies Center in Jerusalem. Sama and Aida were always a source of knowledge and great friendship to me.

In the late stage of this book, I was blessed with a wonderful PhD student, visitor, young scholar and friend, Sarah Ihmoud, as well as the support and help of Nina Griecci, whose attentiveness and insights were priceless. I also benefited from the readings, comments and editing of wonderful professionals, students, research assistants and editors, including Helene Hogari, Katie Gonzales, Kate Rouhana, Laieth Jayousi, Mia Lattanzi and Stephan Dobson. A special thank you goes to two of my wonderful students and close friends who were there for me, by searching for new sources, court decisions, academic articles and much more, Sana Khsheiboun and Yossi David.

I am indebted to my family, Gaby, Maro, Tamar and Salpy, for their sustaining love and for our dialogues over the years. Gaby was a great supporter, as he helped me in collecting testimonies and articles for my

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

work, and was there for me at every turn. This book was always a collective family project discussed over meals. My mother, who always listened to me, shared her own ordeals and was very attentive to the details of my work. My sister Yasmin, her husband Joul and their family, Siwar, Majd and Nadine for their warmth, love, great discussions and wonderful food. My brother George, his wife Suhad and their family always engaged in heated political discussions that posed more challenges to my research. My sisters Fatina, May and Lea provided unending love. This book would not have been possible without the care, unconditional love and support of my family.

NADERA SHALHOUB-KEVORKIAN
*Armenian Quarter, the Old City,
Occupied East Jerusalem*
12 August 2014

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION: SETTLER COLONIALISM, THE POLITICS OF FEAR AND SECURITY THEOLOGY

The killer looks at the ghost of the murdered, not in his eyes, without remorse. He tells the mob, "Do not blame me: I am afraid, I killed because I was scared, and I will kill because I am scared." A few interpreted the sentence as the right to kill in self-defense. A few shared their opinions saying, "Justice is the overflow of the generosity of power." As if the deceased should apologize to the killer for the trauma he caused him. Others said, "If this incident occurred in another country, would the murdered individual have a name and a reputation?" The mob paid their condolences to the killer but when a foreigner wondered, "But what is the reason for killing a baby?" The mob replied, "Because one day this baby will grow up and then we will fear him." "But why kill the mother?" The mob said, "Because she will raise a memory." The mob shouted in unison, "Fear and not justice is the foundation for authority."

(Darwish, 2008, pp. 85–86)

For a colonized man . . . living does not mean embodying moral values or taking his place in the coherent and fruitful development of the world. To live means to keep on existing. Every date is a victory: not the result of work, but a victory felt as a triumph for life . . . [T]he objective of the native who fights against himself is to bring about the end of domination. But he ought equally to pay attention to the liquidation of all untruths implanted in his being by oppression.

(Fanon, 1963, pp. 308–309)

Following Fanon's insight that, for the colonized, "to live means to keep on existing," this book examines Palestinian experiences of life and death within the context of Israeli settler colonialism. Drawing from everyday aspects of Palestinian victimization, survival, life and death, and moving between the local and the global, I introduce and analyze what I term the "politics of fear" and the "security theology" within the Israeli settler colonial logic of elimination and erasure. I examine violent acts committed against Palestinians in the name of "security necessities" and consider how such "necessities" demand further surveillance over certain racialized bodies in order to maintain and sometimes reproduce the Israeli political economy of fear. By opening

the analytical horizon to the voices of those who “keep on existing,” I explore how Israeli theologies and ideologies of fear and security can obscure violence and power dynamics while perpetuating existing power structures, aiming to “pay attention to the liquidation of all untruths” (in the words of Fanon, 1963, p. 309) embedded in colonized peoples’ existence under a specific structure of oppression – namely, Israeli settler colonialism.

In order to read and understand such untruths, as well as daily efforts to liquidate them, I rely on a feminist analysis, invoking the intimate politics of the everyday. According to Lefebvre (1987), everydayness is a set of functions connecting systems that might appear to be distinct, and the everyday is a common denominator to all existing systems. Everyday life is profoundly related to all political constraints, social relations and activities (Abu-Lughod, 2013; Allen, 2008). The politics of everydayness enables a feminist reading of conflict because it draws our awareness to routine, intimate and private sites where power is both reproduced and contested (e.g., Alexander, 2005; hooks, 2000; Stoler, 2002). Attention to mundane and routine activities reiterates the feminist notion that the “personal is political” and alludes to the ways in which the everyday is a space for oppression and domination, but also subversion and creativity. Moreover, a focus on everydayness draws attention to the inherently gendered nature of colonial power. The process of colonization constructs gendered subjects (Green, 1995; Lawrence, 2003); hence, everyday experiences of gender reveal the nuances of colonial rule.

The everydayness of Israeli violence is poignantly demonstrated by the tragic deaths of Majda and Raya Hajaj, a Palestinian mother and daughter, during the Israeli military attack on Gaza in 2008–2009. A United Nations (UN) investigation, the United Nations Fact Finding Mission on the Gaza Conflict (UNFFMGC, widely known as the Goldstone Report),¹ reported that an Israeli soldier had killed the Palestinian women while they were waving a white flag:

¹ The Goldstone Report was written following a request on April 3, 2009, by the President of the UN Human Rights Council (UNHRC) to establish a UN fact-finding mission, the mandate of which was to investigate violations of international human rights law and international humanitarian law that might have been committed during military operations against Gaza between December 27, 2008 and January 18, 2009. Justice Richard Goldstone, former judge of the Constitutional Court of South Africa and former prosecutor of the International Criminal Tribunals for the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda, was appointed to head the mission.

The Mission finds that Majda and Raya Hajaj were part of a group of civilians moving with white flags through an area in which there was, at the time, no combat. Moreover, the Israeli armed forces had, according to witnesses interviewed by the Mission, called over local radio on the civilian population of Juhr ad-Dik to evacuate their homes and walk towards Gaza City. In the light of these reported circumstances, and particularly considering that the civilians were at a distance of more than 100 meters from them, the Israeli soldiers could not have perceived an imminent threat from the movement of people in that area, as they would have expected the civilians to respond to the call for evacuation. The Mission, therefore, finds the shooting and killing of Majda and Raya Hajaj a deliberate act on the part of the Israeli soldiers.

(UNFFMGC, 2009, Point 767)

Acting upon the Goldstone Report, the Israeli military arrested the soldier and investigated the killing, but the driver of the bulldozer who buried the bodies near the family home and the officer who refused to allow the family to evacuate the bodies (which remained there until the end of the war) were never investigated, let alone charged with any crime. On August 12, 2012, the military court reached a plea bargain with the Military Advocate General; the soldier who had killed Majda and Raya would be jailed for 45 days (Cohen, 2012). These lenient punishments expose the everydayness of the violence Palestinians face.

Such everydayness is intimately linked to Israeli fear of the Palestinian. Israeli restrictions on Palestinian movement – within the West Bank and between Israel, Gaza, the West Bank and neighboring Arab countries – are legitimated by a security rhetoric that casts Palestinians as potential terrorists (Shalhoub-Kevorkian, 2007a, 2007b). Their branding as “security risks” justifies numerous interventions into the most intimate realms of their everyday life: to delay or deny passage to pregnant women undergoing labor at checkpoints, to deny them medical assistance in life-threatening circumstances, to hinder family reunifications, to demolish homes and to deny dead bodies the right to dignified burial – examples that are discussed throughout this book. These security justifications are closely tied to fears deeply rooted in Israeli society (Makdisi, 2010; Robinson, 2013; Rouhana, 2006). In order to interrogate the context that enabled and justified Majda and Raya’s deaths, I consider the relationship between the Israeli security discourse and the fear of Palestinians among Israeli society.

To understand the conditions of Israel’s settler colonialism (which can be read alongside and in conversation with settler colonial

structures in Canada, the United States, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa), I invoke the Foucauldian concept of biopower. Foucault (1980, 1990) argues that, in order to control a territory and population, some of the population must at times be subjected to death in defense of the sovereign. Population control and the administration of life, as he explains, are central to the functioning of the sovereign power. The biopolitical administration of life, manifested in the techniques of power/knowledge, is preoccupied with the body, its health, birth and sexuality, as well as with criminality and mortality, and views all of these as a whole (Foucault, 1990, pp. 136–139). Biopolitics, the logic of elimination and the accompanying production of knowledge about the feared Other engender the conditions under which security is theologized.

Two central questions guide my analysis of Israel's need to embed its colonial ideology and security concerns in an industry of fear: What kind of power is at work in settler colonialism? And what happens to people, families and communities surviving under the surveillance of such an economy of fear and securitization? The book addresses these questions in order to understand securitization and the politics of fear, together with the processes and mechanisms that support the ability to reorder, regulate and discipline bodies and lives. The hierarchical relations of power between the colonizer and the colonized are performed through social, cultural, economic and political spheres. I examine how colonial domination operates through an industry of fear, penetrating all of these spheres and constructing Palestinians as disposable “unpeople” (to borrow a term used by diplomatic historian Mark Curtis in his 2004 work on Britain's crimes of empire).² This industry of fear becomes influential in securing the colonizer's authority over space, time, life and other modes of subordinating the colonized (Veracini, 2010; Wolfe, 1999).

How can we analyze, understand and speak about securitized fear? How do we account for “security” in both a global political economy of fearing the Other and in specific contexts of settler colonialism? My theoretical underpinning critically builds on existing scholarship that locates the Zionist settler colonial project within larger historical and sociopolitical projects that produce – and are reproduced by – a politics of fear and a security theology.

² Curtis (2004) uses the term to refer to those who can be disregarded as humans, those whose lives are considered expendable in pursuit of the empire's economic and political goals. He focuses on the way Britain has been complicit in the deaths of millions of people around the world.

THE SETTLER COLONIAL FRAMEWORK

The Zionist movement, and later the Jewish state, has carried out and continues to enforce settler colonialism in historic Palestine. As Wolfe (2006) explains, settler colonizers “come to stay”; their intention is to replace the indigenous societies they encounter. Settler colonialism is performed through legal, political, economic, social and cultural institutions. Israeli settler colonialism is a structure reinforced by daily practices of appropriation and erasure, naturalized over time (not as events or a historical era, but rather as a constitutive structure) and reified in Israeli laws and through Zionist ideology and self-narrative. According to Sayegh, Israel is defined by three central elements: a “racial complexion and racist conduct pattern,” “addiction to violence” and an “expansionist stance” (1965, p. 21). These elements are part and parcel of the Zionist settler colonial project, as the realization of Jewish nationalism embodied in the state of Israel. Zionism’s emphasis on Jewish racial exclusivity requires “racial elimination” of the Arab inhabitants of Palestine (Sayegh, 1965, p. 27). Because the settler colonial society must replace the native people in order to establish its own sovereignty, the elimination of the colonized is an “organizing principle” of settler colonialism, which “destroys to replace” (Wolfe, 2006, p. 388). Indeed, Theodore Herzl, the founding father of Zionism, wrote: “If I wish to substitute a new building for an old one, I must demolish before I construct” (Wolfe, 2006, p. 388). Because of such a desire to destroy and replace indigenous presence, G. Frederickson noted that settler colonialism has “the purest form of racist impulse” (cited in Daana, 2013).

The demolition of indigenous presence is not necessarily explicitly physical. In order to eliminate Palestinian individuals and society, Israel seeks to incorporate them into the polity as threatening Others who must be placed under constant surveillance and control, trapping them in a space in which they “must always be disappearing” (Smith, 2006, p. 68; also see Smith, 2010). The Zionist slogan “A land without people, for a people without land” is one of the foundational myths of the Israeli state (Masalha, 1997). The statement not only echoes the claim of *terra nullius*, first used to describe Australia as an “empty land,” but also reinforces the claim that Palestinians were/are not a people. The land was not simply empty; the people living there were *not people*. Thus, the incorporation of native Palestinians into the colonial legal system and politics aims simultaneously at constructing and keeping

them as feared Others, which allows the Israeli state to further pursue their elimination. As Wolfe explains, “the logic of elimination marks a return whereby the native repressed continues to structure settler colonial society” (2006, p. 390).

This tension between presence and desired absence shapes settler society and consciousness. As Razack notes, “while Aboriginal bodies haunt settlers, a too present reminder that the land is indeed stolen, they must also serve to remind them of their own modernity and entitlement to the land” (2012, p. 3; see also Goldberg, 2009; Lentin and Lentin, 2006). Reckoning with Canada’s colonial legacy and persisting structures, Joyce Green (1995) explains how the racial othering of indigenous peoples is accompanied by the “creation of a language celebrating colonial identities while constructing the colonized as the antithesis of human decency and development.” This language of dominance not only justifies the extermination of indigenous peoples, but also allows the state to institutionalize racist and imperialist ideology such that “hatred of the Other is bureaucratized” (Green, 1995). Indeed, the everyday bureaucracies of life are sites where indigenous inferiority is confirmed and nurtured. In this way, the myths of the colonizers’ superiority and claim to the land are reflected structurally in the power to define the narrative and to include and exclude indigenous peoples in service of this narrative. Should indigenous people seek state or sovereign recognition in an attempt to challenge colonial violence, they risk the elimination of indigenous difference and thereby threaten their ability to manage their recognition.

The erasure, displacement and replacement of native peoples are often accompanied by efforts to produce (a certain kind of) life. The production of life, as both Wolfe (2008) and Ellinghaus (2009) explain, aims at amalgamating the indigenous people’s culture and land into the body of the settler nation. Valladolid (cited in Turner, 1998) points out that, in settler colonial contexts, amalgamation becomes a tool for eliminating indigenous people. Indeed, surveillance and security discourses facilitate the process of amalgamating Palestinians into the settler regime by rewriting their subjectivity. This process narrows the possibilities of preserving a Palestinian history, memory and narrative, enabling Israel to replace Palestinian presence with its own narrative and values.

The colonizers’ political economy, with its perpetual elimination of indigenous peoples, defines the state of exception within the laws of settler societies, and it is through the law that settler colonialism

maneuvers its biopolitical machinery and its inherent logic of elimination (Thobani, 2007; Wolfe, 2006). Legalized biopolitical violence, placed in spaces defined by the logic of erasure, both naturalizes the settlers' violence and enables them to further their racialized colonial project. When settler colonialists exclude the identity of the indigenous peoples from the state, they position indigenous subjects not just in a state of exception (Lentin, 2008), beyond the law, but also outside of humanity. The settler is constantly haunted by the colonized, and the fears of the former keep the indigenous population on the verge of eviction if they challenge the stability and safety of the settler. Such fear is incorporated into the settlers' governance, allowing them to simultaneously include and exclude, eliminate and incorporate, assimilate and reject, while producing new categories and modes of sameness and otherness that serve to naturalize settler dominance.

THE POLITICS OF FEAR

This book takes the reader into the world of Israeli securitization, surveillance and the industry of fear. Not only are colonized Palestinians feared, but Israeli interpretations of Palestinian violence, tied to constructing them as feared Others, promotes quotidian surveillance over their lives. I argue that fear and "security claims" have become embedded in the Zionist ontology and epistemology, which, when partnered with power holders, enable technologies of surveillance over feared Others that have assisted in disciplining, displacing and erasing communities, maintaining spatial and racial dispossessions.

Fear of the Other segregates the world into secure and non-secure zones (Appadurai, 2006). Constructing citizens and occupied subjects as feared Others is a process within a larger onto-politico-economic framework in both local and global politics. Conjoined with myths, historical events, politicized exchanges and human encounters, this process serves to negotiate, invent, replace, transform and construct ideas, fantasies and bodies that should be feared. Fearing those who are otherized creates constant tension, uncertainties and struggles within colonial contexts. For, as Said (1978) explained in *Orientalism*, the less clear and more inaccurate the language used to depict the Other, the more alien the Other becomes. As Ahmed notes in her reading of Fanon, "the other is only felt to be the cause of fear through a misrecognition, which reads the body of the other as fearsome" (2003, p. 388). When the feared Other is depicted in a monstrous or animal-like manner, a

profound transformation occurs in perceiving the otherized and in othering bodies, spaces and lives. Fanon (1963) claims that settlers construct natives in zoological terms, and Mbembe theorizes how natives live an “animal life” (2003, p. 24). As Fanon (1967) explains in *Black Skin, White Masks*, the flesh becomes the raw material required for the performance of the native’s identity as one who is unwanted, unneeded, uncounted, unrecognized and feared.

Portraying the Arab/Palestinian population in “zoological” terms – as primitive, barbaric, uncivilized and ultimately as terrorists – constitutes a deliberate and well-calculated manifestation of privileging the Jewish settler over the monstrous native. Reflecting back on Majda and Raya’s unpunished deaths, we can begin to see how the trivialization of their loss of life contributes to the ideology that Palestinians are less than human. As Ahmed observes, “other claims of injury can only be excluded from legitimate grounds for self-defense if ‘others’ are not assumed to have lives that are innocent” (2003, p. 385). Racial and gendered hierarchies are required to make such assumptions of lack of innocence.

For Foucault, it is race that enables the exercise of biopower to “make live or let die” (2003, p. 241). Ideas of racial difference and inferiority/superiority determine who must live and who must die in political systems centered on biopower. The “production” and “protection” of life, as Foucault shows, is intrinsically tied to death. In the biopolitical framework, death is put to the service of life, and the death of some is considered the precondition for the prosperity of others. This dynamic is clearly illustrated in contemporary discourses of security, where the ejection, expulsion or elimination of some is constructed as necessary for the protection and thriving of others (De Larrinaga and Doucet, 2008; Dillon and Lobo-Guerrero, 2008; Evans, 2010). Race structures this dynamic: “security discourses turn violence into a necessity – they must be killed so we can live. Race makes this claim intelligible” (Razack, 2009a, p. 819).

Similarly, Mbembe (2003) recognizes the colonial distinction as a racial one: Racial and colonial differences are interwoven to produce regimes of living and dying. For Mbembe, necropolitical power explains “the various ways in which, in our contemporary world, weapons are deployed in the interest of maximum destruction of persons and the creation of death-worlds” (2003, p. 40). Offering Palestine as an example of a death-world, Mbembe suggests that infrastructural warfare – Israeli control of water, air and space – combined with brutal control

over the individual's mobility allows for the "invisible killing" and "outright execution" of Palestinians, creating a world in which colonial subjects become the "living dead." The spatial fixing of colonized people is related to the colonizers' fear of their resistance, actions, life and movement, resulting in the creation of zones where life is often unlivable or untenable and where dying becomes the regime of living (see also Ghanim, 2005).

When a settler colonial state like Israel constructs itself as a state under attack that must constantly "defend" itself (see Foucault, 2003; Robinson, 2013), its entire system of governance is centered on ensuring that people are always afraid. In settler colonial contexts, security rhetoric and the security regime rely on fear as a common and even privileged instrument to further otherize and separate "dangerous" Others. This can be seen in colonial acts of torture, abuse and imprisonment across colonized geographies (Pugliese, 2013; Razack, 2011b). The fusion between security claims and fear has created a context filled with violent values and acts, advancing racist imperialism and generating a permanent state of emergency. In Israel, as in other colonial contexts, emergency laws and regulations are used to maintain fear so as to secure land grabbing and dispossession. This power violates the rights of the indigenous people, violently intervenes in their social fabric and furthers the planned and systematic maneuvering of indigenous communities through collaborators (Cohen, 2006).

Like other colonial regimes, Israel's intelligence apparatus produces knowledge about Palestinian subjectivity that reflects colonial stereotypes and fantasies of the colonizer (Guha, 1983; Stoler, 1985; Yeğenoğlu, 1998). Such representations allow colonizers to manipulate popular ideas and beliefs about the colonized as a "savage" Other. Israel's security machinery (including its police and intelligence reports and military analyses with the collaboration of some Israeli academics) continuously produces stories, rumors, slogans, statistics, laws and policies, creating new capital in fear to maintain and substantiate their claims.

The maintenance of fear is facilitated, supported and mediated through global political alliances between Israel, the United States and other Western powers, which aid in the elimination of the feared Other, who is identified as the internal enemy that must be purged from the settler colonial state and its expanding boundaries. Israel's policy of land grabbing and the resulting displacement and destruction of entire communities seeks not only to uproot and eliminate "feared" enemies, but

also to submit the indigenous population to terror while simultaneously constructing themselves, the colonizers, as the victims of terror.

The industry of fear creates new opportunities for political maneuvering, for the promotion of certain officials, for the creation of new jobs and for the advancement of social and national solidarity among Israeli Jews (Higgs, 1997). It enables the building of new facilities, the procurement of international funding and recognition, and the proposal of legislation to direct the machinery and bureaucracies of war (Berda, 2012). The Israeli industry of fear targets not only Palestinian anti-occupation and anti-violence protesters, but also Israeli dissenters, anti-war protesters, anti-checkpoint dissidents and other political activists. Those who dare to challenge the industry of fear and its production in conflict zones are confronted by the claim that “We are in danger,” “This is a war,” “They hate us,” and “We fear them.”³

Developing more powerful weapons and creating additional “defense” and “security” strategies becomes a non-negotiable goal of the Israeli state. The embeddedness of Israeli colonial ideology in its militarized system produces a fear that can be clearly detected in the way in which the Israeli political system functions and expresses itself, the manner in which the legal system creates and interprets laws, and the mode in which mass media systems are used to serve the interests of those producing this fear. This assemblage of fear ensures that soldiers like those who killed Majda and Raya Hajaj are not perceived as deviating from the norm and therefore are not properly punished.

The current politics of “security” and “counter-terrorism” surrounding Israel’s militarist policy justifies actions taken to “protect” Israeli citizens at the expense of violating the rights of Palestinians. The political economy of fear, exclusion, death and collective punishment, characterized by a fundamentally unequal power relationship between Israel and the Palestinians, leads to violence, counter-violence and erasure. This creates an escalating vicious cycle in which the imbalance of power forges an ever-widening gap between the powerful and the powerless. I argue that in colonial contexts in general, and in the case of Israeli settler colonialism in particular, the industry of fear aims at socio-cide, which attacks the social fabric and daily life of the colonized, their land, their property and their politics of truth. Under such conditions,

³ See, for example, the Herzliya Conference research and publications (available at www.herzliyaconference.org/eng).

the colonized are forever questioning what is happening around them, for the entirety of their social relations and history is fractured by the relationship with those in power, a relationship that denies them the right to be and become.

To comprehend the political economy of fear in this context, we need an in-depth understanding of the political economy of truth, of the process of knowledge production about Palestine and the Palestinians, and of the way in which the media and the dominant discourse manipulate, nullify, deny and distort knowledge, silencing the voices of people under siege and creating a context filled with terrified, cynical communities (Palestinian and Jewish alike). Such communities are bound to their context and to global political powers by the manufacture of fear of Others who are situated in zones of non-existence (like Majda and Raya Hajaj).

HISTORICIZING ISRAELI FEAR AND SECURITY THEOLOGY

To understand securitization and fear in the context of Israel/Palestine, it is important to look at how they were portrayed before and during the first years of the establishment of the Jewish state. The early Zionist leaders Theodor Herzl and Vladimir Jabotinsky both imagined the Jewish state “encircled by walls” (Sa’di, 2010, p. 46). In Herzl’s vision, the Jewish state would be a “European outpost,” a “defense for Europe in Asia” (Sa’di, 2010, p. 47). For Jabotinsky, the wall was necessary because he predicted the “natives” would not be complacent about the destruction of their society. In this context, Sa’di (2010) reads the Israeli “security fence” (Separation Wall) not as an act of self-defense, but rather as an extension of early Zionist racial thinking that reflects an expansionist/imperialist mode of operating. When considering Zionist claims of self-defense, we should remember that Herzl’s and Jabotinsky’s conceptions of the Jewish state were situated in a context of European colonial expansion.

Historians have explained how after the Palestinian Nakba of 1948, a fear of attack by neighboring Arab countries, combined with a historical Jewish sense of persecution and the tragic criminal acts during the Nazi Holocaust, were used to intensify security justifications in the Jewish state (Al-Khalidi, 1959; Morris, 1989; Pappé, 2007). The political and ideological underpinning of the intense security agenda during

the initial years of the Jewish state was rooted in the “refugee problem” created by the displacement of Palestinians from their homes, lands, farms, villages and cities following the Nakba (Morris, 1989). The continuing efforts of the forcibly removed Palestinian population to return to their homes or homeland severely frightened the newly arrived Jewish settlers, as many lived in the refugees’ homes and used their property and land (Pappe, 2007). This situation also created a sense of insecurity and fear among the leaders of the newly established state, who defined the Palestinian refugees who tried to return as “infiltrators,” as is clear from one of David Ben-Gurion’s speeches to his political party in July 1952:

We are not in a state of peace, but rather in a state of war. Every week, a soldier is killed here or there by the infiltrators. We can’t assume that this thing will stop, for a simple reason: there are 600–800,000 refugees on the borders . . . those people are dispossessed [*menushalim*] – their fields, homes, villages were grabbed [*nigzeli*] in front of their eyes. They are hungry; their souls are bitter [*mareh nefesh*].

(Cited in Shalom, 1991, p. 143)

Ben-Gurion and the newly established state of Israel relied on a wide scope of tactics to dispossess the Palestinians of their land, including “destruction of economic resources; psychological warfare designed to instigate panic; and the destruction of villages and, in significant instances, the murder of their inhabitants” (Lichtman, 2002, p. 139). The dislocation of Palestinians, the fragmentation of their families and their society, the calculated destruction of their economic infrastructure, in addition to the massacres and psychological warfare, created two separate worlds, with Israelis inhabiting one and Palestinians the other.

Colonized people, as Fanon (1963, 1967) explains, are not allowed to lead fully human lives, and yet (perhaps because of this) the colonizers live under the constant fear that the natives will replace them. For example, according to Zaki Shalom (1991), soon after the establishment of Israel, the Israeli security agency was worried by the increased number of refugees attempting to return (“infiltrators”) and by what was seen as their close connection to the surrounding Arab countries, both of which “threatened” the newborn state. The actions of these returnees created “an intense sense of deep anxiety” among Israeli officials (Shalom, 1991, p. 146). Historian Benny Morris (1989) connects this intense and constant anxiety and fear not only to the mode of

establishing a Jewish state while killing, dispossessing and displacing Palestinians, but also to the viciousness and cruelty applied in dealing with Palestinian returnees, who were shot in cold blood when they tried to come back to their fields and homes and visit their relatives. Indeed, Israeli security personnel killed, injured, arrested and displaced thousands whose continued attempts to fight the atrocities of the Jewish state only deepened settler colonial fear and anxiety.

Continued attempts by the Zionist state to expand its possession of the land and further displace its inhabitants intensified the conflict between Israel and the surrounding Arab states. Morris (1997) argues that Arab “infiltration” and Israel’s retaliatory acts changed the geostrategic balance in the region, thereby contributing to the onset of a violent conflict. Tracing the evolution of Israel’s offensive reactions and its decision-making process, Morris provides a detailed analysis of the development of Arab–Israeli relations during the formative years of the Jewish state. His close look at state-organized Israeli raids against Palestinians (e.g., on Qibya, Nahhalin, Kinneret and the Sabha), in addition to about 25 massacres reported by others (Abdel Jawad, 2007; Masalha, 2008) reveals deep feelings of hatred and antagonism on the part of the Israelis.

In addition to the Palestinians who remained in their homeland, and the surrounding Arab countries, the Jewish state also feared the Palestinian refugees on its borders who did not know where to go or what to do. Historians such as Khalidi (1987) and Morris (1997) and scholars like Said (1980) claim that formal Israeli policy was largely based on constant anxiety, fear and hatred along with an intense perceived need for protection from the Arab/Palestinian enemy. Similar policies are discussed in the work of Stoler (1985) and Guha (1983) in their reviews of the insecurities of colonial intelligence agencies and the fears of the subject population in the Dutch East Indies. They point to the way in which colonial violence is externalized and explain how the failure to subdue the hostility of the colonized to colonial rule justifies the colonizer’s fears of the native. Further, Stoler (1985) has observed that the rhetoric produced by colonial voices portrays the natives in a manner that is informed by the perceptions of those in power to justify colonial rule, to possess more power and to advocate more actions against or inactions towards the colonized.

The intensification of land grabbing and the sociolegal oppression of native Palestinians created a deep sense of fear of the Other among Israeli-Jewish settler society and in turn intensified a need to build a

strong military and defense system. The violent confrontations between Palestinians and Zionists, the logic of elimination directing the Jewish state's leadership, the denial of the right of Palestinians to return to their homes and land, as well as Israel's engagement in wars on multiple fronts, increased the sense of fear and of living under constant threat among Israeli society (see Lissak, 1994). The development of a security apparatus, rooted in fear and insecurity, required that the state and its leaders maintain a clear position vis-à-vis their Arab/Palestinian enemies, including planning and initiating war and aggressively responding to attacks. This securitization was ingrained in the nature of the colonial state and in the minds and beliefs of its leaders. The acts of Israeli retaliation that took place were aimed not only at strengthening the security system in the Jewish state, but also at deterring states and individuals from further infiltration and attacks. I argue, in fact, that these acts of retaliation were also affected by the psychological reactions of those victims of the Holocaust who could not handle seeing their Jewish brothers and sisters injured or attacked, and wanted to do all they could to secure the Jewish entity.

Thus, a large combination of factors – the fear of being attacked and persecuted as a result of the crimes perpetrated by the settler colonial project, guilt arising from the displacement and impoverishment of the Palestinian population and the fragmentation of its space, fear of attacks from the surrounding Arab states, the “infiltration” of the Palestinian returnees, Jewish history in Europe, including the severe trauma of the Holocaust, and the changes occurring in the global workings of power – contributed to a severe sense of insecurity and fear among Israelis. This fear constructed securitization and defense in such a way as to make them central aspects of the Israeli settler colonial apparatus. It allowed leaders and policy makers to market the ideology of “the whole world is against us,” the Arabs “want to throw us into the sea,” “they hate us,” in addition to the notion that “we must defend ourselves against their [Palestinian] anger.”

It is my contention that in order to maintain a productive global and local industry and political economy that produces and reproduces fear, Israel's “security” was transformed into a religion, an indubitable theology. This theology has been combined with the Zionist biblical claims of a Jewish “birthright” to the “Promised Land” to create a new settler colonial theology in Israel. Insofar as biblical claims of Jewish “chosenness” and “return” serve Israel's narrative as a legitimate and sovereign state, they also work to cast Israeli violence against

Palestinians as a “security necessity.” The discursive collapse of biblical and security claims works to exonerate racist structures; to mask state violence through the biblical/security prism naturalizes the dispossession of Palestinians.

Analyzing the biblical claims of the Chosen People/Promised Land narrative that are at the heart of Jewish and Christian Zionism and which justify racial violence, Masalha notes:

Although some Israeli fundamentalists refer to the Palestinians as “Ishmaelites” and to the circumstances under which biblical Abraham “expelled” Ishmael, others prefer to use Joshua’s destruction and subjugation of the Canaanites as a model for the determination of Israeli policy towards the contemporary “Palestinian problem.”

(2009, p. 58)

Whether perceiving Palestinians as Ishmaelites or Canaanites, Masalha (2009) notes that the Bible is the founding myth of Israel. He argues that biblical myths are behind the American support for Israel today, just as they were behind the Christian British support for the Zionist project over 100 years ago. He also claims that Jewish fundamentalists portray Jerusalem in terms of a “sacred geography,” and the fear of the violation of its sacredness through the presence of non-Jews has opened new spaces for additional uprooting of and violence against Palestinians (2009, p. 59). Further:

According to the Hebrew Bible, the ancient Israelites shared the belief that Yahweh (Jehovah) was a warrior directly involved in earthly battles. Was Yahweh a “genocidal” god? At least some ancient Israelites believed that Yahweh demanded the complete extermination of the enemy people.

(Masalha, 2007, p. 271)

Ideologies calling for the extermination of enemies quite obviously can lead to hate crimes and other crimes against humanity.

The key historical moment that conflated the settler colonial ideology of erasing the native and the theological ideology of the Chosen People/Promised Land narrative was manifested in the Balfour Declaration of 1917, when Britain declared its support for the establishment of a “national home for the Jewish people” in a non-European land without any consideration of or consultation with the natives (Khalidi, 1987; Said, 1980). This was further supported at a later stage in history by the blatant and immoral agreement on the part of the United

States to accept the Zionist map of Palestine, which gave 75 percent of the total area of Palestine to the Jews at a time when Jews owned 7 percent of the land (Khalidi, 1987). Once President Harry S. Truman committed himself to the Zionist map on Yom Kippur in 1946, the fate of the Palestinian natives was determined and the colonial logic of erasure was politically approved by international power holders, justified through biblical, religious/sacred claims and adopted ideologically and strategically by the Zionist project.

The first Prime Minister of Israel, David Ben-Gurion, reflected in 1954: “We must not separate religion from the state. The fate of the state of Israel and the Jewish people is one” (cited in Bishara, 2011). By conflating Israel with all Jewish people, Ben-Gurion attached protection of the state of Israel to protection of the Jewish people. In a 1988 Israeli Supreme Court decision, Justice Aharon Barak echoed this sentiment: “We are a young state in which an ancient people returned to its nation . . . Deep is the religious, national and historical political bond between the people of Israel and the land of Israel as well as between the Jewish state and the Jewish people” (cited in Bishara, 2011). This record of joining the biblical and the national has worked to obscure Palestinian presence and dispossession. Constructing colonized Palestinians as feared “threats,” supported by securitized and biblical claims and justifications, sustains the settler state and enhances and naturalizes its power.

SECURITY THEOLOGY WITHIN GLOBAL RACIAL POLITICS: US/THEM

In addition to the sacred biblical claims, the security theology was supported by a leading political assertion on the part of Israelis of “us against them,” a clearly colonialist and racialized claim. The refusal of the Zionists (and their allies) to acknowledge historical facts and the criminality of the forced displacement, dispossession and massacres of the Palestinian population resulted in the portrayal of the security of the sacred in the colonial logic of elimination, a logic not only of “us against them,” but even of “us, not them.”

On the present international scene, the Israeli security theology is supported by the global hegemon, the United States. The US response to Israel’s vicious attack on Gaza in 2014 and 2008–2009, which it portrayed as understandable, if excessive, exemplifies the global resonance of Israel’s security theology. For decades, the United States

has supported Israel's fear industry and its security theology, even as Israel continues to commit war crimes (as evidenced in the latest massacre in Shajaeyyeh in July 2014), grab valuable land and resources, fragment the remaining Palestinian land with additional settlements and expand settlements in Jerusalem in violation of UN Security Council edicts (Hammond, 2010). Non-violent reactions by Palestinians and solidarity groups are rarely noticed in the US, let alone in Israel, for they do not serve the fear industry; rather, Palestinian violence is always emphasized. Even when the Northern Ireland Nobel Laureate Mairead Corrigan Maguire was tear gassed and shot at by Israeli troops during her participation in a vigil protesting the Israeli Separation Wall, her injuries did not receive wide attention; only the Irish media covered it in English (Nobel Women's Initiative, 2007).

The logic of elimination underlying the security theology is also apparent in the case of Gilad Shalit, the Israeli prisoner of war who was released in October 2011. The day before Shalit was captured, Israeli forces had entered Gaza and kidnapped, in violation of the Geneva Convention, the Muammar brothers, two civilians who have since disappeared into Israel's prison system (BBC, 2006). While Shalit's case received considerable media attention, the kidnapping of the Palestinian civilians was barely noted; it was not considered news.

Despite the increase in scholarship on and examination of the flagrant illegality of Israel's settlements – which includes the occupation of East Jerusalem in violation of numerous UN Security Council resolutions, as well as the judgment by the International Court of Justice on the Separation Wall (B'Tselem, 2011c) – the logic of Israel's security theology remains intact. The international double standard displayed in dealing with Palestinian versus Israeli acts of violence is extremely disturbing, especially as Palestinian acts, such as the Qassam rockets fired from Gaza, are vehemently condemned by the West, yet the destructive acts of the Israeli state, like the attacks on Gaza in 2008, November 2012 and July 2014, continue.

Although Israel has imposed emergency laws and a military regime on the Palestinians, the Zionist colonial project is nevertheless presented as a democratic state (Bishara, 2011; Robinson, 2013). Despite its democratic status, the state is maintained by a military structure that controls its political and economic structure, life and "security." The celebration of a settler colonial state as the "sole democracy" in the Middle East has helped the state of Israel obtain domestic and

international legitimacy and the support of the international community in its quest for “security.”

The Israeli security theology is accepted and affirmed by the international community, as is evidenced by the failure of international organizations to prevent continuous injustices and attacks on Palestinians. Even international humanitarian law fails to challenge Israel’s security theology (for an in-depth discussion, see Hajjar, 2001, 2006). Article 33 of the Fourth Geneva Convention of 1949 states that: “No protected person may be punished for an offense he or she has not personally committed. Collective penalties and likewise all measures of intimidation or of terrorism are prohibited... Reprisals against protected persons and their property are prohibited” (Article 33 of the International Committee of the Red Cross, 1949). Gazans, West Bankers and East Jerusalemites under Israeli military occupation are considered “protected persons.” Furthermore, Article 50 of the Hague Convention of 1907 clearly states that no penalty can be inflicted on a population for the acts of individuals for which it cannot be regarded as collectively responsible. Israel’s grave breaches of international humanitarian law, added to the continuous use of its religious claims of “chosenness,” prompt Israeli legislators, politicians and social control agents to wave the “sacred” and “security” flags through the political and legal system. This is reflected in high court rulings that add legitimacy to the ugly record of the subordination of the court to the state’s sacralized and securitized theology (Negbi, 2004). The security theology is enhanced by Israel’s claim that, in addition to facing external attacks, it must confront the internal “demographic problem,” in other words, the presence of those Palestinians who remained on their lands after the 1948 Nakba (Soffer, 2003).

As will be shown throughout this book, the security theology simultaneously functions through and reinforces itself by engaging in sudden and, in most cases, unpredictable attacks on the bodies, homes and lives of its subjects. The disciplining practices under the regime of the security theology lead to displacement, deprivation of housing, health care and education, and restrictions on movement, resulting in crimes against humanity. The Israeli Zionist ideology and the biblical rationalizations used to oppress and dispossess Palestinians create operational modes and racist structures that support the use of violence in the name of “homeland security,” “security necessity” and the “security needs” of the powerful.

EVERYDAYNESS

Finally, I return to my point of departure – the politics of everydayness. Giving birth, honoring the dead, getting married, keeping families together and preventing home demolitions are all issues that will be analyzed not only from a biopolitical and necropolitical perspective, but also from the perspective of the everyday. Colonial control and its quotidian power in the everyday are central to my study of theologized security and the politics of fear. Understanding the everydayness of surveillance and control is vital, for as Nettleton and Watson (1998) assert, everyday life is fundamentally about the production and reproduction of bodies, and is heavily tied to the economy of life and death.

As Johnson explains, the everyday is the level at which hegemony functions, the “threshold at which it seeks to become invisible as such, its violence buried deep, so that it is lived as consent rather than domination” (2007, p. 23). But the everyday is also the level at which hegemony is contested. The work of de Certeau (1988) is particularly poignant here, as he explores the creative and unpredictable ways in which people manipulate, evade and negotiate their own environments (see also Felski, 2002; Tan, 1996). Making a distinction between *strategies* (which are the practices of the dominating order) and *tactics* (which are the practices of the “common” people), de Certeau (1988) explores how people use tactics to forge spaces for themselves in environments defined by strategies. These small, “unofficial” practices are part and parcel of “official” institutional practices.

Reflecting upon how Palestinians live every day, not knowing if they can reach school, the health clinic or give birth in a safe setting, I realized how Palestinians’ living and dead bodies are used as tools to produce fear, theologize security, gain power and visibilize disciplinary forms of power, and how their bodies resist this oppressive global economy of knowledge. Linking everydayness with biopolitics and necropolitics allows us to understand how daily practices of self-regulation are connected to the strategic needs of the settler colonizers to maintain surveillance and preserve the colonial logic of erasure. The colonized body and space are both utilized and constructed to enable this exercise of necropolitical power. Focusing on the everyday dimensions of power and resistance, each chapter will consider particular manifestations of fear and resistance mediated through the security theology and the structures of settler colonialism.

Chapter 2 examines the criminal actions of the Israeli-Jewish group known as Tag Mehir (“Price Tag”), portraying these as acts of visual and rhetorical surveillance over the Palestinian living, almost dead and dead body, aimed at erasing Palestinian indigeneity while structuring settler colonial society. Chapter 3 examines how the “fear” of the colonizer results in laws that impose surveillance over Palestinian family life. Focusing on the Israeli Citizenship and Entry Law, the chapter elaborates on how legislation exacerbates historical injustices, invades people’s bedrooms and affects their most intimate decisions. Chapter 4 analyzes surveillance over Palestinian memory and memorialization, examining surveillance of the commemoration of a violated homeland alongside the practices and policies of home demolitions in Occupied East Jerusalem. In Chapter 5, I examine surveillance over the dead Palestinian body, using the concepts of biopolitics and necropolitics to understand the meaning of the security theology and the industry of fear. I look beyond the living, analyzing how the dead and their desecrated bodies are turned into symbols of power and become boundary markers that appropriate Palestinian place, space and conduct to reproduce a context of constant uncertainty and chaos. This chapter also poses the methodological question of whether one can research the invisible in colonial contexts in the midst of heavy surveillance. Transforming men and women’s dead bodies into symbols of power and identity (within the complex local and global economic and political forces) is examined through the voices and experiences of the unheard and unnoticed. The penultimate chapter examines the political economy of fear and surveillance over the Palestinian birthing body. The book concludes with a look at future directions in researching fear in the context of settler colonialism.

CHAPTER TWO

PRICE TAGGING PALESTINIANS: ALTERNATIVE METHODS OF SURVEILLANCE AND CONTROL

At the entrance to our house, they [Tag Mehir] sprayed a Star of David and the phrase “tistalku mi kan” [“Get out of here”] . . . all in black . . . They invade the neighborhood at night, scare the kids and spray “mavet la aravim” [“Death to the Arabs”] on the walls, and when we call the police and ask for help, they don’t even come to check the area, let alone listen to what we have to say. They treat us like animals, like we’re not human, like we don’t have families that need to feel safe when sleeping or children that need to know that at least the walls of their homes are secure . . .

(Nahed, 42, Old City of Jerusalem)

Nahed’s narration of her ordeal resulting from the violence of the Jewish-Israeli movement known as Tag Mehir (“Price Tag”) articulates how language and images – such as the Star of David – are technologies of power. These are the tools used to transform bodies, lives and homes into insecure, threatening constructs which produce knowledge about who should be thrown out (“Get out of here”) and eliminated (“Death to the Arabs”).

The violence against Nahed’s family and life, sprayed on the walls of her home, imposes on her a strong sense of being haunted by constant surveillance. It leaves her and her family on guard and unprotected, or, as she stated, “in a daily state of living our uprooting.” The violation of Nahed’s personal, familial and physical integrity, the nightly invasions of her home and neighborhood, and the desire of the perpetrators to penetrate her otherness as a Palestinian woman living in the Old City of Jerusalem create a heavy sense of fear. The violence of words is used not only to vandalize her private space, but also to exaggerate the power of the colonizer. Nahed’s narrative suggests that colonialism works in many forms, including rhetorical, invisible ones (despite their visibility as writings on the wall) and those that politicize private and public spaces to promote its agenda, mobilize people and create a climate that maintains its ideology.

Rhetoric is widely and consistently used as a political tool throughout colonial history. As Fanon points out:

In fact, the terms the settler uses when he mentions the native are zoological terms. He speaks of the yellow man's reptilian motions, of the stink of the native quarter, of breeding swarms of foulness, spawn, of gesticulations. When the settler seeks to describe the native fully in exact terms he constantly refers to the bestiary . . . Those hordes of vital statistics, those hysterical masses, those faces bereft of all humanity, those distended bodies which are like nothing on earth, that mob without beginning or end, those children who seem to belong to nobody, that laziness stretched out in the sun, that vegetative rhythm of life – all this forms part of the colonial vocabulary.

(1963, pp. 42–43)

In keeping with Fanon's (1963) concept of colonial vocabulary and his analyses of the power of visuality in practicing political power, this chapter analyzes the surveillance power of rhetoric, words and graffiti as violent cultural forms that politicize private and public spaces in order to maintain a sense of being haunted and uprooted. It is my claim that Tag Mehir's politicization of space promotes a specific ideology and agenda so as to establish the colonizer's presence even in the most intimate spaces of the colonized, thereby creating a terrorizing climate. By understanding the power of the politicization of the private and public spheres, reflected in writings and vandalism on walls, cemeteries, homes and fields, we can better comprehend the ramifications and repercussions of such violent acts not only on inscribing power over spaces, but also on instilling fear in individuals, families and entire communities – as we learned from Nahed's narrative. This will allow us to go beyond the uncovering of colonial vocabulary and visualities and the colonial logic of elimination (as explained in the previous chapter) to examine the role of such inscriptions on Palestinians' sense of being watched and persecuted, and the effect of this on the social and psychological texture and meanings of life and living. This will help us delve into the implications of the violent and fear-inducing actions of Tag Mehir.

I argue that Tag Mehir's vandalism, its use of rhetoric and visual images are charged with an ontological epistemology that has the power to structure, produce, negotiate, reinvent and catalyze Israel's colonial regime. It disrupts safety and promotes a politics of fear aimed at

furthering the security of the powerful, all the while producing and maintaining the obedience of the marginalized through ongoing surveillance. This politics of fear and surveillance leaves the colonized constantly insecure, particularly because they are unable to interpret or appropriately handle the many complex symbols, forms of rhetoric and visualities of the colonialist. They are constantly on guard, not knowing when and how they have crossed the line, and of course they are always guilty.

Lasting more than 60 years, and despite Israel's constitutional Basic Law, judicial precedents and a plethora of civil rights statutes formally prohibiting racial discrimination, the oppression of Palestinians through administrative monitoring has not ended. Visible and non-visible, formal and non-formal, and legal and illegal discriminatory acts, along with deeply embedded personal and group preconceptions and public policy assumptions, continue to support discriminatory public policies (see, e.g., Davis, 2003; Rouhana, 1997; Weizman, 2007; Yiftachel, 2006; Zureik, Lyon and Abu-Laban, 2011). Formal and visible discrimination can be detected when reviewing, for example, socioeconomic data. Statistics indicate that the Arab population of Israel has a much higher poverty rate than the Jewish population (54 percent versus 16 percent among individuals, 51 percent versus 15 percent among families, and 62 percent versus 24 percent among children; Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2010, p. 143). Other basic measures of poverty among "citizens" of the Israeli state reveal that the highest rate is found among Palestinians, particularly Palestinian women. A United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, Occupied Palestinian Territory report from 2011 indicates that unemployment is rising in Gaza and the West Bank, and the jobless rate in Gaza is among the highest in the world (Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, 2011b). However, my argument is that statistics alone cannot adequately reflect life conditions, for Nahed's daily life experiences are not captured by the official numbers. It is what is hidden and invisible in the violent colonial context that affects the state of those living in spaces and places of otherness. Data on unemployment and poverty are not only reflections of cultural behavior, political ideology or economic policy; they are also indicators of social injustice in the context of social conflict, political risk, military occupation, displacement and oppression. Further, these numbers are indicative of how those in power would like to read, count,

portray and construct the oppressed. But can such portrayals uncover the magnitude of the effect of ostracization and otherization, particularly when conducted through hidden methods of securitization and surveillance?

Part of the logic of this chapter is to provide an analysis that avoids relegating the question of fearing the “Other” and the “otherized” to official statistics. Instead, my arguments stem from Nahed’s experience facing the violence of Tag Mehir as written on the walls of her home in order to make visible the Israeli regime’s covert power of surveillance. The analysis of surveillance methods over the Other often falls short of recognizing how such surveillance produces fear and furthers control and securitization (both formal and informal) over the “unwanted” Other, while threatening to reproduce further oppressions (Sa’di, 2011; Zureik et al., 2011). Thus, the criminological categories of surveillance and control warrant a more intricate analysis. It requires reformulating the nature of the surveillance discourse itself while juxtaposing it with parameters of social justice (which, as I define it, includes historical justice). My intention is to engage the complex significance that constitutes surveillance and securitization so as to closely examine how the discursive constitution of Palestinian otherness is achieved through politically racialized modes of differentiation.

A HISTORY OF BODY AND MIND CONTROL IN COLONIAL SECURITY POLICIES

A politicized reading of the surveillance, securitization and control literature reveals that the menace of otherness and fear of the Other – with its mundane disciplining power, invisibility and traumatic effect, as portrayed in Nahed’s narrative – cannot be treated as a sub-domain of psychology, law, sociology, economics or political science alone. It requires a multi-disciplinary framework that can provide an in-depth understanding of the colonial context and logic, with its environment of rhetorical significance and articulation embedded in the vocabulary used to refer to the otherized.

In Fanon’s (1963) analysis, the colonizer’s bourgeois intellectuals use their colonial vocabulary in order to produce visible articulations of menace against otherness. The colonizer’s monitoring and surveillance exercises simultaneously aim at sustaining otherness and preserving the settler’s power to control the native’s body, home and land; the colonizers place individuals and communities under surveillance

to keep the colonized in their place. Fanon (1963) claims that confining the colonized, producing knowledge, statistics and publications that point to the need to fear them, and compartmentalizing their spaces to ensure they do not challenge their limitations are but some forms of colonial control and surveillance. Colonial control and its surveillance regime can be practiced through spatial separations and confinement as well as through control of bodies, language, visual images, media coverage, etc. Theorists reflecting on empire, rhetoric and visibility have articulated how language and images are technologies of power used to galvanize politics (Said, 1978; Shepherd, 2004). Words and images are never just words and images, and at times they themselves become technologies for contesting power to produce knowledge about who should fear whom and why, and demonstrate how power holders can invent modes to securitize and impose surveillance over the feared Other.

Fear in the context of Zionist colonialism transforms the production of the Palestinian as the unwanted and feared Other into a natural outcome of Zionism. As Sayegh explains: “Zionism is the belief in the national oneness of all Jews – who are identified as such in terms of their supposedly common ancestry . . . Zionist racial identification produces three corollaries: racial self-segregation, racial exclusiveness, and racial supremacy” (1965, p. 22). The very nature of the Zionist colonial project rejects the assimilation of Jews into non-Jewish societies and requires:

racial purity and racial exclusiveness in the land in which Jewish self-segregation is to be attained . . . The Zionist ideal of racial self-segregation demands, with equal imperativeness, the departure of all Jews from the lands of their “exile” and the eviction of all non-Jews from the land of “Jewish destination.”

(Sayegh, 1965, p. 23)

The eviction of non-Jews, as reflected in the writing on Nahed’s walls (“Get out of here,” “Death to the Arabs”), intensifies fear among the colonized, preserves the purity and exclusiveness of Jews in Israel, and produces an eliminatory, discriminatory condition that turns Nahed’s community into threatening entities that require constant policing.

Fear of the colonized is galvanized by two mutually inclusive theologies, mobilized by two main powers. One theology is based on religious claims and justified by the sacredness of the “Chosen People”; the other

is based on the Zionist colonial eliminatory ideology. Together, they construct a security theology that aims at securing the Jewish people in “their land.” I wish to argue that the graffiti of Tag Mehir carries implicit statements against Christians and Muslims and against the Palestinian people while “price tagging” any act that might shake the “holiness, exclusivity, and supremacy” of the Jewish identity.

The colonizers, for their part, aim their work, in its formal, legal and exhibitionist mode, at inscribing their power on the body and life of the native. As Sherene Razack (2003, 2012) theorizes, following Fanon’s (1963) line of reasoning, the colonizers’ inscriptions of power over the body of the native reveal not only their sense of being haunted by the latter, but also their perceived need to safeguard themselves from the native’s “vulgarity” and “permissivity.” This preoccupation with securing and protecting themselves is transformed into the colonizer’s “right to oppress” – as seen in Nahed’s case, when attackers invaded her homespace, terrorized her family and inscribed their power via graffiti on her walls, calling for her uprooting, eviction and death. As Fanon explains, the colonizer’s “preoccupation with security makes him remind the native out loud that there he alone is master . . . [T]he settler or the policeman has the right the livelong day to strike the native, to insult him and to make him crawl to them” (1963, pp. 53–54). Thus, surveillance and control strategies as well as laws and regulations are developed. In sum, the production of fear reproduces the bodies, social relations and sociopolitical order in the colonized world. Such productions manifest the political power of the colonizer and sustain a continuum of oppressive disciplinary power relations, a constant silent war that inscribes relations of force through visible and invisible modes, institutions, bureaucracies and language.

Surveillance over the colonized is often hidden and unseen, its power inscribed on their living and dead bodies, invading their most intimate domains, their communities, homes and families, their secrets and interactions (Razack, 2012). Such surveillance violates personal and physical integrity, constituting a type of voyeurism. This pornography of the self and body includes the marginalization of subjects, the production of these subject’s obedience while simultaneously requiring their eviction, and finally the inscription of power not only over the living or dead bodies of the colonized (Razack, 2011b), but also over their space, time and psyches (Sayegh, 1965).

The “supremacy” of the colonizer can also be detected in their colonial fantasies. Focusing on the West’s fascination with women in the

Orient, Yeğenoğlu (1998) argues that the very desire to penetrate the otherness of veiled women is constitutive of colonial control and hegemonic identity. She further claims that the production of colonial difference supports the marginalization of the Other and, in turn, produces the gendered and sexualized differences of the veiled woman.

Yeğenoğlu's (1998) observations assist us in further understanding the invisible modes of maintaining the exclusivity of the colonizer and the ostracization of the Other. These observations are supported by my own study of the use of information and communication technologies (ICT) to electronically coerce and dominate women in occupied Jerusalem, a study that revealed how the Israeli regime of control not only penetrates women's private acts and spaces (including cyberspace) in order to limit their mobility and access to education, economic welfare and health services, but also restricts, polices and disciplines their aspirations for the future (Shalhoub-Kevorkian, 2012b). Racial and gendered segregation is not accomplished primarily through physical means, such as imprisonment, but rather through mundane acts of surveillance and of instilling in the colonized a sense of being watched, haunted and trapped (Shalhoub-Kevorkian, 2012b).

Understanding the construction by the colonizer of the colonial subject through the invocation of a colonial discourse of fear and surveillance does not mean that there is a unitary, transhistorical and globally homogenized machinery of colonialism and colonial control. On the contrary, it implies that colonialism operates differently in different times and spaces. I argue that Tag Mehir's violence is but a continuation of the settler colonial Zionist regime in Palestine. If terrorizing the native Palestinians – who stubbornly remained in their homeland despite all efforts to evict them during the first years of the Jewish state – was the main machinery of surveillance and control in the past, then Tag Mehir is terrorizing the present-day Palestinians to further the colonial logic of elimination.

Studies of colonialism have demonstrated that it works in political, economic and cultural forms (Razack, 1998, 2002; Stoler, 2002; Thobani, 2007). Little attention has been focused, however, on how surveillance in colonial contexts is structured by unconscious or unrecognized processes that are formal and informal, visible and invisible. Although an analysis of conscious and unconscious political behaviors, processes, discourses and desires might reduce structural processes to the level of individual psychological motivation, it can also highlight specific genealogical constructions and collective processes that

severely affect the colonial subject. The following section will focus on the power of alternative, non-state, violent rhetoric and discourse, that of Zionist surveillance.

BODY, LAND AND MIND CONTROL

Elements of the discursive dynamics that maintain surveillance over the development, movement, life and body of Palestinians, in the context of Zionist colonialism, is revealed through an examination of Tag Mehir. This movement employs violence against Palestinians and their property both in the West Bank and inside Israel, as well as against Israeli peace activists and military personnel, who are portrayed as threatening the racial exclusivity and supremacy of Jewish ancestry. It is not my intention to historicize this organization, although I will discuss the historical context when relevant; rather, my aim is to examine its acts and discourse as a vehicle in my quest for new directions in analyzing securitization, surveillance and the production of fear. To do so, I would like to first connect Tag Mehir's violence to the early acts of the Zionist regime in Palestine and remind the reader of Sayegh's description of how racial discrimination has affected Palestinian Arabs:

The remnants of Palestine's Arabs who have continued to live in the Zionist settler-state since 1948 have their own "Bantustans," their "native reserves," their "Ghettoes" – although the institution which they encounter in their daily lives is given by the Zionist authorities the euphemistic name, "security zone."

(1965, p. 28)

This security regime placed Palestinians under martial law in "security zones" to live at the mercy of "Emergency Defense Regulations" prosecuted by military tribunals and subject to a pass system aimed at maintaining them as "security threats" and "feared Others." The Zionist settler state's habitual behaviors of resorting to force, violence and intimidation as a chosen means to evict the native – such as the state-sanctioned violence against Palestinians by Zionist forces in Deir Yassin, Ein al-Zeitun and Salah ed-Deen in April 1948 – "were calculated measures in a formal program of eviction-by-terrorization" (Sayegh, 1965, p. 31). What I am wondering here is whether Tag Mehir's violence is likewise embedded in the securitized (religious and colonial) theology, only dressed up and masked to suit contemporary local and global politics.

What is Tag Mehir?

Tag Mehir is a Jewish settler movement that emerged in mid-2008 and engages in violent direct action against Palestinians and their supporters. The numbers involved in Tag Mehir activities in 2008 exceeded 3,000, with most coming from religious settlement schools (*yeshivas*) espousing Zionist ideology (Shragai, 2008). They encompass a wide range of people and groups (see Muhareb, 2012), including rabbis, yeshiva students and graduates, activists and followers of Kach (a political party that entered the Knesset, the Israeli Parliament, in 1984 and was officially banned in 1994). The party leader of Kach, Rabbi Meir Kahane, was a preacher and teacher of Jewish holy violence; he saw the removal of the Arabs not as a political matter, but as a religious obligation (Hanauer, 1995; Morgan and Attias, 1990; Sprinzak, 1998), and he promoted the expulsion of all Palestinians (Neff, 1994). Tag Mehir also includes the “hilltop youth,” a group of young, radical, anti-establishment settlers living in unauthorized outposts in the West Bank, a group that the then-Defense Minister Ehud Barak once labeled a “terror group” (Carton, 2011; *Jerusalem Post*, 2011).

Tag Mehir targets Palestinians on a daily basis. The actions of its members include stone throwing, shooting live ammunition at people, attacking homes and villages, uprooting trees, setting fire to fields, cars and mosques, stealing produce, vandalizing and destroying crops and graveyards, and writing racist graffiti such as “Muhammad is a pig,” “Jesus, son of a whore” and “Death to the Arabs” (Nesher and Rosenberg, 2012). Muhareb points out that:

Price Tag activists, along with their supporters and wider audience, embrace a racist viewpoint based on intense hatred of Palestinian Arabs. They call for their murder, extermination or expulsion from the Occupied Palestinian Territories, in addition to the strengthening of Jewish settlements in the Occupied Palestinian West Bank and the acceleration of its “Judaization” and annexation to Israel. Until the extermination or expulsion of Palestinians takes place, Price Tag actively calls for making the life of Palestinians in the West Bank unbearable, to a degree beyond the limits of endurance, through tyranny and maltreatment.

(2012, p. 11)

The violence has also extended to attacks inside Israel, on both Muslim and Christian sites, such as the following incident reported in the *Jerusalem Report*:

Late one night, just after the Rosh Hashana New Year holiday, vandals broke into the small Bedouin village of Tuba-Zangariyya, in Israel's northern Galilee region, torching the mosque and reducing dozens of copies of the Koran to ashes . . . Copycat, although apparently unrelated, acts followed the torching of the mosque. Vandals spray-painted the same graffiti in a Muslim cemetery in Jaffa a few days later, but police announced that, due to other evidence at the scene, they are doubtful that the vandals are Jewish extremists. And on October 14, Shvuel Schijveschuuder, whose parents and three siblings were murdered in a terrorist attack in Jerusalem 10 years ago, was apprehended as he spray-painted "price tag" and "free Yigal Amir" [the assassin of Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin] on the Tel Aviv memorial marking the spot where Rabin was murdered . . .

(Gradstein, 2011)

According to an Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, Occupied Palestinian Territories (2011a) report, "Israeli Settler Violence in the West Bank," between 2009 and 2011 there was a 165 percent increase in weekly settler attacks resulting in Palestinian casualties and damage to property. The attacks also destroy the livelihood of the Palestinians: in 2011, for example, nearly 10,000 trees (mostly olive trees) belonging to Palestinians were damaged or destroyed. The Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (2011a) records that over 90 percent of monitored complaints regarding settler violence filed by Palestinians with the Israeli police in recent years have been closed without indictment. B'Tselem, an Israeli human rights organization established in 1989 by a group of prominent academics, attorneys, journalists and Knesset members to combat the phenomenon of denial prevalent among the Israeli public, has also reported on the violent acts of and use of fear tactics by Tag Mehir against Palestinians (B'Tselem, 2011d, 2012).

Both the Israeli religious parties and the secular nationalist party have one common objective – preservation of the Jewishness of the state, and thus Jewish supremacy, as the only basis for Zionism and for Israel's existence (Sayegh, 1965). This common ground creates a legal condition that both fails to criminalize Tag Mehir's acts and creates solidarity in the Jews' ethnic supremacy, thereby producing xenophobic ideologies and hatred of the Other.

The Israeli political arena, including the Israeli right, has exhibited a growing tendency to distance itself from the violence conducted

by Tag Mehir, claiming that such acts are those of a hostile group unsupported by the vast majority of the Israeli people. Israeli political debates, the Israeli Security Service's analyses and the mainstream media coverage all consider Tag Mehir to be a right-wing Jewish-Israeli organization, sometimes defined as "Jewish terror."¹ There are those who define its members as "hooligans," "belligerent groups" and "vanguards of the entire settlement movement" (Sternhell, 2011). The Israeli Prime Minister has labeled their actions "acts of vandalism" (*Nana 10*, 2012).²

Despite this lack of approval of (or contempt for) this group, there are officials, including members of the Knesset (MKs), who support the violence perpetrated by the organization, either actively or by omission. For example, an article in the newspaper *Ha'aretz* (Levinson, 2012) revealed that Likud MK and coalition Chairman Ze'ev Elkin assisted Tag Mehir activists in tracking the movement of the Israeli army in the West Bank in an attempt to better resist army evacuations of illegal settler outposts. In addition, some factions in the government coalition, such as the Haehud HaLeumi (National Union Party) and the Habayit HaYehudi (New National Religious Party), are supportive of and sympathetic to Tag Mehir's ideology and actions (Liss, 2012). A 2011 poll conducted by the Israeli-based Panels Research found that almost half (46 percent) of the Israeli population support Tag Mehir's acts (*Ynet-Yediot Ahronot*, 2011).

The types of targets and methods used by Tag Mehir demonstrate that it is a secret organization operating in a coercive manner. Based on reports leaked to *Ha'aretz* (Levinson, 2011), the Israeli Shin Bet (secret security agency) believes that Tag Mehir activists work in small cells and groups that are well organized, secret and impenetrable by intelligence agencies. The report stated that these groups are monitoring Palestinian villages and communities as well as Israeli peace activists, and are collecting information and preparing to carry out operations against them. The fact that the security forces are not doing enough to arrest these perpetrators, the absence of statistics on their attacks (each incident is investigated separately, according to the police; Levinson, 2011), the minor convictions, and their well-organized and highly compartmentalized cell work all send a message that these illegal actions

¹ E.g., Walla! (2012). On the reactions of security officials to Tag Mehir, see Harel (2011); Kovovitz and Huri (2011); and Ravid (2012).

² See also the interview in Keinan and Lazaroff (2011).

are tacitly condoned. According to research undertaken by Yesh Din, at least 132 acts of violence attributable to Tag Mehir were reported to the human rights organization between May 2013 and April 2014 (Gurvitz, 2014). Over 88 percent of the time, these cases were closed with the offender recorded as “unknown,” indicating that the police were unable to locate the suspects and were therefore unable to bring them to justice (Gurvitz, 2014).

Justifications and interpretations of Tag Mehir’s actions range from those that consider their violence a reaction to violent Palestinian behaviors towards Jews, to others who interpret this violence as a response to the state’s failure to pursue the Zionist dream and protect settlers and citizens, and on to those that see them as acts of self-defense and resistance against hate crimes. Micha Regev (2011), a former settler activist, explains that Tag Mehir’s violence is motivated by a blind and dangerous hatred and theology. He argues that “external rabbis”³ – who hate all Arabs living on the “land that belongs to the Jewish people” – believe that it is now the age of redemption, that Arabs are contaminating the land and that the Jewish people should reign over the entire land of Israel. To become truly sovereign, Jews must provoke the situation, creating a religious war with the Arabs.

The actions of the Tag Mehir movement are “justified” in the book *Torat ha-melekh (The King’s Torah)*, written by two prominent settler rabbis (Shapira and Elitzur, 2009). According to this volume, which provides quasi-religious foundations for Tag Mehir, the aim of the group is to “secure” the rights of the Jews. The violent acts of Tag Mehir, supported by a theological logic, offer a glimpse of the constitution of surveillance and “informal” policing while creating a sense of fear and insecurity that dominates the lives of Palestinians and their supporters.

As explained earlier, it is my claim that Tag Mehir constitutes a continuation of the Zionist colonial project that seeks to evict the Palestinian native and preserve the alleged oneness of Jews in Israel. Tag Mehir’s acts construct the Palestinian as the feared, threatening “Other” whom it aims to terrorize and eliminate from the “Promised Land” so as to secure the rights of the “Chosen People.” The movement has therefore built a machinery of surveillance that aims to maintain a secure Jewish community and eliminate the Other non-Jew. In doing

³ He may be referring to those rabbis who write, preach and believe in evicting non-Jews so as to preserve the exclusivity of the Jewish population in, and total control of, the Land of Israel, as is the case with some of the settler rabbis.

so, it also polices the Jews and attacks some Israeli policies and behaviors perceived as failing to pursue the “national self-realization” of the “Jewish nation.”

TAG MEHIR'S VIOLENCE: THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF SURVEILLANCE

The *tag mehir* (“price tag”) concept utilizes economic thinking in that goods carry value and careful cost-benefit analysis allows for profitable price tagging of such goods. Any state or Palestinian action that contravenes its particular interpretation of Zionism will come with a price, one that it decides. The concept transmits meanings embedded in a symbolic register of power. The politics of Tag Mehir shows how its analytical and ideological power is influenced by a political ideology having legal and psychological dimensions. Thus, the political economy embedded in the framing of individuals, groups and communities as objects with a specific “value” – or lack of it, as in the graffiti “Jesus, son of a whore” or “Muhammad is a pig” targeting Christian and Islamic communities – suggests a hierarchy of prices. Denigrating the prophet Muhammad as a “pig” and Jesus as the “son of a whore” devalues Muslims and Christians, price tagging them as animals and as illegitimate, respectively. Such acts of symbolic violence give the perpetrators – as well as those who turn a blind eye to their criminality – the power to set the price of each non-Jewish entity. This grants the price taggers, the Israeli government and bystanders alike, the power to evaluate and tag spaces of exclusion, pointing out those who have lesser value, who are unwanted and who are not considered as people.

Price tagging people, communities and spaces of unwantedness and exclusion traps the colonized's spaces, including their mosques, churches and burial grounds, and reconstructs them into objectified Others. Tag Mehir's performed power, and its ability to determine the value (or lack thereof) of certain subjects and realities, provides the inscribers – including Tag Mehir, the regime of impunity and the bystanders – with the power to define, mark, classify and label. It allows them not only to organize the Other in a specific order and with specific values, as a thing, but also to instill constant anxiety among the violated, who know that their existence is price tagged by a powerful entity that hates and fears them and therefore puts them under constant scrutiny and surveillance. Applying a “price tag” is a means of

regulation that builds new boundaries, creates boundary controls and hunts down those who violate such price-tagging principles.

Metaphorical signifying of violent acts through business terms is not new, neither to Israel nor to international conflicts. Gavriely-Nuri (2008) shows how business-oriented metaphors were used in government announcements and media discourses to transform the 2006 war between Israel and Lebanon into a “rational transaction,” blurring and erasing its moral aspects. Such examples include former Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Olmert’s expression “Can the air force deliver the goods?” and the naming of that war as *Mivtza Sachar Holem* (“Operation Fair Recompense”), cynically equating the intensity of the attack with the price Hezbollah has to pay or “deserves.” In fact, the term *tag mehir* was used during the war with Lebanon in such a sense “in two contexts: the ‘price’ of suffering Hezbollah’s rocket barrage on Israel’s interior and the ‘price’ of returning the kidnapped soldiers, the proclaimed *casus belli*” (Gavriely-Nuri, 2008, p. 14). The concept was adopted by the Tag Mehir movement some two years later. The use of economic vocabulary such as *tag mehir* points to power politics and the management of power relations, shifting attention away from the conditions and processes that created the need for this new form of surveillance.

Tag Mehir’s disregard of legislation, the courts and the police is justified by rabbis and rabbinical writings, as is criminality and violence against the native (e.g., Shapira and Elitzur, 2009). The inability or refusal of some rabbis and political leaders to denounce such acts, and the failure of the highly professional Israeli security forces to find them, creates a fertile ground for Tag Mehir to continue its attacks. This is possibly exacerbated, if the claim of some experts is true, through the growing number of military officers moving into settlements in the occupied territories (Etzer, 2009; Harel, 2012).

Torat ha-melekh (Shapira and Elitzur, 2009), the book that provides the religious underpinnings for the Tag Mehir movement, suggests that all Palestinians – young and old, women and men – should be expelled and explains why (see also Muhareb, 2011, 2012). The rabbis who authored this book justify criminality and violence against the native, detailing the religious circumstances that make it permissible to kill Arabs. The book calls for their oppression and expulsion as well as the seizure of their property and agricultural produce, not unlike Rabbi Mordechai Eliyahu’s religious edict permitting Jews to steal olive crops from Palestinians (Ben-Chim, 2002). Rabbi Elitzur also published an article entitled “Mutual Guarantee” that lays down the intellectual and

political guidelines for Tag Mehir (Muhareb, 2012, p. 11; see also Yemini, 2011). Muhareb explains:

Elitzur emphasizes in his article that no Israelis should ever forget, not even for one moment, that the real enemy is the Palestinian Arabs who are trying to occupy the country and who are confusing the minds of corrupt Jews who are too removed from the Torah.

(2012, p. 12)

The clergy's support of youth who believe they are above the law religiously justifies securing and protecting the Jewish population through violent acts, a new variant on an older theology that holds that the Arabs should be expelled.

The creation and unimpeded existence of Tag Mehir illustrates the persuasive power of its narrative, which incorporates and normalizes both fear and securitization. What is important in its actions is not only how they impose and implement surveillance or establish new mechanisms of control, but also that they contribute to the normalization of violence. The acts of Tag Mehir aggravate the growing sense of insecurity, mark the walls and spaces of the colonized with the non-value of the non-Jew (or non-supporter of Jewish exclusivity and supremacy) and further marginalize the Palestinian struggle for respect and dignity in their own homes, fields, prayer spaces and land.

I argue that Tag Mehir's violence, surveillance, power of control and boundary marking is a continuation of Zionist racial exclusivity and of the religious claims supporting it. Though operationalized through a new group, Tag Mehir is based on an old settler colonial ideology embedded in a well-orchestrated regime of surveillance over the unwanted Other. This regime of surveillance shows that the horror created by its graffiti – such as “A good Arab is a dead Arab” – not only disturbs families and terrorizes communities, but also reminds the Palestinians that Tag Mehir's agents will not be punished. The graffiti reminds Palestinians that they are under constant attack. It creates a feeling of being persecuted by abusers who are left unpunished and, often outright or tacitly, encouraged to conduct violent acts against the non-Jewish Other. This political economy of impunity, of price tagging social groups, constructs a social and economic order structured by racial exclusivity that highlights the settler colonial origin of the spray-painted words.

The ability of Tag Mehir to perpetrate its acts of excessive violence – despite the Israeli state's omnipotent power – has created an

“indisputable” security theology that produces the biopower necessary not only to sustain the settler state, but also to extend and naturalize its regime in global governance. The group’s ability to mark people, spaces and places as unwanted and unnecessary has resulted in the construction of a new political-economic formula that preserves asymmetries of power and maintains surveillance over the less powerful, all the while fearing their reaction and resistance to such oppression. This new formula that tags the “Other” is rooted in an old Zionist logic that dictates the superiority, racial power and exclusivity of the Jew (Sayegh, 1965, p. 22).

To further understand the repercussions of Tag Mehir’s acts on the everyday lives of Palestinians, I now present the voices of two women living under the threat of settler violence in Jerusalem. By focusing on the daily imposition of surveillance and terror, I hope to reveal the multi-functionality of Tag Mehir’s violence, its production and reproduction of fear and terror, and the resulting human suffering and trauma.

PSYCHOSOCIAL TRAUMA, SURVEILLANCE, SECURITY AND FEAR: BORROWING MEANINGS FROM THE COLONIZED

The following narratives shared with us by two Palestinian women that illustrate the psychological, spatial and physical violence and the constraining logic of security provide a powerful entry into the psychosocial articulations of surveillance and the politics of fear. Yara, a 39-year-old Jerusalemite, discusses the fear and anxiety that Tag Mehir creates in her neighborhood, particularly her own home:

I am very confused, I feel like someone is about to die, but don’t know what death is. Just seeing them, those settlers around the house, hearing them on top of the roof, day and night, sensing their shadows behind the windows . . . hearing their language and modes of talk . . . their movements, their closeness to the soldiers and police . . . is like a nightmare . . . They manage to paralyze us all . . . Last week, they came in, destroyed everything, the antennas, the electric power lines, the water tank . . . they broke the door, the windows, they broke half the furniture in the house, looking for something! Total horror, paralysis, confusion and mess, and I stood there like a lost and injured animal, holding my baby and my son . . . while their rifles were in my face. I was screaming at them, shivering like someone electrified, but he [the settler] was laughing

at me. I became something to laugh at by all of them. I felt so desperate, so wretched, so humiliated, and couldn't cry. It's this sadness that takes away even one's ability to cry. Now, people have stopped visiting us, they fear exposing their children and themselves to such attacks. Even my brother stopped coming to see me; *jannanuna* [they are driving us mad].

Yara's story illustrates how the attacks against her family have instilled a deep-seated anxiety, sadness and sense of persecution. Her perception of being followed, resulting from the constant and seemingly random appearance of the settlers in her family's space, has marked that space as dangerous and has succeeded in differentiating her family, house and neighborhood from others, separating her from her community. This has created a new arrangement that marks her familial space as highly securitized, one under constant surveillance.

To understand the scope and impact of such violence and surveillance, and the risks that they pose, we must consider the growing ability of the attackers and surveillance authorities to know more about Yara and her family – to track them, collect data about who is either in or out of the house, when each one leaves, what they do and where they go. As Yara explains: "In addition to us living while being watched, they now have new security guards and a new specialist . . . and all they do is watch us." Her neighbor, Areen, a forty-two-year-old woman, states:

Even when I'm asleep, I see those red laser points, and I know someone is holding a camera and tracking our movements . . . in the bedroom. Come and see the curtains I added, just to feel safer. The house looks like a prison – no light, no voice, no breathing space.

Yara historicizes the psychosocial implications of such surveillance:

The Haj [her father-in-law] is a refugee from Jaffa. They displaced him [during the 1948 Nakba]. He had a house in Ajami [a neighborhood]. They owned a big vineyard. Then his family was forcefully evacuated, and in a second, instead of *awlad e'ez* [people living in wealth and prosperity], they were turned into *laji'in* [refugees], and here we are today, still at their mercy. They will not leave us alone. The Haj told us that this is what they did in 1948 in Jaffa . . . and they are doing the same now. They calculate everything. They attack us suddenly, without leaving a corner untouched. They scare us. Do you know what it means to be paralyzed? They attack us at night, while we sleep, in a state of paralysis. They study the situation, the area, the doors, windows, entrances

and exits. They are supported by the soldiers and the police. The police and soldiers protect their backs, help them, plan with them, give them information and even equipment to detect our movement. They come in the middle of the night, and that creates horror in the children's hearts, and I feel paralyzed on my feet, and my ability to think is also paralyzed; I fear them, and everyday, they create a new gang that attacks us. So now they are called Tag Mehir, and Tzahi [a Jewish settler], he lives nearby, he leads them.

As Yara explains, the mundane surveillance over her life is not just a security issue; it is a tool in the hands of the attackers to govern their lives.

Yara's articulated experience allows us to examine the psychological implications of the ongoing violence of surveillance and the politics of chasing and frightening. It reveals her perceptions of the aims, agenda, technologies and practices of Tag Mehir from her everyday life experience. Her narrative calls upon us to look closely at the complex ways through which specific modes of surveillance and mechanisms of daily monitoring are used by Israeli colonial power. It also invites us to understand the settlers' surveillance project from a broad, critical sociopsychological perspective, through its processes and networks within the neighborhood and outside it, within and beyond the formal Israeli security procedures.

Areen's narrative points to the far-reaching consequences of such surveillance on the present and future of her family:

They create such terror in the neighborhood...They have cameras to spy on us. They have big dogs. They use electronic devices to track our movements and speech...They listen to our conversations when we gather for dinner...They're after us all the time...scaring us...frightening the kids, and my little daughter is always in a state of panic.

Areen's expressions of her family's fears of being persecuted, created and reaffirmed by the use of security technologies such as listening devices and dogs point to the clear message that is being made by the Tag Mehir members: We are after you, even when you are at home at the dinner table.

As individuals personally experiencing life at the mercy of a group of Jewish criminals, and as a society experiencing racially motivated hate crimes, Palestinians are terrorized, fostering a fear that creates a persisting trauma. Areen's narrative continues:

Last week, my seventeen year old was arrested . . . He was jailed for three days . . . Those were the worst days of my life . . . One of the settlers came with the police and soldiers and told them my son and husband participated in demonstrations and that my son is a terrorist . . . They horrified the entire family. My son was very frightened. They [the settlers] hit him on his way home from school, and when the police came to arrest him, they noticed he was injured and were convinced he is a terrorist. My son suffered so much from them and their attacks . . .

Areen's words express her subjective horror at having to deal with the apprehension of her son as a result of the attacks of Jewish settlers. She shows us her concern to safeguard her family as well as her vulnerability as a mother who cannot prevent the psychological effect on her son of his unjust arrest. Her sense of helplessness and impotence is clear:

The settlers pass by the house and pee and defecate on the mattresses I leave out to air. They cut the laundry lines and throw all my clean laundry in the streets . . . My son has lost interest in school . . . and I decided to agree to marry off my fifteen-year-old daughter, to save her from all this . . . We live these horrors daily . . . daily fears, not knowing what is next . . . Yesterday, we woke up to find graffiti on the inner wall of our garden . . . inside . . . not only outside . . . inside the front yard . . . They came inside our yard and sprayed "Muhammad is a pig." I woke up at 6:00 a.m. and saw it, and rushed to my sister-in-law. I took the paint she had, and we both painted the wall . . . We feared the kids would wake up and see it, and we would have a war . . . We would all end up at the police station . . . and have to pay fines . . . Just last week, I paid 5,000 shekels [about €1,000] to obtain the release of my son and my husband . . .

Areen's narrative brings into focus the gendered and psychoeconomic dimensions of securitization and surveillance. Such attacks not only perversely affect her economically when she has to pay fines, but have also convinced her that the best way to protect her daughter from the threat of sexual harassment is to find her a husband, all the while feeling extremely guilty for taking such a step.

While attacks that force individuals to make difficult life decisions might not *legally* be considered violations of rights or the law, the gendered impact of surveillance and fear clearly influences women's life choices and affects children's willingness to study and focus on their futures. As both Areen and Yara explain, the political violence perpetrated by Tag Mehir creates apathy and social withdrawal. It inflicts negative experiences that increase feelings of threat, exhaustion, misery,

grief and pain. Surveillance and political violence instill in victims a constant need to sacrifice their long-term livelihood for short-term measures futilely aimed at achieving peace of mind.

Official reactions to the violence of Tag Mehir are basically non-existent. As Yara states:

They do not care about us. Just the opposite; the government loves to see us and our children disturbed and worried, not knowing what will happen, or what we can do...and fearful...For they want us out...Come read what is written here; they wrote, "*tistalku mi kan*" ["Get out of here"]...Now, every time they attack us, my young children shout at them, "*tistalku mi kan*"...All we have is the ability to talk...We only can talk...

The stories of Yara and Areen call upon us to anchor our analyses of such attacks not only in political securitized sites, but also in dynamic psychosocial sites. Such logic and operations, inside and outside the home, attack psyches by targeting family spaces and religious beliefs. By cutting down laundry lines, stealing plants and spraying messages on walls, this spatial violence marks, divides and differentiates Areen's and Yara's social and physical spaces in order to regulate their individual and social lives and activities. The symbolic markings of these spaces, patrolled alike by unofficial policing groups (the attackers) and official Israeli forces, create a state of terror that impacts the psychosocial well-being of the women, their families and their community at large.

The personal accounts of these women reveal how a heavy sense of suffering continues to mark the daily lives of individuals identified as "social risks" and "security threats." The transformation of lives and homes into spaces of constant surveillance and terrorism stem from a hyper-security form of politics that contains norms, values and constraints within specific legal regulations. The imposition of such regulations, which control their social, economic and psychological well-being, is the result of their racially discriminatory identification – namely, their identity as Palestinians.

In the attempt to secure Israeli Jews from the "dangerous" Palestinians' "risky" places, such surveillance turns Palestinian families into public spectacles. It privileges certain dispositions of security and surveillance politics, using legal regulations to further control the "dangerous" Other. The marking of their bodies, lives and spaces as "risky and dangerous" separates and rearranges their lives. Such labeling furthers Palestinians' sense of insecurity, reinforcing the uneven and unjust

deployment of surveillance technologies and the presence of public and private control agents.

Yara's and Areen's narratives help us understand how the actions of Tag Mehir guarantee and sustain the alienation of the "Other," placing the Jewish settlers in a higher social position than the "risky and dangerous" Palestinian. This practice not only segregates the non-secure from the secure, the terrorist from those who require protection, but also further legitimizes the rhetoric of security, regulates and racializes social life, and controls spaces.

THE WRITINGS ON THE WALL: NECROPOLITICS IN SECURITY DISCOURSE

As the narratives revealed, violent acts and words of hate perpetrated on behalf of Tag Mehir result in strong feelings of insecurity, fear and continual apprehension among Palestinians. Having looked at the psychosocial effects in the private domain of individual families in the neighborhood, I now turn to the actions of Tag Mehir in public spaces – specifically, how the spraying of graffiti at various public sites such as mosques, churches and cemeteries, and the use of phrases that are clear expressions of hate crimes contribute to fear, surveillance and control.

The graffiti commonly used by Tag Mehir can be divided into three types. The first is the juxtaposition of slogans – "Death to the Arabs," "Kahane was right" and "Kahane lives" (referring to the late Rabbi Meir Kahane, who led a group of extreme rightist Jews) – telling Palestinians who should be dead and who will live forever. The second is the phrase "Get out of here," alluding to the displacement and dispersion of Palestinians. The last type attacks individual and community religious norms and beliefs, and includes slogans such as "Muhammad is a pig" and "Jesus, son of a whore."

Incidents involving Tag Mehir graffiti that call for "Death to the Arabs" are rampant. For instance, on February 7, 2012, the newspaper *Ma'ariv* reported that statements attacking Christianity as well as the slogans "Death to the Arabs" and "Kahane was right" were painted on cars and walls at a bilingual school in Jerusalem where Jews and Arabs study together (Eli, 2012). Such writings take a psychological toll. Covering the same incident, the newspaper *Ha'aretz* reported that the writings on the walls created severe panic in a school of children aged three to eighteen (Nesher and Rosenberg, 2012). Such messages have an added impact when they are written on graves. On October 8,

2011, *Ma'ariv* reported that two cemeteries in Jaffa, one Christian and one Muslim, were vandalized, with “Death to the Arabs,” “Kahane” and “Tag Mehir” painted in red and black (Goren and Ashkenazi, 2011). Tag Mehir also vandalized a cemetery in the Qadom village in the West Bank, writing “The State of Palestine” on graves (Breyner, 2010).

The slogans “Death to the Arabs” and “Kahane was right” go hand in hand with the colonial logic of eliminating the native. The image of “Death to the Arabs” conveyed by the words spray-painted on the spaces of living and dead humans is reproduced and transmitted in numerous ways. This obsession with the dead Arab, alongside the contrasting slogan “Kahane lives,” reiterates the motto of the Zionist settler colonial regime that gives the power of life – even when dead – to the racially superior, all the while controlling, segregating and eliminating the unwanted and lesser Others. This message is reinforced by “The State of Palestinian” written on graves, unambiguously narrating that the Palestinian state is dead and buried.

Tag Mehir’s writings threaten the Palestinians, informing them that they have to suffer for being born in a coveted geographic area, in a land that should be emptied of them. These writings convey the message that being born as Palestinians subjects them to life-long surveillance and pursuit, setting a high “price” for their existence as non-Jews in the Israeli state. In short, Tag Mehir is in a state of war against individuals and communities based on their religious, ethnic identity and the fact that they are non-Jews.

The statements “Death to the Arabs” and “Kahane lives” serve as visible, violent rhetorical phrases, a politics of death, indicating the infiltration of an invective full of death and hate into existing surveillance and control strategies. Although the power of interpreting such slogans lies within the subject, it also lies within the aggressor. Having the ability to call for the death of the Other gives Tag Mehir a normative basis for the right to kill. It is an expression of their power to nullify the enemy.

In spray-painting such phrases on walls and graveyards, Tag Mehir creates more than spatial and social ordering, as in the panopticon (Foucault, 1977). Such graffiti divides people into those who must live and those who must die. This separation of human species into groups and the location of dead otherness is where I locate the ideology purported by Tag Mehir. Tag Mehir’s racism goes beyond death, suggesting that particular individuals and groups be relocated to zones of non-existence, and when the victims are actually dead (in the graveyards),

that racism locates the Palestinians in a hierarchical and visible order of otherness that is constantly regulated by the panoptic gaze of the colonizer-occupier.

In analyzing Tag Mehir's violence and its inscriptions, we must acknowledge the importance of power in determining variations in living and dying. The colonialist's reading of the living power of the dead Palestinian body in the grave and the inscription of death on the living Palestinian body and space (as in the graffiti of "Death to the Arabs") creates a new discourse on securitization and surveillance, one that proposes viewing the Palestinians as already dead – or as those who should be dead. Tag Mehir's violent acts of surveillance and graffiti can be seen as part of a nexus of surveillance, securitization and the creation of an economy and regime of life and death – as Mbembe (2003) defines it, "necropolitics." In utilizing this term, Mbembe is referring to the colonizer's power to decide who will be allowed to live and who will be made to die. Tag Mehir vandals view Palestinian life as controllable, and thereby expendable.

The construction of the dead Arab and the living Jew positions individuals and groups in zones of exclusion/inclusion, in the context of a racialized conflict. What are the actual and rhetorical effects of moving Palestinians from the living zone to the dead zone? Labeling people as dead casts them out and regards them as non-existent. It also serves to remove any humanity from their lives, delegitimizing them as living entities.

In my book on militarization and violence against women (Shalhoub-Kevorkian, 2009), I suggest that the death discourse creates a discursive spiral and a transgressive regime that produces and reproduces fear of the Other, whether or not based in fact, which leads to a world of complete insecurity. Such a condition can be found in totalitarian state systems:

To pursue the total, monistic domination, the ruling structure cannot be itself monolithic and coherent, yet it must generate a belief in a menacing deeper unity, hidden underneath and perpetuated behind the scenes... The masses need to acquire a Kafkaesque sense that the true power structure does not lie in the visible maze of offices, but is deeply hidden and profoundly secret.

(Los, 2004, p. 22)

The connection between Tag Mehir's seemingly random acts of criminality and violence, its aggressive power of excluding, dividing and

marking otherness that is reproduced by the death text, requires a more in-depth examination. We need to consider the construction of truth about the unwanted Palestinian who should be regulated, feared and killed through various forms of surveillance discourses and apparatuses. Such discourses produce invisible plans that can mobilize a necropolitical discourse. An unacknowledged necropolitics can conceal the racism embedded in the power structure and the workings of power.

Tag Mehir's acts help to destabilize and militarize everyday life, increasing the emphasis on the Jewishness of the state and its safety and security. They produce new and sophisticated tools for the Zionist surveillance systems to control and subvert the Palestinian "Other." This political-economic machinery of price tagging, marginalizing, silencing and even erasing Palestinians reproduces fear between the native and the settler populations.

CONCLUSIONS

The chapter has revealed how the violent acts of Tag Mehir are but a continuation of the settler colonial Zionist regime that attacks the Palestinian body, home, society and land. The aggression of Tag Mehir is a way of marking otherness, a politics of fear and surveillance directed towards mastering and controlling the enemy species. Their violent rhetoric and visibility of otherness, through torching spaces, destruction of property and marking areas with degrading graffiti, becomes an additional tool of surveillance aimed at persecuting and controlling the space, body, mind and cognition (both conscious and unconscious) of the colonized. The scare tactics of Tag Mehir limit both physical action and the psychological and social environment in the realms of life and death.

Latent and manifest policies of alienation, domination and social death, which are mundane, rhetorical and private, establish various types of surveillance and control implemented through alternative groups, such as Tag Mehir, making it harder to place the "blame" on the state. They do, however, receive tacit support given the inaction of the state – approval by omission – that encourages repression, surveillance and control. At the mercy of Tag Mehir's violence and the state's failure to prevent it, Palestinians are perpetually terrorized, living with unpredictable cruelty and profanity, while the attackers themselves demand that the state secure them from the feared Others. There is clear cooperation between the state, the army and settler groups to mark

Palestinians as such and so further justify the need to fear them more. This preoccupation with the security of the Jewish population has become a new type of theology that requires the constant reproduction of fear mechanisms against the Palestinian Other.

Religious groups acting through Tag Mehir along with governmental unresponsiveness to the detriment of the Palestinian population privileges Jews while constructing Palestinians as the unwanted, feared Other. Crucial to understanding this construction of terror of the terrorized is race. Tag Mehir's terrorism is exercised over Palestinian bodies, spaces and lives while constructing them as a site where the colonizers exercise power outside the law, as a site to rule and oppress those they wish to keep dead, outside their borders.

I now return to a question posed at the beginning of the chapter: What are the implications of the continued existence and actions of Tag Mehir? The undercover operations of Tag Mehir create a sense of surveillance over the alienated Palestinian Other. Such surveillance is mediated not only through direct visual means – texts of death and their chilling effects – but also by vandalizing property, burning cars, cutting down olive trees and more. The experience of being watched and attacked, whether by representatives of the state (the military or police) or by informal, unofficial agents (the settlers of Tag Mehir), inevitably leads to the inscription of anxiety into the lives of those surveyed, engendering constant uncertainty, suspicion and self-regulation. The increasingly endemic nature of surveillance sets conditions for paranoia and a conspiracy culture (Harper, 2008) among the Palestinians.⁴ It creates a paranoid society, one fearing the security and intelligence agencies that work for the benefit of one group at the expense of the other. Fear, paranoia and constant uncertainty about decisions, under conditions of total mistrust of formal agencies, legal frameworks and criminal justice personnel, produce additional fears and anxieties. At times of increasing conflict and aggression, when bureaucratic acts cover up illegality and violence, the powerlessness of those living under fear increases exponentially.

If we limit our understanding of the impacts of such surveillance to personal individualistic intra-psychic analyses, we fail to capture its historical, social, economic, cultural and geopolitical significance. In order to more fully understand the fear and surveillance resulting from the

⁴ Harper (2004) argues that conspiratorial accounts are more likely to be adopted by the powerless, as such accounts reflect the positions of their lives.

acts of Tag Mehir, we must combine the political with the psychological and human suffering resulting from a history of injustice. We must seek the interdisciplinary meaning of the industry of fear represented by Tag Mehir on both the native and the settler state. The industry of fear sustained by Tag Mehir's actions goes beyond the individual psychic or collective sense of belonging, or lack thereof. It sustains the logic of elimination, affecting family life, collective identity and political positioning. The case study of Tag Mehir reveals how the colonial condition of Palestinian biopolitics is situated in a provisional status of humanity, where their elimination is inscribed on walls. Borrowing meanings from economic language and adopting a death discourse, Tag Mehir positions Palestinians as an entity with a price tag and as always dead.

I argue that the violence of Tag Mehir and the text written on the walls serve to position objects and subjects in particular ways and modes (dead or alive). Positioning the otherized as objects that can be price tagged and as entities that should be removed, kicked out and even killed leaves no space for life. Despite the power over space and death that Tag Mehir attempts to exert, Palestinians still demonstrate a tremendous amount of agency and resiliency within their own lives. Although scared and made anxious by the everyday attacks, the stories of individuals like Yara, Areen and Nahed prove that by understanding and discussing how these violent settlers seek to control their lives, they can resist and refuse to allow price tagging to further uproot them from their homes. Despite an established state framework of control and surveillance, Palestinians continue to exist within their spaces, conditioning a powerful and conscious form of resistance and resilience.

CHAPTER THREE

ISRAEL IN THE BEDROOM: CITIZENSHIP AND ENTRY LAW

Early in 2012, Manal, a twenty-nine-year-old mother of four children, lost her husband, Tayseer, who died in his house in the Old City of Jerusalem following a battle with cancer that had begun in 2010. Manal, who married at the age of sixteen, is Tayseer's distant cousin, originally from a village that is a fifteen-minute drive from the Old City. The Israeli logic of keeping Palestinians where they were born, in their small villages and neighborhoods, categorizes Manal as a West Banker, with the right to remain in Jerusalem only with an official permit, even though her husband carried a Jerusalemite ID that categorizes him as a resident. During Tayseer's two-year struggle with cancer, the family lived on the children's welfare benefits and his disability allowances. His early and painful death left Manal in a state of loss and confusion. It left her not only as a single mother, without the love and support of the father of her children, but also as an illegal entity in her own house due to her residency status – or lack thereof – as a West Banker. Her legal condition restricted her mobility and denied her the right to take her daughter to the hospital when this was required, as she feared she would be deported to the West Bank and so lose her children. It also prevented her from financially supporting her family due to the cut in her children's welfare allowances, a cut that was “justified” by her status as a West Banker.

After four months of living in fear, with a deep sense of insecurity, Manal requested legal aid assistance from a local human rights organization to help prevent her family from being deported from her home in Jerusalem and to regain her children's allowance benefits. She wanted

to keep the children in their school, close to her and to Tayseer's parents and cousins who lived in the Old City so that they could be raised in their small rental unit where she had started her family with her late husband. Because her children were born in Jerusalem and were registered on their father's ID card, they were recognized as permanent residents (but not citizens) and had access to medical insurance and education in local public schools there.

The only legal way to keep Manal in her home was to apply annually for an official permit that would allow her to stay in Jerusalem with a special humanitarian status (Code a1(a)(2)), based on the Citizenship and Entry into Israel Law (Temporary Order) of 2003 (hereinafter "Citizenship Law"). Manal's initial request for such a permit was accepted 20 months after her official application. The approval letter stated:

The special humanitarian reason is the fact that you had a permit to stay when your husband was alive and now following his death you remain the only natural guardian of your children. The permit is valid as long as the center of your life is in Israel and you are not married to a resident of the area or as the second wife of a bigamist man. When renewing the permit [every year], the center of your life and your personal status will be reexamined. In addition, a security and police-oriented investigation will be conducted.

Manal's current legal and psychological condition is thus one of living in constant uncertainty. Underlying her immense human suffering is a well-orchestrated legal system of population control that considers Palestinians a demographic threat to the Jewish state as well as a machinery of surveillance embedded in the context and history of the Israeli–Palestinian conflict (Zureik et al., 2011). The advancement of technology and the emergence of formalized bureaucracies have given rise to advanced political mechanisms of control reflecting the power of the state through the development of identification documents – a manifestation of the codification of persons and so of barriers to attaining "citizen's" rights.

In Israel, ID cards and permits were introduced in 1949 following the November 1948 census (Davis, 1997; Kassim, 2000). All Jews, whether residing in Palestine prior to 1948 or arriving from elsewhere, were automatically granted ID cards. The 165,000 Palestinians who had not been expelled from what became Israel were also granted cards, but this was done:

not so as to incorporate them into Israeli civic and political life per se, but so as to prevent the return of the 750,000-plus Palestinian refugees who had been expelled or fled, who were then considered “absentees” and thus denied Israeli citizenship and any possibility of return.

(Tawil-Souri, 2011, p. 221)

Manal’s present condition can be situated in the history of surveillance and control over Palestinians living under the Zionist/Israeli settler colonial regime, which, as some scholars argue, persisted in a state strategy aimed at keeping individuals and the collective in a constant state of fear of being expelled, ghettoized and/or monitored through a well-articulated system of surveillance and control (Sa’di, 2011; Zureik, 1979). Lustick (1980) saw the regime’s system of control not as a state strategy, but rather as a practice containing three mutually reinforcing components: segmentation, co-optation and dependency. Hillel Cohen (2006) explains that control over the Palestinians began as early as 1920, when the Jewish population comprised 10 percent of the population, and was aimed at inflicting fear by destabilizing, disorganizing and creating conflicts among the indigenous Arab community.

Manal’s and Tayseer’s families were originally from Jaffa. When the extended family was uprooted in 1948, some members moved to the Jerusalem area, while others moved elsewhere in historic Palestine. As a result, Manal, though living with her family for years in Jerusalem, is considered a West Banker and has to undergo annual investigations in order to be allowed to remain in her own home with her children.

Manal’s difficult position raises a number of questions that require in-depth consideration. How do state-built strategies and laws of uprooting and surveillance intrude upon the private, intimate affairs of individuals and the collective? How is legislation superimposed on the natural instincts inherent in personal kinship ties, restricting the pursuit of livelihood, situating communities in constant fear of displacement from their own homes and land? How can the safety, unity and security of Manal’s family be considered a threat? How can Manal’s bedroom, body politics, partnership, marital status, change of neighborhood and other related behaviors become “security risks” or “criminal” acts that permit the state to deport or expel her? How can Israel’s population control and surveillance ideology affect an individual’s personal rights and intimate decisions in the bedroom? And for what reason would the Israeli state have the jurisdiction to decide on an individual’s personal status and ability to take care of her own children? To begin to

answer these questions, I will first discuss the Citizenship Law and will examine the way in which the law is used as a tool for domination and control.

The structure and epistemic knowledge used to rationalize governance and the rule of law contained in the Citizenship Law, as this chapter will show, opens up additional spaces for racialized legal rationalizations that diminish freedom and result in the demonization of natives and the legalization of violence against them. Starting from Manal's ordeal as the point of departure, the chapter first discusses the Citizenship Law in context and then presents it as a racially based tool of framing and naming through otherization. Next, I discuss the political-theological underpinning of the law, looking at the case of children, and then return to the unheard voices of Palestinians like Manal, providing several illustrations of how the law affects the everyday life of Palestinians, from life choices to intimacy in the bedroom. The chapter closes with some theoretical reflections, turning our gaze from the law back to domination in the settler colonial context.

THE CITIZENSHIP LAW IN CONTEXT

The Citizenship Law, approved by the Knesset (Parliament) in March 2007, prohibits the Palestinian spouses or children of Israeli citizens and residents from receiving permanent residency status in Israel or Israeli citizenship (Association for Civil Rights in Israel, 2012a). Though originally passed as a temporary provision, it has since been renewed each year by the Knesset. The Law permits Palestinian spouses and children of Israeli citizens residing in the West Bank or Gaza who had received temporary residency status in Israel before the enactment of the Law to continue to renew their temporary status, but it prohibits them from upgrading their status to permanent residency or applying for Israeli citizenship. It also includes a provision giving the Israeli government discretion to strip such spouses of temporary status on account of any perceived national security concern (ACRI, 2012a). As such, the force of the law means that males over the age of 35 and females over the age of 25 living in the West Bank who are married to Israeli citizens or residents cannot apply for citizenship or permanent residency status (Khoury, 2012). A 2007 amendment to the Law prohibits Israeli citizens' Palestinian spouses residing in Lebanon, Syria, Iran or Iraq from applying for any status in Israel, whether temporary or permanent.

In addition, the Law bans citizenship for “anyone living in an area in which operations that constitute a threat to Israel are being carried out” in the opinion of the security services (Citizenship Law, 3d).

Various UN organizations have voiced concern over the logic and ideological underpinning of this law and its consequences primarily in terms of medical care and parental and other related family mental health rights. In a statement made on February 26, 2009, the UN Human Rights Council recommended that Israel revoke the law, arguing that:

the critical impact of the closure regime (e.g., the Wall, checkpoints, road closures, earth mounds, etc.) on Palestinian women’s access to adequate prenatal, natal and post-natal medical care remains a matter of serious concern, impairing the fulfillment of the right of everyone to the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health.

(United Nations General Assembly, 2009)

Further, in reference to the long-lasting effect of the law on Palestinian women (like Manal), the UN Commission on the Status of Women stated, as part of a 2012 joint resolution, that it:

Reaffirms that the Israeli occupation remains the major obstacle for Palestinian women with regard to their advancement, self-reliance and integration in the development of their society, and stresses the importance of efforts to increase their role in decision-making with regard to conflict prevention and resolution and to ensure their equal participation and involvement in all efforts for the achievement, maintenance and promotion of peace and security; *Demands* that Israel, the occupying Power, comply fully with the provisions and principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Regulations annexed to the Hague Convention IV of 1907, the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949, and all other relevant rules, principles and instruments of international law, including the International Covenants on Human Rights, in order to protect the rights of Palestinian women and their families.

(Commission on the Status of Women, 2012, emphasis in original)

An article by Nikfar in a law journal published two years after the Citizenship Law was originally passed declared that it was not only a violation of Israel’s Basic Laws, but also constituted a violation of Israel’s duties as a state signatory to both the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) and the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (ICERD) (Nikfar, 2005).

The law violates Article 17 (protection against unlawful interference of privacy, family, and home) and Article 23 (protection of an individual's right to marry and raise a family) of the ICCPR as well as Article 26 (protection against discrimination and guarantee of equal protection under domestic law) of the ICERD (Nikfar, 2005).

On January 11, 2012, in a 6–5 decision in the case of *MK Zahava Galon v. Attorney General et al.*, the Supreme Court of Israel ruled to reject all appeals against the Citizenship Law (Jabareen and Zaher, 2012). The civil rights organization Adalah, one of the parties whose appeal to revoke the law was rejected by the Supreme Court ruling, argued that the decision upheld a law that deprived citizens of their right to have families in Israel based solely on the nationality or ethnicity of their spouses and thus constituted a case of clear racial discrimination, one that contradicted the principles of equality enshrined in Israel's Basic Laws (Adalah, 2012b). The Citizenship Law, as Adalah's petition for its appeal argued, created:

three tracks of naturalization in the State of Israel. The first, the highest track, is for Jewish people, who can gain citizenship immediately and automatically under the Law of Return (1950). The second track is for foreigners, to whom the graduated procedure of naturalization applies, allowing them to obtain Israeli residency or citizenship status over a four-year period from the date of submitting the application. The third, the lowest track, is for the spouses of Palestinian Arabs, citizens of Israel from the OPT, Syria, Lebanon, Iran, and Iraq.

(Adalah, 2012b)

The creation of such citizenship tracks is essentially based on a system of classification that gives each and every Jew in the world a sacred, religiously based “birthright” to acquire Israeli citizenship, while controlling and manipulating the rights of those born in the land.

A report by BADIL, the Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights, describes how the court ruling forces members of Palestinian families with different residency statuses to make a stark choice: to live together abroad (putting the Israeli spouse at risk of losing his or her Israeli citizenship), to live apart or to risk living illegally together (BADIL, 2012). This report also discusses how targeting Palestinian families and forcing them to make such an intolerable choice provides proof of the race-based “demographic intent” behind the Citizenship Law: to maintain the Jewish racial majority of the state by barring Palestinians from any path to citizenship and, more directly, by

providing a legal means by which the government can transfer Palestinian temporary residents from Israel.

Statements by certain Members of the Knesset welcoming the Supreme Court ruling provide further evidence of this intent. According to MK Otniel Schneller,¹ “the decision articulates the rationale of separation between the two peoples and the need to maintain a Jewish majority . . . and character of the State.” In the words of MK Yaakov Katz,² “the state of Israel was saved from being flooded by 2–3 million Arab refugees” (BADIL, 2012). The stark invocation of a demographic threat also helps to explain the remark of the conservative Supreme Court Justice Asher Grunis,³ who defended his vote for the majority ruling by stating that “human rights should not be a prescription for national suicide” (Clyne, 2012).

By rejecting all appeals against the Law, the Supreme Court situates people like Manal in a condition of constant fear and uncertainty, imposing on them the obligation – if they wish to stay in their present home – to never remarry or change their personal status and also to ensure they are not defined as someone engaged in “criminal” or “security”-related acts.

THE LAW AS A TOOL FOR FRAMING AND RACIALIZATION

“Security” concerns about the claim to return

Members of the Knesset promoting the Citizenship Law masked oppressive and discriminatory intent through language that indiscriminately identifies Palestinian residents of the West Bank and Gaza who are married to Israeli citizens as terrorists and national security threats (Al-Haq, 2012). The transcript of the Knesset discussion before final approval of the Citizenship Law (Committee for Interior and Environmental Quality, 2003, p. 4) captures the Committee’s security concerns regarding family reunification. Committee member Daniel Solomon (from the

¹ According to the Knesset web site, Schneller is a colonel in the army reserves, lives in a Jewish settlement in the West Bank and is a member of various lobbies aimed at sustaining the Jewish race.

² According to the Knesset website, Katz was an officer in an elite IDF unit, lives in a Jewish settlement in the West Bank and is one of the founders of the Gush Emunim movement. Convicted in 2003 of giving false testimony under oath and sentenced to six months’ community service, he received a presidential pardon and the verdict was expunged.

³ Asher Grunis was appointed President of the Supreme Court on February 28, 2012, after a special law drafted by MK Yaakov Katz was passed that allowed his appointment.

legal department in the Ministry of the Interior) explained his position in response to a question raised by Yuri Stern, the Committee chair:

Solomon: Due to the seriousness of the issue, the law is temporary, and is renewed each year . . . and the law is applied only to citizens from the Palestinian Authority area . . .

Stern: Why? What is the difference from a security perspective?

Solomon: Because the conflict that was the origin of the governmental decision was a conflict with the Palestinian Authority. The concept of “Palestinian origin” is highly problematic and, therefore, in the legislation the issue was limited to Palestinian Authority citizens alone.

(Committee for Interior and Environmental Quality, 2003, pp. 3–4)

In an attempt to stress the security dimensions of the law, Solomon stated that “before the request for family reunification is approved, security and criminal records of the alien partner should be checked.”

The unquestioning acceptance of security-related justifications can also be found in the wording of the 2012 Supreme Court ruling:

Confidential information held by security sources indicates clearly that the use of a population of this type operates systematically, as a method, a recipe for penetrating Israel through marriage, in accordance with orders from terrorists and based on information from foreign intelligence.⁴

The reliance on “confidential information” from unnamed “security sources” and the reference to information from “foreign intelligence” and “terrorist” sources construct a theological shrine that cannot be challenged, one that is sustained by preservation of the purity of the Jewishness of the state and, accordingly, by the transfer of Palestinians from their homes and lands and the denial of reunification of their families.

Looking closely at the choice of nomenclature used in Israeli expert opinions regarding this law, distinct rhetorical biases against Palestinians can be distinguished. Of particular interest is the published opinion of Amnon Sofer, Israel’s leading researcher in demographic studies. In a study published by the College for National Security, Sofer and Shalev note:

⁴ H.C.J. 466/07 MK *Zahava Galon v. Attorney General et al.* (petition dismissed).

The Palestinian's "return" to the sovereign territory of the State of Israel has severe ramifications in the economic field (huge National Insurance payments – child allowances, unemployment benefits...); the security field (on average, every fifth attack has involved an Arab Israeli who got an ID card due to family unification); the national field (the *meuhmashim* [a militaristic reference to those granted reunification permits or IDs] created a process of "Palestinization" of Arab Israelis, instead of trends of "Israelization" of this population, and this significantly hinders the willingness of Israeli Arabs to integrate in Israeli society); the criminal field (...drug offenses, property right violations...); and the demographic field (effect on the quantitative proportion of Arab and Jewish populations; pushing the Jewish population out of mixed cities; and strengthening the "Arab voice" in the political arena).

(2004, p. 7)

The pairing of the word "return" with *meuhmashim* – which I argue is a military-oriented mode of naming – to discuss family reunification suggests that the requests of Palestinians, such as Manal, are analyzed by researchers like Sofer and Shalev as requests for the right to return, thereby turning her into a "security risk." The term *meuhmashim* has the same linguistic connotation as the (emotionally powerful) word *tahmoshet* (ammunition), suggesting that Palestinians can be perceived as dangerous entities that might explode or otherwise cause violent harm. Investigating Palestinians who wish to unite with their family members in their own land and portraying them as "security" risks and "criminal" concerns is reflected in Sofer and Shalev's (2004) argument that such unification could actualize the Palestinians' "claim to return."

Framing the issue of "return" in a manner that claims the destabilization of the state's economic, national and security apparatus produces a language of fear. Such phrasing requires the state – as the authors claim – to create laws, bureaucracies and surveillance tools that "protect" it from the return of Palestinians to "the sovereign territory of the State of Israel." The authors refrain from historicizing the analyses or pointing to the fact that what they define as "the sovereign territory of the State of Israel" is the lost homeland of Palestinians who are applying for their right to be with their own families, in their own homes. Palestinian requests to prevent fragmentation of their families, as in Manal's case, are defined by the authors as applying "the right to return" and thus destabilizing colonial equilibrium.

The anthropologist and historian Ann Stoler explains that, in colonial contexts, it is hard to recognize or define things by name, for by doing so, we:

raise unsettling questions about what it means to know and not know something simultaneously, about what is implicit because it goes without saying, or because it cannot be thought, or because it can be thought and is known but cannot be said.

(2011, pp. 121–122)

Sofer and Shalev's (2004) rhetorical tools give support to a claim for the colonial nature of Israel as a Jewish-only state whose members must be Israelized. This is particularly apparent in the expressed fear of the "Palestinization" of Arabs in Israel and the "criminality" of the "Other" that is combined with the need to silence their voice in the political arena.

DEMOGRAPHIC POLICY AND POPULATION CONTROL

Discussions of Palestinians' legitimacy as residents in their homeland must be seen as a juridico-political extension of the colonial regime that tries to maintain the invisibility of the native. This can also be analyzed through the logic of a state on the offensive, constantly dealing with a social divide in search of a *casus belli* against its native population. As portrayed in the message behind Sofer and Shalev's analysis, Israel surveils, counts and manages Palestinians to ensure that they do not resist, express their political views, raise the issue of their identity as Palestinians or produce too many children who might change the demographics of the ruling majority. Such an incarcerating regime (without actual incarceration in some instances) follows every move, every birth, death and marriage, in keeping track of the native. To ensure that Palestinian numbers do not increase, Israel legislates laws and creates additional systems of control that deny the rights of unauthorized individuals to unify their families, return to their home/land in a lawful manner or access their social networks.

A look at transcripts of internal Knesset committee discussions of the newly enacted Citizenship Law indicates that concerns were raised regarding the numbers of Palestinians in the country and with respect to mechanisms for counting and managing them. For example, on July 14, 2003, the following dialogue took place:

Meni Mazouz: Everybody understands that this is not a simple proposed law ...

Isam Makhoul: Why can't we be satisfied with existing options, which enable the government to take its time to investigate? It looks like the real consideration is the demographic one.

Ehud Yatom: It is written here explicitly that the law came to be because there seems to be a growing involvement of Palestinians in the conflict. This should be taken into consideration. Such an issue can't be ignored.

Jamal Zahalka: How many people are involved?

Ehud Yatom: We are talking about 140000 people who settled [in Israel] between 1994 and 2002.

Nisan Slomyanski: The security element is made up of two things. 1. That there are *terroristim* and *mehablim*;⁵ 2. That they are changing the demography. The right to return became the basis, the reason behind every agreement that exploded,⁶ that the State of Israel, including the Labor Party, strongly opposes the right to return. When there is a group that is willingly and consciously applying the right to return, and that is beyond the question of terrorism, the state surely needs to protect itself. (Committee for Interior and Environmental Quality, 2003, pp. 5–6)

Slomyanski's articulation and rationalization of the law reflects a political psychosis that threatens the state's psychic sovereignty and generates paranoid fear of invasion by the native. This psychosis, haunting the colonizer with the threatened return of the natives to their homeland, is the catalyst for regulation and control. Capitalizing on and fueling the public's fear, power holders reproduce it through new bureaucracies, laws, the media and hegemonic academia.

THE JUDICIARY AS POLITICAL

The quotes cited earlier illustrate the varied readings of the Citizenship Law as expressed in numerous discussions among the public, in the Israeli Knesset, in the media and in the courts. There are those who perceive this law as racist and discriminating against the indigenous Palestinian people, a legalized means of transfer and displacement that violates human rights, and a tool in the hands of the colonizer to control

⁵ Both are Hebrew words for "terrorists."

⁶ He was referring to the fact that, despite considerable efforts, agreement was never reached.

demographic changes in historic Palestine. There are also those who read it as a means to protect Jewish Israelis from demographic threats and from terrorist Others.

This perception of the law – this psychosis – is also discernible in the debates and writings of Supreme Court justices. For example, Justice Dorit Beinisch, the liberal President of the Supreme Court who voted against upholding the Citizenship Law, stated:

that the law in its present format, in its sweeping and all-embracing scope, cannot stand, owing to the disproportionate harm to the right to family life and the right to equality. The inability to perform individual [case-by-case] checks, and the law's sweeping forbiddance of Palestinians to enter Israel in order to have a family life with their Israeli spouses, give too great a margin to the value of security without properly addressing opposing values and rights. Justice Beinisch stated that Israeli society must maintain its character as a society that honors the rights of its individuals, even in times of crisis and war. Defense of human rights must persist in days of war and days of peace, even if the proper balance needed for protection is constantly changing.⁷

Yet, despite Justice Beinisch's position that the law infringes upon the constitutional rights of citizens of Israel, the majority of the court ruled that such infringement is proportional and does not violate Israel's Basic Laws. The court thus indicates that it perceives it to be impossible to balance "security" risks with democratic principles regarding the preservation of equality and human rights, mainly because the mere raising of "security"-related concerns requires no proof. In other words, the debates *de facto* reproduce unequal relations of power. The discussions of security-related concerns yield prohibitions from within the law that contain punitive measures against the natives, reproducing their losses, perpetuating their dislocation and psychologically damaging their future.

Israel's judiciary is one of the most highly regarded in the world, largely because of its formal commitment to civil rights and judicial review, and independence from political branches of government. It has long been regarded by Jewish Israelis as a "bastion of liberalism," a term spoken with either pride or disdain depending on the political view of the observer (Clyne, 2012; Levy, 2012). For that reason, many on the left in Israel bemoan the Supreme Court's decisions upholding the Citizenship Law as a sign of the court's fall from grace as a just and

⁷ H.C.J. 7052/03 *Adalah et al. v. Minister of Interior et al.* (petition dismissed).

independent institution (Lendman, 2012). Others believe that the Supreme Court is an institution that is inherently part of a colonial project and therefore it is, for all intents and purposes, indistinguishable from the political branches of the government with respect to the rights of the colonized (Barzilai, 2000; Zureik et al., 2011). For these observers, the court's ruling upholding such an inherently racist law is indicative of a change in method, but not in ultimate intent: Policies of exclusion and disenfranchisement that were once unofficial and hidden behind a veil of democratic liberalism are now openly acknowledged by the court and even declared to be compatible with Israel's Basic Laws (BADIL, 2012; Pappé, 2008).

The law has often been used as a means of masking the true nature of the state with respect to Palestinians. Laws (and the court language upholding them) have long been couched in neutral and liberal terms, making it difficult for outsiders (and for many Jewish Israelis) to recognize that Palestinian citizens have been systematically deprived of full citizenship rights. The modus operandi of discriminatory treatment was administrative discretion. David Kretzmer, after conducting a 1990 study on discrimination against the Arab/Palestinian minority in Israel, concluded:

Though full equality between Jewish and Arab sectors of the population has not been achieved, there can be little doubt concerning the formal commitment of the legal system to equality . . . [Cases of] overt discrimination are few, but covert discrimination . . . that relies on administrative discretion rather than on any formal legal arrangements, is without doubt the most common form of discrimination by the institutions of government.

(Kretzmer, 1990)

Kretzmer came to this conclusion just as Israel appeared to be ushering in a more liberal-democratic era of constitutionalism, when the passing of the Basic Laws provided some hope of protection against the administrative forms of discrimination suffered by the Palestinian citizens of Israel.

Unfortunately, this has not proven to be the case. While the Basic Laws appear to provide greater security for protection of rights, their protection can be easily diluted by the constituent branch of the Knesset, which can usually annul or amend such a law by a simple majority decision. For example, the Basic Law of Freedom of Occupation has been amended three times since it was passed in 1993. It now

contains the phrase “Jewish and democratic” to connote the baseline values for any guarantee of protected rights (Saban, 2004). Furthermore, programs that have been implemented to ensure adequate representation of Palestinians in important decision-making bodies like the Knesset have for the most part fallen woefully short, further impairing the ability of Palestinians to fight the majority’s efforts to weaken the protection of fundamental rights (Benvenisti and Shaham, 2004). In other words, the liberal protections afforded to Palestinian citizens on paper have never been implemented in practice (Hallabi, 2011). The Supreme Court ruling on the Citizenship Law reveals that, in the name of national security, the Basic Laws are not even sufficient to provide protection against legislation that is openly discriminatory.

Many critics of the Supreme Court ruling argue that this provides proof that the independence of the court has been compromised, particularly with respect to decisions regarding Palestinian citizens. These critics hold that the Supreme Court justices have caved into the pressures of the ruling right-wing majority in the Knesset (Clyne, 2012; Levy, 2012). Of particular concern is the behavior of Justice Dorit Beinisch with respect to the Citizenship Law. Although she was one of the five justices in the minority who voted against it, critics accuse her of taking covert steps to uphold it – namely, she replaced a liberal judge, Ayala Procaccia, who objected to the Law, with a religious conservative judge, Neal Hendel, knowing that he would vote to support the Law. Furthermore, they claim that although she knew what the verdict was going to be as early as July 2011, she deliberately postponed completing it until after Procaccia’s retirement, thereby ensuring that the majority would vote to uphold the law. According to these critics, this was a deliberate attempt on her part to avoid the “public uproar” that would ensue if the Citizenship Law had been revoked, yet maintain her liberal credentials. They also point to the trend of the Supreme Court refusing to rule against potentially racist laws (e.g., the Nakba Law; see Chapter 4) as a sign of the court’s efforts to avoid confrontation with the Knesset (Zarchin, 2012a, 2012b).

The extent of the legislature’s influence on Israel’s highest court suggests a dangerous blurring of the lines between the political and the judicial, thereby undermining the separation of powers so essential to any functioning democracy (Salzberger, 1993). The maintenance of the colonial logic by the Supreme Court and the rationality that operates over the bodies and lives of the natives bears witness to the brutality of the colonial regime.

ON CHILDREN, SECURITIZATION AND THE LAW

A recent publication of the Israeli National Council for the Child (NCC) reveals that security-centric ideologies and demographically focused legal interpretations have also affected the legal status of children. The NCC reported that, in 2012, 156,985 children were living in Israel without citizenship – an increase of over 24 percent since 2001 – with over three-quarters (78.2 percent) of them residing in East Jerusalem (NCC, 2012, p. 2). This situation positions children in a state of “unauthorized legality” and “official unrecognizability.” Living without official legal status on account of their illegitimacy by Israeli administrative standards places restrictions on children’s mobility and their access to educational institutions and medical services, jeopardizing their safety and livelihood.

Knesset protocols discussing the proposed Citizenship Law shed light on the problems raised in relation to the status and rights of children of the indigenous Palestinian population. During one discussion in the Knesset following a 2002 government decision that ordered the Minister of the Interior to refrain from allowing couples from the West Bank or Gaza to have a legal status or get a permit to “live in Israel,” Adi Landau from HaMoked: Center for the Defense of the Individual argued that many children live in Jerusalem without official legal status:

Adi Landau: Since the government decision, children who are residents of East Jerusalem are not registered with the population council. There is no way to arrange their [legal] status.

MK Yuri Stern, Chair: I do not think this issue is relevant to the legislation at hand.

Adi Landau: According to this legislation, children who reside in Jerusalem will not be able to receive [legal] status. The legislation refers to citizens and people who are residents of the area and that includes children.

Yuri Stern: Jerusalemite children are permanent residents.

Adi Landau: Jerusalemite children are not automatically permanent residents. We represent hundreds of people in such conditions. Children of widows who were married to someone from the *shtahim* [Palestinian areas] stay without any official status, and they are candidates for deportation.

MK Nisan Slomyanski: You are talking about those that were born in the *shtahim*!

(Committee for Interior and Environmental Quality, 2003, p. 7)

As the above dialogue suggests, Landau's statements were summarily rejected. The Committee chair and other Knesset members refused to acknowledge the precarious status of these children. Note that both the members of the Committee and the HaMoked representative used the term *shtahim* to refer to the Palestinian area (including those parts of Jerusalem defined as such by Israeli law, as well as the West Bank and Gaza). The use of this term – as children of people from the *shtahim* or being born in the *shtahim* – is rooted in a racial logic of power, the power to separate between those who are included and those who should be erased and therefore denied official status. This allows for the violation of the children's basic rights, denying them security and safety and destabilizing their future status.

As the discussion ensued, the Committee continued to stress governmental concerns, generalizing to the whole population and refusing to acknowledge children's rights. The HaMoked representative tried once more to explain his position:

Adi Landau: If we are talking about security concerns, this could be valid when discussing couples, but this is not valid when talking about children.

Ehud Yatom: Let's not open this discussion, for there have been suicide bombers as young as 14 years old.

(Committee for Interior and Environmental Quality, 2003, p. 7)

Here, we clearly see that Ehud Yatom not only refused to accept Landau's argument that the law should treat children in a different manner, but added a claim that Palestinians, even children, can be "suicide bombers."

Following upon this discussion, Dani Guateh from the Israeli General Security Service (Shabak) stated:

I want to present you with the security aspect of the issue at hand. Things that I am saying are not classified; they were mentioned in the state's reply to the appeal to the Supreme Court.

We know that since the outbreak of the Al-Aqsa Intifada, there is a growing number of Palestinians from the *shtahim* involved in terror. The law is designed to prevent such involvement. The same seekers of family

reunification, residents of the *shtahim*, are involved in a series of attacks in Israel and they are attackers and collaborators.

In addition, we know that they are involved in gathering data related to attacks . . .

The involvement of Palestinians from the *shtahim* in terrorism is a direct result of the growing interest in them by terrorist organizations in the *shtahim* and abroad. They are a preferred group for recruitment to terrorist organizations. When they get [legal] status in the State of Israel, they hold Israeli documentation and get an Israeli vehicle license. The fact that they hold such documentation means that they can move freely in Israel, they are well involved with Israeli society. [Yet] they continue to keep close ties with their families and with the institutions and organizations in the *shtahim*.

(Committee for Interior and Environmental Quality, 2003, p. 19)

Guateh's above-mentioned statement verges on saying that all Palestinian applicants are actual terrorists. Furthermore, he went on to explain that the population from what he refers to as the *shtahim* is loyal to its community, and therefore can gather information regarding targets for attacks. The security concerns and the constant violent conflict, as portrayed by the Shabak, require that the law help the state to decrease attacks.

Committee chair Yuri Stern concluded:

We are in a state of war with the Palestinian people. This legislation is emergency legislation for a state of war. I want the Ministry of Justice to review what happened in Europe or in the United States when they were in an armed conflict with some countries.

(Committee for Interior and Environmental Quality, 2003, p. 20)

Stern's concluding remark clearly states that, since the law is "emergency legislation" and Israel is in a "state of war" with the Palestinians (and their non-existing country), all Palestinians can be considered terrorists – even children – and should not be granted official status. Children's rights in such a theologically securitized discourse lose their value and morality while the immorality of war prevails. Thus, not only are families prevented from being together and staying in their homes with their families and loved ones, but even children are deprived of their right to legal status and perceived as terrorist Others. The language used by Stern transmutes Palestinians from human subjects into unwelcome legal objects. The objectifying language of war transforms

Palestinians into unwanted, deportable objects to be erased from Israel's "sovereign" territory.

NECROPOLITICS AND THE MANUFACTURING OF THE FEARED OTHER

Dispossession of the right to family and home produces severe anxiety and an ongoing state of insecurity. The disavowed but complicit role of the Citizenship Law in the denial of Palestinian rights, founded on historical injustices and asymmetrical relations of power, when the body and life of the native is scarified to safeguard and comfort the Zionist state and the Jewish Israeli, manufactures Palestinians as feared objects. This unethical and inhumane complicity, tangled in power, can be clearly heard in the voice of Maysoon, a 30-year-old woman from Jerusalem.

I interviewed Maysoon when conducting group therapy with bereaved women in 2012, a project led by the Women Studies Center of Jerusalem. The violence of the Citizenship Law, whereby Maysoon's status needs to be legalized/approved by the Israeli authorities, has shaped her ideological perspective on history, life and living. Her first words in the interview historicized her condition:

We are originally from Jaffa. In 1948, during the Nakba, my family was displaced and ended up in Jordan. In the 1950s, my uncle, cousins and many family members decided to come back to Palestine and reside in Jerusalem [they were not allowed to return to their homes in Jaffa]. I was born in Jordan, but married my cousin's neighbor, who met me in Amman during my cousin's visit and proposed to me. I now live in Jerusalem . . . My nuclear family [Palestinian refugees in Jordan] has never visited me . . . My father said that he could never survive seeing the Israeli flag on houses in the Old City, destroying his old memories of the Old City of Jerusalem and I fear having my family visit me. The Old City is packed with cameras and Israeli security. If they come to know that we are originally from Jaffa, if they hear us talking about our homes in Jaffa, they might deport us all.

Maysoon's experience of displacement and the accumulation of losses of her family's land, home and right to reside in their city is reinforced by a colonial system of mundane surveillance. Her lack of security is aggravated by her inability to talk of Jaffa or Jerusalem as home in her own home; her anxiety about hosting her family in her home in the

Old City, for fear of deportation; and the agony she anticipates from her father's reactions should he witness their suffering and never-ending dispossession. She continues:

I live in an area filled with soldiers harassing us to protect the settlers... their cameras, their nastiness... their children that keep fighting with our children... and their flags are all over... I live in Jerusalem like a thief, a refugee in my home, living in my home like a criminal... my children are treated like criminals... even on their way to school or to the grocery shop on our street... They have turned them into criminals... and I behave like a thief... I swear to God I behave like a thief... always afraid... I walk fast... look around... I'm never relaxed... I need to renew my permit every year in order to stay in my own house with my family... every year again and again... again and again; and for the last three years I haven't gotten an official renewal, they keep on sending me back, asking for new documents, new papers, checking to see if I am still married to my husband, if I have a criminal record.

Casting out Palestinians is possible not simply through Israel's sovereign right to expel, but also through its ability to keep individuals in a state of uncertainty, sitting in an eternal waiting room in a Kafkaesque labyrinth of administrative processes. The Citizenship Law results in expropriation of Maysoon's means to become a legal entity, forcing her and her family to live illegally, as permanent refugees, in fear of Israel's surveillance and threat of deportation. Thus, Maysoon's daily life is fused with constant fear and anxiety. Perceived as thieves and criminals, she and her children are highly vulnerable, exposed to settler violence on a daily basis. She continues:

Since I got married in the year 2000, I live with so much fear and anxiety. Last week, I was sleeping with my husband in bed, and you know, it's cold, and we're under the covers, and saw a little red light... I was in an intimate state with my husband, when we both saw a small red light, moving from one side to the other, from the cupboard to the wall, on the bedroom curtains and back, we both totally froze, then it disappeared. Then... we both noticed it again, we both froze, froze totally, and my husband said with such a low voice, in a voice filled with pain, a terrorized voice "Maysoon, they have come to take you... This is the story of your permit."

Maysoon's endemic crises because of her illegality – or, as her husband puts it, her "story" with her "permit" – together with Israel's

machinery of oppression and surveillance invaded her most intimate moments with her husband. This production and accumulation of dispossession creates spatially and psychologically restricted zones of immobility, even in one's own bed.

Nariman, a 37-year-old woman who participated in the same therapy sessions, shared similar suffering. Nariman was raised in Jerusalem, studied in Jerusalem and works in one of Jerusalem's hospitals. But she married a man from the West Bank who, according to the Citizenship Law, cannot stay in Jerusalem legally without an official permit. Nariman explains:

I live alone in my house, in Ras el Amoud [a small neighborhood in Jerusalem]; my husband is from al-Khader, a village in the Bethlehem area. I call myself a temporary widow, for I have a husband, but lately – in the last years – and due to the additional restrictions imposed by Israel, he is prevented from reaching Jerusalem, and the children and my family and the children's schools, doctors, grandparents and my own work are all in Jerusalem. I am a nurse, a certified nurse, living alone with my four children, and my youngest son misses his father a lot... I also miss him... His father can't help me when they fight, when they're sick. He can't help them with their homework; he can't spend time with me and be there for me. When he comes, when he sneaks in, we need to be quiet... We can sleep with each other, but like thieves... so, I don't move, and try not to make noise, fearing the children will wake up, or the police will come and catch him with us. When he comes to see us, I don't use the light... and even when we sleep with each other, I fear getting up and washing myself... fear the Israeli police will catch him inside... We are both like this "rule"... what do they call it? The absent-present rule, or the present-absent? We try to be absent when present... and want to be present... when they want to us out... they do not want to see us.

Nariman defines herself as a "temporary widow" and defines her situation as "absent when present." As a Palestinian, she is surviving and residing in a liminal space in which colonial law produces her husband's condition as illegal. As her story reveals, the law allows the state not only to illegalize her beloved ones, but also to deny their very presence.

In *Black Skin, White Masks*, Fanon (1967) points to the objectification of colonial subjects by the colonizer's power. His analysis allows us to comprehend the ordeals, hardships and fears voiced by Nariman and Maysoon, for it highlights the ways natives are positioned, and the tension, terror and violence to which they are subjected. Nariman and Maysoon carry their otherness and their identity as Palestinians,

an identity that is kept under surveillance. Could it be that Nariman and Maysoon's being and becoming – that is, surviving their mundane life – disrupts the methods that colonization uses to create them as uniform terrorizing objects in order to justify the colonial need to dispossess them of their legality?

Fanon points out that the context of colonization leaves no room to see, feel, understand, hear or engage with the personhood of the colonized. He argues that the colonized is fashioned and recognized in a hyper-visible monstrous manner (as he also suggests in *The Wretched of the Earth* [1963]), as someone to be feared, and that fearing them is a reflection of master and slave interpositions that turns a human being into a “mere mechanism” (Fanon, 1963, p. 23) that is dangerous and to be feared. But, as Fanon indicates, that same “feared Other,” at the moment of degradation, challenges the colonial power, opening up counter-spaces, times and locations for the colonized to refashion themselves: “In the world in which I travel, I am endlessly creating myself” (Fanon, 1963, p. 229).

Nariman and Maysoon also constantly refashion themselves as humans who suffer and survive the Israeli colonial regime. Nariman creates a new category of law by defining herself as a temporary widow. She further invents the absent-present classification, which connects her to her roots and history of uprooting, when the colonial laws defined her people and their land as absent-present or present-absent. Likewise, Maysoon's survival strategies lie in her ability to detect surveillance and to challenge such surveillance with her powerful acts of “staying at home.” These actions are her hope for being present despite the colonizer's aim to turn her into an “absent” entity.

These women's narratives reveal how the Jewish state articulates its racial politics, demonstrated in its structural oppression, its acts of dispossession and (formal and informal) legalized control and surveillance systems. In preventing these women from living normal lives with their loved ones in their own homes, race is being used as a regulatory apparatus to control and separate Palestinians from each other, preventing them from being there for each other as families and communities, and controlling their economies and actions by imposing a heavy regime of surveillance and control.

Examining the voices of Maysoon and Nariman from an Israeli legal perspective allows us to comprehend how the subject of the Palestinian people emerges as a public policy concern and to reveal the institutional regulatory and disciplinary responses that turns them into criminals and

outsiders (although even criminals can have recourse to legal rights that are unavailable to them as Palestinians). Nariman's and Maysoon's life in Jerusalem, though ostensibly unrelated to the functions of state power, cannot be analyzed separately from the context of such power. Their narratives reveal how their articulation with the Israeli discourse of "security" risks and "demographic" threats, as racial and gendered categories created by disciplinary power, results in the racialization and radicalization of the law as well as the biopolitics and geopolitics of the Israeli state. As such, this mode of racial formation resonates within the Israeli legal culture and system, through the Citizenship Law and similar practices, revealing the effect of Israeli government management and the Jewish nature of the state on Palestinians' right to a family life, home and marital privacy. The discriminatory policies produced through their affiliation as Palestinians, created by racialized historical hierarchies, invade the very boundaries of their bedrooms.

Refusing to recognize Maysoon's origin as Jaffanian or to define her as a native, a resident of the place, while viewing her as a "security threat" to be feared and watched, is a form of "necropolitics." Expanding upon Agamben's (1998) concept, Achille Mbembe (2003) argued that "necropower," the economy of life and death, produces "death-worlds." To continue this line of reasoning, the perception of Palestinians as security and demographic threats together with the surveillance and control over their lives, families and bedrooms produces the disciplinary, biopolitical and necropolitical power of the Jewish state. Visible and invisible uprooting, displacing, fragmentizing and dispersing of the family and other acts of elimination of the Palestinian memory, identity and right to livelihood, citizenship, shelter and safety are necropolitical. So, too, are the underlying dialectic exchanges of the theologized (e.g., security, colonial, racial, religious and demographic) foundations and rationalization of the legal code, as reflected in the Citizenship Law.

The "colonial order of things" (Stoler, 1995, p. 46), evident in the voices shared here, cannot be dissociated from the racial politics of Israeli rule. To embrace colonial analyses, I focus on categories of race in the Israeli law and Zionist imaginary, assessing how such categories play in the everyday process of producing the colonial subject as unwanted, feared and dangerous. In tracing the colonial past in present conditions, we must look closely at the biological engineering of Israel/Palestine as portrayed in the Citizenship Law and reflected in the mundane realities of Palestinians living under colonial rule, particularly in terms of

controlling the decisions of those colonized to choose a life partner, unify one's family under one roof or even share one's bedroom with a specific partner.

As Lazreg (2008) points out, the monopoly over terminology and the practice of naming enables colonizers to reproduce and deconstruct themselves, and simultaneously to recompose themselves with the Other. Discussing Palestinian subjects as feared Others who need to be under constant surveillance and prevented from living their lives with their communities and families, without taking into consideration the historical injustices and the coercive power of continuous dispossession, manufactures the colonizer as socially superior while denying the colonized the right to home, family, society and dignified living.

CONCLUSIONS

This chapter has examined the Israeli legal regime through the lens of the Citizenship Law, particularly its effect on the Palestinian population's right to security and stability in the face of colonial dispossession. I have shown how this Law has helped to manufacture Palestinians as feared Others as well as how it has helped to mobilize fears that exacerbate control over them. The Citizenship Law justifies and increases surveillance over Palestinians and deeply impacts their bodily security, family relationships and everyday life. It enables the production of the Palestinian subject through a variety of technologies of surveillance that allow the Jewish state to manage "risk" and "danger." Surveillance strategies and differentiation through individual, group and community identification, materialized through "legalized choices," create racialized dichotomies. As I have argued in the preceding chapters, the produced "security theology" with its heavy reliance on the notion of the "dangerous Palestinian" and allied with knowledge and technologies of power used by the colonial state, including the Citizenship Law, constructs Palestinians as criminals, security threats and monsters. Suggesting that all Palestinians – even children – are terrorists implies that they should be dealt with as figures beyond redemption and recognition.

The official and unofficial tendency to enshrine the state as an ethnic Jewish republic has granted the Israeli General Security Service, the Israeli Supreme Court and many Israeli academics the power to define Palestinians as dangerous security threats. Intellectuals, as Gramsci (1971) argues, are a product of their dynamic and social reality. The

existence of intellectuals as critical and oppositional figures who provide an ethical-philosophical and legal framework and who maintain and constitute public consciousness is crucial for preserving morality and humanitarian values, particularly in times of conflict. Israeli academics have enhanced the production of knowledge to maintain colonial control and dispossession, which in turn has contributed to racializing Palestinians, the invasion of their families and bedrooms, and the definition of their children as terrorist Others. Israeli academics participating in the political economy of otherization, surveillance and dispossession should keep in mind that writings are violent weapons and not neutral epistemological products.

Stoler (2008, 2011) has labeled “aphasia” – a pathological condition that affects the capacity to comprehend words or connect them to their meanings – as the control over the colonized’s personal and family life and the complicity of those politicians and intellectuals who refuse to acknowledge such systematic colonial abuse. Although I reject the pathologization of such control, I do embrace the connection of colonial dispossession to the “inability to recognize things in the world and assign proper names to them” (Stoler, 2008, pp. 209–210). I consider the unwillingness to acknowledge the meaning of a formal mandate for surveillance over the intimacy of the bedroom and the dilution of the Palestinians’ rights to home, freedom and self-determination as clear colonial racism.

The Supreme Court’s decision and the language of the Citizenship Law operate in a discourse of spiral “active dissociation” (Stoler, 2011, p. 125). If we portray such colonial law as aphasia, racism and colonial ruination, we can gain some insights into legalized political and ideological cognitive domains in which “knowledge is disabled, attention is redirected, things are renamed, and disregard is revived and sustained” (Stoler, 2011, p. 153). The Citizenship Law redirects attention to securitized concerns, hiding structural asymmetries and the oppressive impact of power. The use of the word “citizenship” in the name of the law frames the issue in such a way as to encourage oppressive and unjust acts against Palestinians living in Israel, whose desire to use the law to acquire a status of recognizability infuses danger in the meaning of the word “citizen.” Naming it the “Citizenship Law” when it is a “Law of Erasure” relocates processes situated in specific histories and disposes people of the right to dignified living.

The nomenclature of this law and its numerous interpretations and ramifications require that we make cognitive connections to the

history of Israeli settler colonialism – a history that is lost in the Supreme Court and Knesset discussions of the law. Such connections are the core of unfinished histories; not histories of the past, but of the differential futures that produce the present colonial dispossession and human suffering. Instead, by individualizing the discussion, separating the narratives of Manal, Nariman and Maysoun from the story of the dispossession of Palestinians, the colonizer creates a zone of disconnection, characterized by laws that hope to hide the racism embedded within them. By introducing a concept of “citizenship” that disassociates and disconnects the human rights of certain citizens from the land, the state, its legislature and its judiciary – while upholding Jews in the world as protected by a divine, God-given, sacred birthright to Israeli citizenship and the Jewish-Israeli individual as an unconditional citizen – the law frames distinctly racist intentions as issues largely concerning “homeland security” and “democracy.”

Denying the loss of the Palestinians, refusing to see the “intimacy” of colonial rule or its invasion of the racialized arenas of life, divorces analyses from the ruling nature and power of the Jewish state. The racial epistemic of governance (as Stoler, 2011 would explain it) cannot be denied, particularly in light of the Citizenship Law and subsequent policy that classify citizens according to their race and the race, place and belonging of their loved ones, setting different citizenship laws for each racial group and determining who sits at the top of the hierarchy and who inhabits the bottom. This creates a clear set of segregation laws similar to those in apartheid South Africa and is reminiscent of policies towards indigenous American Indians in early colonial times.

When facilitated by laws that reorder societies, settler colonialism generates new resources for the colonizers to engage “legally” in producing a group of unwanted governed Others. The legal resources given to the colonizers turn the illegalized, unwanted Others into threats. The Citizenship Law is an example of a coercive law that dispossesses Palestinians of their basic citizenship rights in their homes and homeland, while offering any Jew in the world the “sacred birthright” to settle and become a citizen with full rights.

The Citizenship Law is a reflection of how Israeli society fluctuates between governance through “democratic” state acts, aphasia and racism. Derived from a colonial past, this Law continues to manifest itself in the present while erasing the possibility of a dignified future for the otherized Palestinians. The Law constitutes an attempt to both reconstruct history and plan the future. Such oppressive usage of an

allegedly “fair and democratic” legal system is beyond aphasia; it reflects an inability to acknowledge Palestinians’ rights to pursue happiness, to love, marry and live with those they choose in their own bedrooms, home, land and country.

Masking such laws with “security” and “demographic” justifications reinforces otherness and creates an industry that produces new meanings for “a democracy under threat.” The explanations and meanings apparent in judges’ discretions, the tactics to promote the majority hegemony (such as waiting for Judge Procaccia to retire) and the machineries used to invade Palestinians’ lives and bedrooms are all aimed at disconnecting meanings from their ideological and racist origins and temporalized interpretations, to the degree of *unrecognizing* the Palestinians’ right to freedom and happiness, thus creating a legal atmosphere promoting the dismissal of the non-Jew.

Mbembe (2003) and Lazreg (2008) argue that colonizers consistently deny the racism of their policies. They use this position to extort land, abuse and destroy, hiding commonplace colonial ventures and structural inequalities through silencing. Remaining silent about such domination and racism, through “democratic” and “legal” repackaging, using concepts like “security,” “citizenship” and “demography” fashioned by the discourse on “terrorism,” denies the *de facto* invasion of such racially targeted policies in the Palestinian’s bedroom. Invoking the Citizenship Law, as I argue in this chapter, provides a legal justification to employ force and justify forcible transfer, not at the hands of the army or “radical-fanatic settlers,” but at the hands of the Supreme Court, allowing colonizers to continue the dispossession in a “liberal” and “democratically” “legalized” manner.

CHAPTER FOUR

HUNTED HOMEPLACES

To deepen the argument regarding securitization and fear, I now pay closer attention to the psychosocial expressions of geopolitics and territoriality in the homespace. I recognize the critical role of space, its history and memory, as an embryonic principle of territorial sovereignty and nation building. The memory and production of localities, and the attachments of colonized groups and individuals to local life and spaces can become a source of emotional connectivity, resilience and attachment in exilic places and spaces, in the sense that localities carry shared histories and collectively remembered spaces for people: They have attachments to neighborhoods, streets, names, favorite sites, times, objects of meanings and places for congregating, escaping or regulating public life. This chapter shows how colonialists can use the family home and the memorialization and meanings of homeland as an excuse for surveillance and control under conditions of continuous uprooting and displacement of the native. But these same homes, memories and memorializations can also become sources of agency and power for the colonized (Shalhoub-Kevorkian, 2005).

The focus of this chapter is on the homespace and the memory of home, with the meanings and practices these bear. As anthropologists Sa'di and Abu-Lughod (2007) note, home for Palestinians is a place of continuity and memory. These memories are painful when it comes to the events of the Nakba, the Palestinian expulsion in 1948 from what was to become the state of Israel involving massacres, the dispossession of eighty percent of the population, displacement, and demolitions of homes and homeland. Palestinians who fled the battlegrounds

were forcefully removed, not allowed back and their property was confiscated.

Home, as a symbol of belonging for Palestinians, is a reminder of what has been taken and what remains under constant attack. Homes and memories, particularly for the uprooted, are privileged sites that produce notions of belonging, membership and solidarity. The home is responsible for the preservation of psychological and social life and the prevention of social death. The memory of home, as legal scholar George Bisharat (2007) explains, can provide a blueprint for the future, a vision of a solution to seek, and therefore it is an expression of power. By developing a framework of investigation that considers the home in conflict zones beyond a living space of certainty, belonging, membership and solidarity, we can hopefully comprehend the way in which home is evidence of sociopolitical history.

The homeplace, as I see it, is a localized site of global forces. The politics of home is tightly connected to the politics of homeland, and the violence surrounding the homeland is intimately connected with the home and politics. Home as a place of memories, as feminist historian Rosemary Sayigh (2007) argues, embraces the role of producing identities, localities, social relations, cultures and the nation. Home, as reflected in my own writings when studying housing demolitions revealed Palestinians' abilities to create counter-spaces for resisting oppression and racial repressions (Shalhoub-Kevorkian, 2005). In a settler colonial context, as in the current case study, maintaining *home* generates new morphologies of social categories that interact and multiply, that shift sociability, culture, politics and legal regimes. Bringing the Palestinian home to the forefront of our analysis aims to make visible the complicated and dynamic ethical principles that inform the "Palestine question." The homespace, as material space, carries the meanings that make this space the homeplace. The homeplace carries meanings and memories of individuals. It carries the names of people and places and of lost ownership, and the aspirations and compelling life experiences of Palestinians, with voices of power and voices of silence.

HOMELAND: MAPPING GEOGRAPHIES OF VIOLENCE

It was in mid-September 2012 when I met Elias, a sixty-four-year-old taxi driver from Haifa, my hometown, and also when I started writing this chapter. Elias drove me to my home in Jerusalem after my car broke

down while I was driving to Mada al-Carmel, where I am the Director of the Gender Studies Program. Elias picked me up from Mada, drove me first to my parents' house in Abbas Street, and was thrilled to tell me that he knows my mother and was close to my late father. During the two-hour drive to Jerusalem, he told me he was at my father's funeral, and that he knows the story of my parents and how they came to be married. His narrative captivated me:

I know your parents very well. I am like your father and mother; we are all "infiltrators" of the Nakba, but, at that time, I was a baby. The late Said Sweidan told me that your father was eighteen when they shot him in the leg, ankle, and hip, but he managed to sneak back and come to Haifa after being hospitalized twice in southern Lebanon. Your mother and my mother are strong women; they managed to infiltrate and sneak back, three times, before they managed to get official approval to stay in Haifa in their own homes. But my mother came back home only to discover that it had been demolished by the Israelis, so, she started from scratch.

Elias' tale about his family managing to come back home to Haifa after the Nakba suggests that his home was a site for his history, his memory and his pride – the pride of managing to challenge the many attempts to erase his ability to preserve or come back to his home even though his house had been demolished. His parents' ability to recreate a home and to acknowledge his rights and those of his siblings to remain in Haifa, outside the normative and institutional definitions of the newly established Jewish state and its legal codes, addressed his new collective and personal space as a minority in his homeland. He related how his access to this home was curbed:

We were eight siblings, and my parents were horrified during the attacks on Haifa in 1948, so my mother took seven of us – I was born in 1948, so I was maybe two or three months old – and we all went to Lebanon. But in Lebanon, my siblings were beggars on the street, and my mother could not feed us; so she decided to come back home. My father had a steady salary in Haifa. He used to work for the municipality and our economic situation was good. My mother saw my brothers and sisters being beaten and hurt [in Lebanon], for they were begging for food and even needed to steal some bread to feed us all. She suffered a lot [i.e., during her stay as a refugee in Lebanon and during the trip back] as at that time the only way back was to walk or ride a donkey, and there were seven of us siblings. But she managed to sneak us back, and out of fear of being caught by the Israelis, we all lived in the cemetery, in Mahatteit el-Carmel, beside

Sahwirma Khazen, beside the Ford garage . . . But she was caught, and the Israelis loaded us on a truck and threw us across the Lebanese border. My mother tried three times to come back home, and each time she came back to the cemetery, where she was able to feed us from the fruit and vegetables planted around the graves, and there was water too. And only on the third attempt, after the involvement of Bishop Hakim, did we manage to get an official permit to stay home. And even after we got our official permit, they [the Jews] still feared us . . . They feared seeing us in the streets or hearing us speaking Arabic.

Although, as he explained, finally making it back home and obtaining the official approval of maintaining a home – as both a physical and psychosocial space of connectivity, belonging and continuity – returned “the breathing space to my mother,” his family’s ability to survive was constantly delegitimized, if not criminalized. He explained:

My oldest brother was not with us in Lebanon; he stayed in Haifa to help my father. When we all came back, he wanted to go check on my uncles and relatives in Lod beside Ramlleh [the Nakba events prevented families from learning about the safety of other relatives, and family members looked for ways to check on other relatives], but his absence from Haifa for two weeks led to his imprisonment. My parents asked us not to leave the house, speak Arabic in public or participate in any political activity, and even when the political situation somehow became more stable, we wanted to keep the family together; we wanted to keep my mother less anxious. We did not want them – the Israelis – to be afraid of us. When my mother wanted to tell us how she managed to survive the Nakba – how she took care of us on the road, how she healed the wound of my brother who was beaten by two Lebanese men while trying to take some fruit from their farm – my father would worry. But she wanted to share her ordeal with us, and of how she managed to take care of us while living in the cemetery. She was a great woman who created a home filled with love and care, and I’m sure that, even in the cemetery, we felt safe and at home with her. But I was maybe two or three years old, it was 1951 – I don’t recall things. But I remember seeing misery, deep misery on her face when she related her experience of the Nakba to us, and after a couple of minutes, she would raise her head and tell us, “I brought you back, the seven of you. We lived in graveyards for months. They demolished my parents’ house with everything in it and that also broke my heart; but we are here, in our home, we are here while many people became refugees, beggars at people’s doors, lost their children and their homes. We have a home and we stayed one family.”

Hearing him tell me the story, with the pain the mere memory caused him, and at the same time the sense of pride in his mother's power and her determination to preserve their home, as a family, emphasized for me the way in which he perceived the meaning of home and the importance he attributes to the preservation of homeland. Elias' narration revealed that home – with the family's history of displacement, its resilience in its experience of being refugees, and with its fragmented territoriality within a space of burial – is a special site for the formation and reformation of his own identity as well as that of his family and community. As described by Elias, this home has been a site of violent political and social confrontations and transformations.

Violence against the home has to do with more than a threat to the right to a safe physical haven. It concerns the moral dimension of privacy, togetherness, personhood and continuity. It is that space of membership that defines the meanings of practices of belonging. It is a place about which to make claims and tell the stories and memories of belonging despite uprooting, demolition and the politics of erasure. The meanings of violence associated with the attack on the home and its memory provide a map of the colonial violence that invades the very intimate space and details of family and community life. In this geography of violence, the memory and preservation of the home as a (physical and moral) space in which the family creates its home is a site of inquiry that can reveal the meaning of the attack against the home in the context of settler colonialism. It tells a story of using violence to make claims against the home of the colonized and using the home of the colonized to make violent claims against any rightful claims to a home in the homeland, as Elias' mother explained. The geography and psychology of the loss of home is too important, vocal, visible and legible to be missed.

My understanding of the multitude of homes in which memories of loss and agency are narrated derives from Elias' insight expressed in his final words as he was dropping me off in the Old City of Jerusalem:

Jerusalem is so sad; I get so sad every time I drive someone to Jerusalem. How could you live here? I feel so sad when I come here. It's a dead old city, Israel killed its economy. The *suq* [marketplace] is dead. The people are lost. Life is not life. Beggars; poverty; children are arrested all the time. The police are all over. There are soldiers with rifles everywhere, just look around you. Even when I go to buy *qaek* [a special kind of bread] from the bakery for my family, just to bring something from Jerusalem, I see settlers around and soldiers to frighten the Arabs. What

a pity. Jerusalem is dying. How can you live here? How did you raise your family here? It looks to me like you're living in a graveyard.

The thread of Elias' tale narrates his mother's story of the Nakba, of living in a graveyard in Haifa, the rebuilding of his home there despite its demolition during the early years of the Israeli state, through to his words about occupied Jerusalem as a dying city and of his use of the metaphor of a graveyard for its residents. This thread is reflected in the progression of this chapter. It begins by discussing the Nakba and the memory of it through the prism of the newly enacted Nakba Law, which was passed in March 2011. This is a law that was aimed at erasing memories by invoking surveillance over the mere memory of the loss of home. Next, the reader will follow a short path of remembrance, connecting the losses of home during the Nakba to the attack on the home in today's Occupied East Jerusalem (OEJ). The third section looks closely at housing demolition in contemporary Jerusalem. I will then discuss the connection between surveillance and erasure of memory inherent in the Nakba Law and the attacks upon and demolitions of Palestinian homes in OEJ. I argue that the attempt to erase memory goes hand in hand with the erasure of the current personal, familial and national home. Part of a whole process of "losing the home," this erasure involves the act of nullifying the historical and sociocultural home, a homespace filled with memories, through the demolition of the physical and sociocultural space.

THE NAKBA LAW AS MEMORY SURVEILLANCE

The originally proposed bill (of April 2009) from which the Nakba Law is derived sought criminalization and imprisonment for up to three years of any persons or institutions that organized ceremonies in memory of the Nakba.¹ This bill was later revisited as an economic sanction, a kind of "softer" version of the law, proposed by MK Alex Miller from the right-wing Yisrael Beiteinu party and approved in March 2011 by a simple majority of present MKs (thirty-seven for and twenty-five against, with sixty abstaining or absent) – a majority of only thirty percent of the elected representatives. Officially known as the "Budget Foundations Law (Amendment 40) – Reducing Budget or Support for

¹ Palestinians mark their national catastrophe on May 15, the day following Israel's declaration of independence, to gather, mourn and recall the ordeals of those who suffered the trauma of the Nakba.

Activity Contrary to the Principles of the State” and approved by the High Court of Justice ruling H.C.J. 3429/11 *The Alumni Association of the Arab Orthodox School in Haifa et al. v. The Minister of Finance et al.* on January 5, 2012, the Nakba Law grants the Minister of Finance the discretionary power to deprive state-funded bodies (including the already financially anemic schools and public services) of their allocated budgets if they commemorate the Palestinian Nakba. Thus, it penalizes the use of rhetoric that labels the day of Israel’s establishment as a “day of mourning” for the Palestinian civilians massacred by Israeli forces and the over 700,000 Palestinians forced into exile by the 1948 war. Such commemoration is considered to challenge the Jewish and democratic principles of the state.

The Nakba Law implies that remembrance of the Nakba is analogous to the incitement of racism, violence, terrorism and support for an armed struggle or a terrorist state or organization. While the harsher original proposal of 2009 was quickly criticized as infringing individual rights to freedom of speech and expression, the “softer” version still largely violates basic freedoms. The Association for Civil Rights in Israel lists this law as one of the top anti-democratic legislative initiatives in Israel and warns of the discriminatory outcomes of placing discretionary power for implementation in the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Finance (Association for Civil Rights in Israel [ACRI], 2011). Adalah, an independent human rights organization and legal center, also lists the Nakba Law as one of the top discriminatory laws in the country, arguing that it imposes severe limitations on freedom of speech and assembly (Adalah, 2011). In response to the ruling of the Higher Court of Justice that approved the law, Adalah and the ACRI stated:

This court ruling ignores the fact that already this law in practice harms both the freedom of expression and the civil rights of Arab citizens, even before its implementation. Because the law’s formulation is so broad and vague, many institutions have already begun and will self-censor in order not to risk incurring penalties. Today, the High Court of Justice missed an opportunity to make clear to legislators that there are limits to their anti-human rights steps, particularly to the targeting of the human rights of Israel’s Arab population.

(Adalah, 2012a)

By permitting authorities to unjustly penalize citizens for holding events to commemorate the Nakba, the Law infringes upon their legal and human rights to remember the uprooting of their relatives and the

destruction of their homes, and compromises their economic, political, academic and cultural freedoms. Furthermore, the discretionary power given to the Ministry of Finance to determine if, when, how and why institutions and individuals should be penalized will clearly lead to the imposition of surveillance, the encouraging of political persecution and the implementation of policies to fulfill political agendas that discriminate against a segment of Israeli society that makes up one-fifth of its population – namely, the Palestinian citizens of the state of Israel.

Despite its approved “softer” version, the Nakba Law contains the same motivations as when it was first proposed. It aims at frightening those who wish to commemorate the human and physical loss of the Nakba and its political tragedy, in which Zionist leaders expelled most of the Palestinian inhabitants of the country. It aims at preventing them from remembering and mourning the destruction of their homeland, at suppressing public debate and at silencing those government-funded organizations (such as schools, cultural centers and research institutions) that dare to address the issue. Such groups will be loath to exercise free speech or participate in activities commemorating the traumatic events that victimized Palestinians for fear of financial sanctions and, I would argue, for fear that such sanctions might be expanded to include additional punitive measures. Such draconic legislation is added to the toolbox of the Israeli colonial regime to invoke surveillance over the very memory of the home.

Fanon discusses a similar situation in colonial Algeria: “Pacifists and legalists, they are in fact partisans of order, the new order – but to the colonialist bourgeoisie they put bluntly enough the demand which to them is the main one: ‘Give us more power’” (1963, p. 53). The practice of creating laws for surveillance over the “Other” is not uncommon among colonizers; in fact, it seems closer to the rule. Fanon’s analysis aids us in understanding how the recent Nakba Law functions as a facilitating tool of the colonizer’s surveillance regime. Examination of this law helps us to uncover the subtler forms of violence and surveillance deployed by the Israeli regime in an attempt to inscribe power over Palestinian commemorations of loss, and to uncover the use of the fear of the commemoration of the Nakba among Israeli Jews and their state officials as a self-validating catalyst to produce further fear of the Palestinians.

The banal nature of the denial of the Nakba as expressed through the Nakba Law is kindred to the denial of genocides, such as those of Native Americans, Australian aborigines and Armenians, as well as

more recent genocides committed in the former Yugoslavia, Rwanda and East Timor. A variety of explanations have been offered to understand such denials. Denials of genocide are not simply denials that such events occurred, as Stanley Cohen (2001) argues in *States of Denial: Knowing about Atrocities and Suffering*, but rather those denials are imposed by society, the state and its institutions. In their classic article “Professional Ethics and the Denial of the Armenian Genocide,” Smith, Markusen and Lifton (1995) revealed the motives underlying genocide denial as being a component of a self-serving ideology entailing bigotry and racist attitudes, intellectual confusion and identification with power on the part of the deniers.

Theorizing the aim of the Nakba Law through Elias’ ordeal, we realize it is based on political ideologies having legal, economic and psychological effects that intensify the already-existing pain of loss. Denial of the Nakba is a deep-seated nihilism also found in the attitudes of the Israeli academia toward the Armenian genocide (Auron, 2003). Indeed, using the case of the Armenian genocide can aid us in understanding not only the denial of the Palestinian Nakba, but also the surveillance over it, as reflected in the Nakba Law. In both cases, denial is about control embedded in the structure and identification of power. Richard Hovannisian’s (1999) analyses of the methodology, mechanisms and shifting strategies of denial, with reference to the Armenian genocide, allows us to further comprehend Elias’ remembrance and its connectivity to contemporary Jerusalem. Applying his analytical framework to the Nakba Law while juxtaposing it with Elias’ narrative suggests that Nakba denials aim to go beyond negating, rationalizing, relativizing and trivializing the Nakba to punishing those who – like Elias – vividly remember it in their everyday analyses of the present conditions of Palestinians, such as those living in Jerusalem.

The production of regulations and officializing control tactics concerning collective and individual memory over the loss of the homeland marks yet another perilous episode in the lives of Palestinians. The surveillance over the mere memory and the surveillance that maintains the power to erase memory is a strategy to erase Palestinian history. The Nakba Law penalizes the remembrance of Palestinian individuals and society, the remembrance of the traumatic cultural episode. It institutionalizes the desire to target the memory of Palestinian history and suffering as an expression of power, and uses officialized colonial strategies to penalize those who desire to guard and commemorate their history, essentially attacking the Palestinian collective and individual memory.

As is evident in this analysis, the Nakba Law works to promote a strategy aimed at erasing Palestinians' past and silencing voices of pain. The use of fear and tools of surveillance work hand in hand to promote this strategy; legislation infringing on freedom of expression and assembly becomes a useful tool for the surveillance and control agenda of the state through memory manipulation.

THE ERASURE OF HOME AS HOMELAND

The Nakba is associated with a rapid de-Arabization of the country involving the destruction of about 418 Palestinian villages and erasing the Palestinian population from five out of twelve towns in historic Palestine (Sa'di, 2002). The common thread between the destructions of the Nakba period and today's demolitions of Palestinian homes in occupied Jerusalem is the severe attack on Palestinian spaces and places and so all the meanings and memories they carry. A report published by the Israeli human rights organization B'Tselem,² outlined in Table 4.1 below, indicates that although there are periods in which the number of house demolitions increases or decreases, the attack on the Palestinian homespace and the displacement of individuals has never stopped. Similarly, the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) (2009) reports that, in the years 2000 to 2008, the Israeli authorities demolished more than 670 houses due to a lack of building permits.

The aim of this table is not only to show the number of people affected by such violence and the manner in which Israel uses a variety of regulations – such as those of the Interior Ministry or a municipal authority – to justify the demolitions, but also to make clear that violence against the homespace is violence against and displacement of families, of men, women and children. As the OCHA report states:

The demolition of houses causes significant hardship for the people affected. Not only must displaced families overcome the psychological distress of losing their homes, they are usually burdened with debt after the loss of their primary asset, the demolished house, and, if they have retained a lawyer, the payment of legal fees. In the case of East Jerusalem, families also face heavy fines imposed by the Jerusalem municipality and, in some cases, prison sentences.

(2009, p. 3)

² "House Demolitions as Punishment: Statistics," www.btselem.org/English/Punitive_Demolitions/Statistics.asp.

TABLE 4.1 Home demolitions in the West Bank and East Jerusalem as of September 12, 2012

Year	West Bank			East Jerusalem					
	Houses demolished	Displaced people	Children	Total	Interior Ministry	Municipality	Self	Displaced people	Children
1999	101	–	–	31	14	17	–	–	–
2000	41	–	–	16	7	9	–	–	–
2001	186	–	–	41	9	32	–	–	–
2002	276	–	–	45	9	36	–	–	–
2003	206	–	–	99	33	66	–	–	–
2004	139	–	–	133	18	115	–	194	110
2005	No data	–	–	90	14	76	–	140	78
2006	51	249	At least 74	81	10	71	–	98	18
2007	44	308	126	75	6	69	–	219	149
2008	44	306	163	77	6	71	–	340	188
2009	28	217	60	47	–	–	–	256	145
2010	86	472	223	22	–	–	9	191	94
2011	149	962	448	26	–	–	15	151	79
2012 ^a	62	420	234	12 ^b	–	–	5	47	18
Total	1413	2934	1328	795	126	562	29	1636	879

^a As of August 13, 2012.

^b As of May 31, 2012.

The Arab Association for Human Rights (HRA) considers house demolitions a severe violation of human rights, which intend to erase the Arab presence in cities and exacerbate Palestinians living conditions (Arab Association for Human Rights, 2005).

The bureaucracies of occupation (Barda, 2012) and the various technologies used by the Jewish state intensify the power and role of surveillance strategies, produce and reproduce fear, and prolong human suffering. The settler colonial logic directing such control is produced, as Cheshin et al. (1999) explain, through the drawing of new municipal borders for the city, borders that exclude Palestinians by situating them outside the city limits, thereby providing the city with land for Israeli settlements:

In east Jerusalem, however, the stakes were different ... Allowing “too many” homes in Arab neighborhoods would mean “too many” Arab residents in the city. The idea was to move as many Jews as possible into [Arab] east Jerusalem, and move as many Arabs as possible out of the city entirely. Israeli housing policy in east Jerusalem was all about this numbers game. Israel believed that the more Jews it moved into east Jerusalem, the stronger its hold on that part of the city. Israel saw each new Jewish neighborhood in east Jerusalem as another insurance policy against the re-division of the city.

(Cheshin et al., 1999, p. 32)

The demographic management and Judaization of occupied Jerusalem is apparent in government discussions, plans, and policies that aim at limiting the Palestinian population’s livelihood and growth in Jerusalem (Cheshin et al., 1999). Michael Dumper (1997) explains the strategic nature of Israel’s policies. These policies are directed at maintaining the Jewish majority and eliminating the Palestinian presence in occupied Jerusalem through zoning laws and city planning mechanisms that encourage Jewish immigration to the city by offering low housing costs, low mortgage interest rates and subsidized municipality services, while depriving Palestinians of services, limiting the passage of the Palestinian population and restricting their growth.³ Judaization is also reflected in land confiscation and housing demolition policies as well as policies encouraging the development of “legal” and

³ See also E. Springuel, “Information Brief: Jerusalem: City of ‘Peace,’ City of Pieces,” Jerusalem Fund for Education and Community Development, www.thejerusalemfund.org/html/GetDocumentAction/i/26810.

“illegal” Israeli settlements in Palestinian neighborhoods in East Jerusalem (B’Tselem, 2002).

Disparities between Palestinians and Israeli Jews in occupied Jerusalem are also apparent in zoning and urban planning laws. Palestinians face a wealth of restrictions that keep them from living in West Jerusalem.⁴ In contrast, in 2009, Jewish Israelis residing in East Jerusalem neighborhoods accounted for almost one-eighth of all Israeli governmental construction. A third of East Jerusalem land (thirty-five percent) has been expropriated for Israeli settlement, with another thirty percent as unplanned land, twenty-two percent zoned land and only thirteen percent zoned for Palestinian construction. This division limits Palestinians, who make up over one-third of the city’s population, to thirteen percent of the Jerusalem land that was occupied in 1967 (see also Ir Amim and Bimkom, 2010; OCHA, 2009).

The reduced budget granted to the development of Palestinian neighborhoods plays an additional role in pushing Palestinians out of the city. Many such neighborhoods lack roads, sewage systems, pipes, sidewalks, public parks, public libraries and the like. In 2007 alone, Palestinians made up thirteen percent of the population, but received only between nine and twelve percent of the budget (Margalit, 2007a). As building permits are not granted where there is a lack of public infrastructure, difficulties increase when no resources are dedicated to the development of the area.

Israeli urban zoning policies, the lack of resource allocation to maintain infrastructure and a paucity of building permits have led many Palestinians to construct homes without permission (Amnesty, 2004; B’Tselem, 2006; Margalit, 2007b). According to the Israeli Committee against House Demolitions (ICAHN; see Schaeffer, 2011), in December 2011 there were between 15,000 and 20,000 unauthorized buildings in the Palestinian sector of East Jerusalem. According to the OCHA (2009), some 93,100 residents are at risk of being displaced by having their homes demolished.

Israeli laws regulating demographics also allow the Interior Ministry to revoke residency from Palestinians of occupied Jerusalem without warning. According to statistics published by B’Tselem (2011d), in

⁴ Even walking around that part of Jerusalem can be dangerous; see, e.g., the lynching documented in Ha’aretz (2012).

the period from 2005 to 2011, a total of 7,260 Palestinians had their residency in East Jerusalem revoked. Thus, not only are families prevented from living together (as seen in the Citizenship and Entry Law discussed in [Chapter 3](#)), but the status of residency is taken away from those Jerusalemites who are considered by Israeli law as not residing within the city's municipal borders. For example, Jerusalemites studying or working in the West Bank or abroad can forfeit their residency if they do not return to the city within a specific period (currently seven years). Yet, many have no choice because of the generalized lack of opportunities for Palestinians in Israel proper; as a result, they may be penalized through revocation of their residency rights. To avoid this situation, they are forced to remain close to their families. Take the case of Marwan, a thirty-eight-year-old Palestinian born in the Old City of Jerusalem, who moved with his parents and brothers at the age of fifteen to nearby Eizareyyeh, where rent was lower. Due to new municipal borders that went into effect after the move, Marwan lost his residency rights, including the ability to visit his grandparents, who continue to live in the Old City. This situation is exacerbated by the Israeli separation wall: many Palestinians have found themselves on the “wrong” side of the wall, placing their residency status in peril (OCHA, 2011c).⁵

Population management and its inherent promotion of religious/ethnic supremacy as a prerequisite for survival is part and parcel of Israeli policies aimed at continuing a history of eradication of the unwanted Other. Judaization of the city, neighborhood, marketplace and streets; control of the school system, health care, transportation and banks; and the variegated mechanisms for constant surveillance over all aspects of life and homespace are all part of a process that goes beyond increasing the Jewish presence and the weakening of the Palestinian presence in Jerusalem. It also goes beyond simply delegitimizing claims of the city as the capital of a future Palestinian state to claiming it as a uniquely Jewish land, a land not meant for Arabs or other groups. The Judaization of space is a colonial technology; it is a demographic strategy of managing populations that fragments social, political and economic life and attacks the Palestinian home at its core.

⁵ See also E. Springuel, “Information Brief: Jerusalem: City of ‘Peace,’ City of Pieces,” Jerusalem Fund for Education and Community Development, www.thejerusalemfund.org/html/GetDocumentAction/i/26810.

THE ISRAELI POLICY OF HOUSE DEMOLITIONS: A “MILITARY NECESSITY”

Since 1967, Israel has implemented a policy in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip whereby the Israeli military government destroys or seals houses in which “security” offenses have been allegedly committed or in which suspected offenders have resided (Simon, 1994, p. 7). Although Israel’s policy of house sealing and demolition has varied over the years, the Israeli army reinstated the practice in 2001 during the al-Aqsa Intifada of 2000–2005 (Shnayderman, 2004, p. 13). Since 1999, the Israeli military has destroyed more than 5,200 Palestinian homes, rendering 25,719 Palestinian women, men and children homeless (see Al-Haq, 2004).⁶

Three principal reasons are advanced by Israel for the policy of house demolitions. First, it is argued that the interests of security or military necessity require houses to be destroyed to prevent them from providing cover for militants bent on attacking Israeli settlements or security forces. Second, the homes of those who have been accused of committing crimes against Israel are destroyed by way of punishment or, as the Israeli government prefers to call it, as a form of deterrence. Third, houses built without administrative permission, in a system in which permits are seldom granted, are destroyed to assert respect for Israel’s administrative regime (Dugard, 2003, p. 13). Thus, home demolitions in the Occupied Palestinian Territories (OPT) fall under three categories: (1) punitive demolitions of houses belonging to families of people allegedly involved in suicide attacks; (2) operational demolitions carried out during military operations; and (3) administrative demolitions of houses constructed without a permit (Margalit, 2005). Here, I focus on the last two categories – operational and administrative demolitions – that are enacted through a highly systematized government policy.

The legal foundation of the home demolition practice is Article 119 of the 1945 Defense Emergency Regulations, a British mandate-era piece of legislation still in effect in Israel. Article 119 states, in part:

⁶ See also B’Tselem, “Demolition for Alleged Military Purposes,” www.btselem.org/English/Razing/Statistics.asp, retrieved May 16, 2006; “House Demolitions as Punishment: Statistics,” www.btselem.org/English/Punitive_Demolitions/Statistics.asp, retrieved May 16, 2006; “Planning and BUILDING: Statistics on Demolition of Houses Built without Permits in the West Bank (Not Including East Jerusalem),” www.btselem.org/English/Planning_and_Building/Statistics.asp.

A Military Commander may by order direct the forfeiture to the Government of Palestine of any house, structure or land from which he has reason to suspect that any firearm has been illegally discharged, or any bomb, grenade or explosive or incendiary article illegally thrown, detonated, exploded or otherwise discharged, or any house, structure or land situated in any area, town, village, quarter or street the inhabitants or some of the inhabitants of which he is satisfied have committed, or attempted to commit, or abetted the commission of, or been accessories after the fact to the commission of, any offense against these Regulations involving violence or intimidation or any Military Court offense; and when any house, structure or land is forfeited as aforesaid, the Military Commander may destroy the house or the structure or anything in or on the house, the structure or the land.

The broad language of the provision gives the commander complete discretion and almost limitless authority in determining the circumstances under which it can order home demolitions. First, it grants the government the sole authority to issue demolition orders, with no need for judicial review; it requires only that the military commander have “reason to suspect” and be “satisfied” that an offense was committed (Simon, 1994, p. 16).⁷ Second, Article 119 gives the military government broad legal authority in determining the scope of the practice. The letter of the law provides the military government with the authority to destroy homes that are used directly in the commission of an offense or where the offenders reside (Simon, 1994, p. 16). However, the scope of this practice has been construed very liberally and has been applied in a manner that includes rented homes, homes in which offenders lived infrequently, multi-apartment structures and homes of those killed in the course of commission of an offense (Simon, 1994, p. 16). Third, Article 119 does not require ownership; thus, homes may be demolished even when their owners have no connection to an offense (Simon, 1994, p. 17). Finally, the law does not apply any proportionality criteria arising from an offense to the destruction of the house (Simon, 1994, p. 17).

⁷ Since August 1989, however, most orders have undergone judicial review by the Israeli Supreme Court. The Court routinely issues interim orders preventing the execution of demolition orders until it completes its proceedings. Nevertheless, the Court’s oversight does not amount to a criminal appeal because it does not canvass evidence or determine guilt; it merely decides whether demolition orders meet the relatively lenient standards for review of administrative actions. Furthermore, demolitions do not replace criminal proceedings or regular criminal punishment. Whether or not their homes were demolished, the offenders are invariably prosecuted in military courts for the very same offenses and are generally sentenced to substantial terms of imprisonment (Simon, 1994, p. 16).

The Israeli government relies on Article 23(g) of the Hague Regulations of 1907 to justify the demolition of houses. This Article states that it is forbidden “to destroy or seize the enemy’s property unless such destruction or seizure is imperatively demanded by the necessities of war.” Accordingly, Israeli officials argue that house demolitions are a military necessity in order to accomplish the government’s objective of “protecting” security forces and settlers from Palestinians and combating the digging of tunnels intended for smuggling weapons.⁸ Although Article 23(g) of the Hague Regulations is similar to Article 53 of the Fourth Geneva Convention Relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War of 1949, Israel relies on the former provision in order to emphasize: (1) that an armed conflict is currently being waged in the OPT; and (2) that the Fourth Geneva Convention does not apply in the OPT.⁹

Underlying Israel’s “security defense” is the narrative of protectionism. Israel’s justification for its housing demolition policy is protection of its citizens from “terrorist” Others. Iris Young argues that the narrative of masculinist protectionism relies on the image of a protector who must take precautions against threats and be ready to fight and make sacrifices for the sake of its citizens. Applied to the security regime, the logic of protectionism justifies a state’s preemptive acts as protective actions against a threatening aggressor (Young, 2003, p. 6).

The relevant humanitarian legal instruments that govern what an occupying power can or cannot do under conditions of belligerent occupation include the seventeen Hague Regulations of 1907 and the four Geneva Conventions of 1949, along with the two Additional Protocols of 1977. Under the Hague Regulations of 1907, which regulate the methods and means of warfare, Article 46, which deals with occupied territory, provides that “Family honor and rights, the lives of persons, and private property, as well as religious convictions and practice, must be respected” and that “private property cannot be confiscated.”

⁸ See B’Tselem, “International Humanitarian Law on Demolition for Alleged Military Purposes,” www.btselem.org/english/Razing/Humanitarian_Law.asp.

⁹ *Ibid.* In the past, Israel relied on the language of Article 53, claiming “pressing military necessity” as justification for the house demolitions committed pursuant to Regulation 119. Israel made this claim even though it declared that the demolitions were intended to punish persons suspected of attacks against Israel and to deter other Palestinians from performing similar acts. The prohibition on the destruction of property set forth in international humanitarian law is intended precisely to prevent using such reasons to justify damage to property (Simon, 1994, p. 18).

Moreover, Article 53 of the Fourth Geneva Convention Relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War of 1949, to which Israel is a signatory, stipulates:

Any destruction by the Occupying Power of real or personal property belonging individually or collectively to private persons, or to the State, or to other public authorities, or to social or co-operative organizations, is prohibited, except where such destruction is rendered absolutely necessary by military operations.

In addition to these provisions, it is universally agreed, as stipulated in the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, that everyone is entitled to proper housing. Article 11(1) of the Covenant provides:

The States Parties to the present Covenant recognize the right of everyone to an adequate standard of living for himself and his family, including adequate food, clothing and housing.

(United Nations General Assembly, 1966)

It should be noted that the way in which house demolitions are implemented renders entire families homeless and destitute, and inflicts great suffering on the civilian population who, in the process, experience loss of life, arrests and harassment. The force used and the failure to provide warning maximizes the emotional and physical trauma of the demolition (Ertürk, 2005, p. 10).

In spite of the various conventions to prevent the demolitions of family homes and international restrictions on occupying forces, Israel continues to demolish houses, causing much suffering to individuals, families and communities. Why the attack on the home? What purpose does it serve? To answer these questions, let us now listen to the voices of those who suffer the effect of such destructions.

TRAPPED: PALESTINIANS, THEIR HOMES AND COLONIAL HUNTING ZONES

[The] urban environment must be understood not simply as the backdrop to conflict, nor as its mere consequence, but as trapped in a complex and dynamic feedback-based relation with the forces operating within it – be they a diverse local population, soldiers, guerrillas, media or humanitarian agents.

(Weizman, 2006, p. 8)

Under the technologies of insecurity, the homeplace, despite its invaluable and precious meaning, becomes a trap, a hunting zone. It is in the home that children are getting arrested; it is in the middle of the night that homes are raided; and it is during the early morning, while everyone is still in bed, that the demolitions take place. Assembling police and military forces around the family home, invasively using explosives, bulldozers and police cars in the homespace, changes it totally, turning it into an unsafe, unfamiliar and uncontrolled war zone.

The attack on homeland, in the urban environment of occupied Jerusalem, traps the Palestinian community in an imprisoned and imprisoning space, the homespace. These urban warfare tactics are indicative of the ideological underpinnings of the conflict. The physical and architectural elements – houses, neighborhoods and the public space – are entities responsive to and affected by the changing political games, the “securitized” environment and the forces of “fear.” Homes, their residents and the homespace in occupied Jerusalem are at the forefront of the conflict. They are hunting zones and, as such, they produce surveillance and a political economy of fear.

We need to expand our knowledge of the technologies of attacking the homespace, exploring the uses and articulations of such technologies on individuals and families, so as to sharpen our political critique of them. The following juxtaposes Palestinian voices narrating their personal ordeals with the horror of home demolitions, showing how the ongoing torturous process robs them of economic and social resources and drains their ability to fight back. The narratives were collected during interviews of almost two hours in 2007–2008 with fifteen families who live in OEJ. In addition, interviews were also conducted with women and men who participated in two of my latest studies conducted in OEJ in 2010–2012 (Shalhoub-Kevorkian, 2010c, 2012b). Although those two studies did not focus on the issue of housing demolitions, interviewees spontaneously raised their concerns and shared their ordeals in dealing with the attacks on their homes. Interviewing and listening to Palestinians facing attacks on their home can reveal how Palestinians and their homespace are treated by colonial power, both psychologically and organizationally. Sharing with the reader the technologies of demolition before, during and after the event not only allows a closer look at the effect of such technologies on family members, but also helps uncover the manner in which the Israeli war machine and colonial logic functions through housing demolition policies.

Maneuvering through the homespace to avoid demolition

Samer, a thirty-two-year-old father, explained to me:

After they gave us the demolition order, I was told that only a good lawyer could help us keep our home, so we [he and his wife] both started working more hours and saving money, to keep the house and pay the lawyer. The lawyer and his office worker suggested we start using a back door to get into the house. They also told my wife not to put the two chairs and table outside the house and not to finish painting the entranceway – and my wife enjoyed painting the walls and decorating the house – [so as to] to keep the house as invisible as possible to authorities. We even blocked the front window that brought much light into the house, and the big window in the children’s room, just to keep the house. We asked the children to enter the house from the small back door; otherwise, they will notice us and feel that we are enjoying our home, and will come and demolish it.

The need to maneuver through and across homeplace and homespace in an attempt to subvert the system and keep the house forced Samer and his family to reorganize their lives and spaces. It changed and challenged the definition of what is in and what is outside the homespace. It changed the meaning of the two chairs that Samer and his wife used to sit on every morning and evening, drinking tea and enjoying life on their street. It changed the meanings of their doors, windows and building. As Samer told it, blocking the front window elicited from his daughter an “agonizing cry.” Such acts of subversion resulted in a reinterpretation of the homespace and the movement from room to room, or inside the room-space, for all of these became constitutive of power, authority and security, or their lack.

The torture of self-demolition

Bisan is a young teacher who worked hard with her husband and family to build their house. They knew they were building without official permits, but they also knew that no permits were issued in their area (because of a large Jewish settlement that was being built behind them), even though her family had papers proving their ownership of the land. She told me:

We built our house 17 years ago, and since that day, we have been trying to get an official permit. We spent over \$100,000 on lawyers and engineers. We paid thousands of shekels in fines. They made us demolish the two rooms we added eight years ago, and we did... And that was pure

humiliation, pure oppression, *thull . . . thull* [oppression]. We demolished the two rooms with our own hands, on that very rainy day, that day that caused my husband to have a stroke, which kept him from speaking for almost two months . . . We demolished our home, our two rooms, with our own hands, not because we wanted to, but because the court said if we didn't demolish it, they'd bring their bulldozers and demolish it. We were worried that we would end up paying the 75,000 [shekels] for the bulldozer and then additional payment for the soldiers, police and municipal workers that help in the demolitions, so we demolished it with our own hands.

The choice of self-demolition – as an act that prevents the trauma of demolition by Israeli bulldozers and avoids increasing the financial burden on the family – is an additional device of capturing, regulating and disciplining Palestinians, marking a shift in the way in which colonial power operates. It is a “better” and more “appropriate” alternative that can prevent sudden and unexpected penetration of the homespace, leading to Palestinian family members demolishing their own rooms, homes and spaces.

Bisan's reflections on her family's acts of self-demolition reveal a cruel and violent instrument of social disciplining and reordering, of social and political oppression – an instrument that has been an organic part of colonial regulation and domination (Lazreg, 2008). I view this deliberate exercise of forcing Palestinians to eliminate their own homes, leaving individuals and families with a severe sense of helplessness and terror, as nothing short of torture. The severe pain that emanated from Bisan while describing Israel's violent imposition of power over her family and her repeated use of the words “humiliation” and “oppression” are indicative of the limitless effect of such torture.

The pain is also clear from Bisan's husband Salim, who stated:

I cried like a baby while I was demolishing my own house . . . [It was] as if someone asked me to kill part of my family, slaughter one member to allow the rest to survive . . . In our area, when you want to curse someone, when you want to really, really curse him badly, you say: “Allah yekhreb beittak” [“May God demolish your home”] . . . and here, I am the one who had to *akhreb beitti* [“demolish my own home”] . . . It is humiliating, a severe humiliation, and doing it with the help of your children all while the Israeli police and military are watching you is torture, is suffering.

The narratives of Bisan and Salim reveal the manner in which spaces, homes, people, fines, objects and actions all function together to serve

one clear plan, namely, building a Jewish settlement in Bisan's area and, as she said, to "bring more Jews, and kick us out." Bisan told me that "they sucked our blood," referring to the money spent paying fines and trying to get an official permit. She said that she is dying a slow death, being killed each day whenever she sees the construction in the settlements, knowing she has lost the ability to protect her own home, even though she chose the act of self-demolition:

When we demolished the two rooms, it rained very hard at night, and the entire house was flooded, filled with water; the beds, the mattresses . . . everything was wet . . . It was such a sad day . . . another day of killing us, another day that I wished we never existed and that we had never caused such pain to our children.

Despite the darkness of her words ("killing us," "sucked our blood"), Bisan, Salim and the family developed complex adaptation systems or used strategies that were imposed on them, including familial and communal tactics that necessitates constant alertness and awareness of what goes on, when and how to react. For example, Bisan explained how following the self-demolition of the two rooms in their home, her children, together with their schoolmates and cousins, refused to allow even one settler to pass by their street, and they burned tires and threw stones to keep them away. Yet, as Salim explained, the family's and community's awareness did not erase the deep sense of injustice and fear of sudden attacks by the Israeli state, its police, municipality forces and/or the settlers' threatening appearance. Bisan stated: "They [the Israelis] kept us under their surveillance. They used cameras and reconnaissance using military jeeps surveillance trips to frighten our children and prevent us from moving freely. We have been under their microscopes for 18 years." Keeping Bisan and her family under constant attack transforms Palestinians' lives, beliefs and power (or lack thereof); I define this as the demolition before the demolition. The constant attack pushed her children, their cousins and friends to say no to humiliation, to become stone throwers – to protect the only space left for them to breathe.

Moreover, the deep sense of fear and of being watched changed Bisan's ability to move freely:

When we built the house, the entire area was open. The street was larger; even the bus used to reach here. Now the settlers control the roads and the area, and we have become totally excluded. Our neighborhood has become like an animal cage. Each animal, each of our families, live in their cage, under their cameras and surveillance devices.

The attack on Bisan's psyche, causing her to live her entire married life in fear and under constant threat; the violence against her home and family, resulting in her husband's stroke; and her loss of part of her home requires that we revisit our understanding on the fear of the loss of home. Fearing the loss of home suggests that we conceptualize violence against the Palestinian home as a specific technology that invades the intimate levels of the psyche, of individual, family and social relations, and that this technology is located within a specific sociopolitical context of spaciocide (as Hanafi [2009] would define it) and sociocide.

Bisan's ordeal is reminiscent of the story told to me by Fadwa, a single mother who used every bit of her power to face the attack on her home. As she explained to me, after her divorce, she moved in with her parents. As her two children were uncomfortable with this crowded arrangement, which gave them no privacy, she decided to build an extension for herself and them. She worked hard as a cleaning woman in Jewish houses, took loans from the bank and her sisters, saved money and built her room. She knew that this addition to her parents' house was unauthorized by the Israelis, but she could not afford rent and most of the houses in her area were built without a permit (mainly because Israeli authorities would not grant any). It was her hope that no one would notice her one-room home.

Her neighbors also built without a permit and, within two years, the authorities demolished their apartment without prior notice. On the day of the demolition, Eyad, Fadwa's eleven-year-old son, fought with the soldiers who came to demolish the neighbor's home. He was arrested, in his unauthorized one-room home, at 2:00 in the morning. Fadwa explained:

I built my room, my small corner, with my own hands, carrying each and every building block alone just to protect my child. But they detect all our movements, they know all our steps, and they follow even the little ones [her children]... On that day [i.e., the day that they arrested her son], they entered the house like a storm. We were all asleep, and they knew exactly which direction to take and in which bed Eyad was sleeping. My poor mother started screaming in horror and anger. She was crying and screaming: "They came to demolish your room, they came to demolish it; you haven't enjoyed it yet." But they came directly to my room, directly to my son, barely allowed him to get dressed, and took him with them, claiming he had been throwing stones during the demolition of the neighbor's house.

Fadwa also related how the homespace is placed under surveillance:

You think you have four walls [of the house] to keep your privacy and protect you, but Palestinian walls are transparent; they see, plan, track everything that goes in and out. They knew exactly which bed was Eyad's, they knew exactly which room was mine, because the person who came with them to raid the house and arrest Eyad was from the [Jewish] settlement next to us.

And two years after Eyad's arrest, their one-room home was demolished as well:

They took my son. His arrest burned my heart, broke me totally . . . I spent all my money on the lawyer. I spent all my time standing in front of the police station begging them to release him, telling them that he is just a child. Eyad was released after I paid a large fine, and afterwards they opened a record [charging him with security offenses] . . . And two years later, while my brother was in court trying to get a permit for my room they came in the early morning and demolished it.

Fadwa and her family tried their best to get permits, abide by the rules and protect each other. She used all her hard-earned money to pay for the proper papers, used the best professionals and was present in the courtroom in order to try and get a permit for the house, but all to no avail. Her inability to prevent the arrest of her young son and obtain an official permit for building her one-room home was not due to her own negligence. Rather:

When they want you on your knees, no matter what kind of lawyer you have, whether you are the owner of the land, what a great engineer you have – they will first take all your money, make you pay lawyers, fines, taxes, spend all your energy and resources, get additional loans from the banks, and then come and with no prior notice demolish all you have invested in, steal your children's future and your home.

Demolition day

Once demolition orders are issued, inhabitants are usually given little notice that their home is about to be destroyed. Often, as little as fifteen minutes is allowed for residents to remove all their belongings from the house they are about to lose. On other occasions, soldiers have informed families that their home might be demolished in the future and no further information is supplied (Darcy, 2003, p. 6). Demolition orders are usually executed by blowing up the home with explosives or by razing

it to the ground with a bulldozer. When a house is ordered to be sealed, concrete blocks or metal sheeting are used to seal off rooms or entire houses, preventing access to them by the former inhabitants. In either case, families are forbidden from rebuilding their homes on the site or using their land in any way and are forced to find alternative living arrangements elsewhere (Simon, 1994, p. 7).

Nora lost her house without any prior notice. Her horrifying story reinforces the previous narratives to reveal how housing demolition functions in an organized, systematic and highly regulated manner to discipline Palestinians and intimately affect their individual and family life:

I did my best to address their needs. I brought them all the needed documents that proved that my family owned the land. I got all the needed permissions and permits from the municipal engineer, the department of zoning and planning, and I even paid all the fines. I built the home according to all the legal permits requested . . . And one day, with no previous notice they demolished the house . . . I had all the papers to show the legality of my house . . . They took the papers, but didn't read them; they do not care. They treated us like animals, as if we did not exist, as if we do not belong here . . . They demolished it and then claimed that it was a mistake . . . What mistake? . . . I lost my home, my family savings, my children, my shelter, my everything; I lost all that I had. And they claimed it was done by mistake, a mistake that is killing me day by day; a mistake that I see every single day I open my eyes. A mistake that will never be erased from my memories, my thoughts, my body; a mistake that meant the world to me – my home . . . Since that "mistake," I have learned that we all – we Palestinians – are considered a mistake that they would like to get rid of; a mistake that burned my heart . . . They killed me [crying].

Amani's situation was no less traumatic:

We were all asleep, but I was holding my son. He was four months old. I was breastfeeding him and putting a cold towel on his forehead, as he had a fever. Suddenly, I looked out the window and saw them all around our area. But I was sure they were after someone, or maybe trying to demolish that new unfinished house that was just built with no permit. I was worried about my son's fever, so I went back to giving him medicine, applying the cold towel, until he fell asleep, and I did too. In less than an hour, they attacked my house, broke the windows, the doors, the shutters, scared us with their dogs, and started screaming, "Barra! Barra!" ["Get out! Get out!"]

Of the fifteen family members I interviewed, eleven told me their houses were demolished in the early hours of the morning. Only one family learned in advance (one day earlier) from their lawyers that their home would be demolished on a specific date. In ten cases, family members were still in bed when the process began. They had no time to comprehend what was happening, to dress their children, to get organized, to collect the household goods or to get the furniture, the family documents, the children's school clothes and books out. The interviewees talked of the horrors which particularly traumatized children, of hearing the noise of the bulldozers, the police and military vehicles; the loudspeakers shouting at the family to get out; and seeing the massive number of security forces (some said over 100, others said 100–250) – police officers, military personnel, patrols and demolition technicians and teams. Families shared their fears of “Jews with rifles and guns,” some in cars, some on horseback and others on foot, and of the masked members of the demolition team.

As Nada explained:

When I looked out the window, I saw a mass ... a scary scene, people wearing black, with masks on their faces, holding huge rifles, bigger than the ones they carry when I see them in the marketplace. They were over 300 police and military personnel, with two big bulldozers; they circled the entire area and prevented anyone from helping us. They trapped us with the children in our house and started walking toward our house with their big dogs ... A terrifying, terrifying situation.

Manar related:

As if their dogs, horses and 250 military personnel with their guns were not enough, they also placed security personnel on each and every house in the neighborhood ... They invaded our house with their big dogs ... it was a mess ... I was carrying my three children, all together in my two arms, running from one corner to the other, like a mad dog ... We were all holding each other and crying with such bitterness ... The floor was filled with glass and the kids were barefoot ... I was also barefoot, but walked on the glass without even feeling the pain ... I only realized it later ... I begged them to get the children's shoes, begged them, but they were busy demolishing the house ... They wanted us out of the house ... I keep hearing them screaming at me, “Get out! Get out!” in my dreams.

Ayman described how security forces would count down over the loudspeakers, emphasizing how time was running out:

The border police were screaming at us: “You have 15 minutes... You have five minutes... four minutes...” And we were running fast, pulling each other out, the kids, pushing my mother, sitting on her chair... “Three minutes,” and my wife was standing in the middle, frozen, totally frozen.

In Sana’s family, the team gave them 30 minutes to empty the house:

We were so confused – the noise, the soldiers around us, seeing the bulldozers... We didn’t know what to take out. I seated the children on the side... and went in, started removing the doors, the windows, the beds, looked for the birth certificates, our clothes... in 30 minutes... I went in the house maybe nine or ten times; each time I remembered something else... But they were breaking our walls, our bathroom. They threw the washing machine and broke it completely... They stepped on the sofas, broke the dining room table... They treated the furniture with such viciousness... Believe me, I felt sorry for the furniture... and for ourselves.

The voices shared here indicated that house demolitions have been a very powerful method for militarizing spaces and imposing spatial dominance. Simon articulates the physical and ideological power simultaneously enabling and being reinforced by the policy:

Few measures display governmental might as poignantly as blowing a person’s home into the sky. Every aspect of a demolition is played out in theatrical fashion. A large military unit enters the neighborhood, usually in the late hours of the night, and officers announce the demolition and instruct families to evacuate their homes immediately. The anxious families are kept at bay as the entire neighborhood awaits the explosion. Then, the thunderous bang, the cloud of smoke, the trembling earth: the spectacle is overwhelming. The government has demonstrated its might by destroying the most intimate of a family’s possessions... But the spectacle of power is not over. The remaining heap of gravel, now a piece of government property, is deliberately left in place as a monument to the Military Government’s dominance.

(Simon, 1994, p. 11)

The violence against the homespace, as seen in Sana’s story, was aimed at attacking the meaning of the home and of its belongings. There were attacks on objects and appliances, on food supplies, even on cars parked outside the house at the moment of demolition. Such attacks suggest an aim to deeply harm, I would even say injure, objects and spaces belonging to Palestinians, with the aim of hurting Palestinians and damaging

their inner strength. Respondents talked of how household objects were making noises while being violated, as if screaming for help: “I felt that my sewing machine was screaming at the soldiers,” Nawal said, “telling them to leave it alone . . . I looked at it, as if it was begging me to save it from their hands.”

The demolition went beyond affecting objects belonging to Palestinians to attacking and violating the bodily safety and physical and mental health of family members. The early morning attack created severe fear among children. Two women stated that their young daughters developed juvenile diabetes afterwards. Other interviewees told of heart problems and high blood pressure following upon the day of demolition, and one older man had a stroke. Ironically, the demolition team was accompanied by health professionals who came in ambulances to “treat” those who needed medical intervention and provide “aftercare” following the demolition.

For two of the family members interviewed, this was not the first demolition of their home and they did not want to witness it a second time. But the demolition team refused to allow them to leave the area, as Qays related:

I just wanted to save my family from having to watch the demolition again, but they refused to let us leave . . . They wanted us to experience the pain again . . . to sit there . . . doing nothing . . . and force us and the children to watch us destroyed, as the house was demolished . . . I was reading my children’s eyes telling me, do something, why can’t you do something . . . stop them . . . [crying].

What was apparent from the various interviews and discussions is that the only way for Palestinians to deal with violence against their homes is by living with the attack, by trying to find substitute homes or by using Israeli law – its court system, municipal regulations and the services of Israeli professionals, such as lawyers, engineers and bureaucrats – to challenge it. Family members revealed that when some members tried to prevent the demolition, the demolition team started beating them, dragging them on the floor, stepping on them in public, arresting them, or detaining them in police cars or away from other members of the family. They explained how the demolition team worked with a clear plan. They said the team knew when to invade the house, how many family members would be inside and planned in advance who would drag the family out, who would arrest whom and what to destroy

first in order to frighten the family. They were convinced that the demolition team had performed intelligence work and investigations in advance to determine which entrance to block, how many police and military vehicles were required, and what other houses should be raided to prevent them from rushing to support their neighbors and family.

The interviewees explained how the process revealed the true faces of the people who carried out the demolition and kicked the family out of their homespace. Respondents stated that members of the demolition team wanted to “eliminate us permanently,” “get rid of us,” “drive us out of Jerusalem.” They talked about how they wanted to, in Hoda’s words, “dismember the family, cutting the legs, then the hands, and bit by bit, killing us.” They described how these people used the act of demolition to humiliate and injure Palestinians, justifying their actions by aligning themselves with their duty to “protect” “their country.” The demolition thus has a twofold effect – on the one hand, it destroys the home, dehumanizing and objectifying the members of the family, while on the other hand, it allows those responsible for demolishing to align themselves with a patriotic, securitized, legal and moral duty.

The humiliation of the demolition aimed not only at repressing Palestinians, preventing them from offering social support to each other, but also at creating a new political order to serve the colonial political project. The repressive technologies embedded in the demolition process suggest that violence against the physicality of the homespace and the violent repression of the family members living in it become a site for the inscription of power and the political regime. As portrayed in the various narrations, the Palestinian home and the process of authorizing its continuity was transformed by the colonialists into a space that furthers the survival of the ideology of Judaizing and Israelizing Palestinian spaces. One of the modes used to Judaize and Israelize the home and the land of the Palestinians is by violently transforming the Palestinian space through land grabbing, housing demolitions, security reasoning, and zoning and planning policies. Changing the Palestinian space is conducted through “legalized” and “securitized” technologies that carefully impose intimate regulations enacted through surveillance technologies, including the process of soliciting permits – practices that require an in-depth measurement and calculation of the Palestinian homespace and homeland.

WOMEN AND THE ATTACK ON HOME

Being a female interviewer allowed me to join women victims of housing demolitions inside their private spaces and converse more openly about their own concerns, in kitchens, in bedrooms while changing baby's diapers or when helping their kids in homework. Women's openness allowed me to comprehend the effect of the housing demolition policy on their daily acts and lives, and opened up the space to grasp the effect of the attack on the home and its repercussions on women. Women were very vocal in defining Israel's threats to their homespaces and its securitized rationalization of demolishing homes to maintain Israel's "secure borders" as "the demolition before the demolition" (*il hadem qabl il hadem*). Women interviewed for this chapter and for additional research conducted previously (Shalhoub-Kevorkian, 2005, 2010b; Shalhoub-Kevorkian and Khsheiboun, 2009) explained how the everydayness of such threats and the constant uncertainty it created affected their choices concerning marriage, education, work, pregnancy, child rearing, schooling and the like. They pointed out that their fears of losing their homes and that the actual demolition of their homes resulted in severe restrictions on daily living, insidiously destroying their abilities to cope with their oppressive environment.

In particular, the attacks on the homespace have cut women off from their close communities and their support networks. The hardships suffered by their own families and neighboring families have weakened the social support system, resulting in feelings of suffocation and alienation. As Samar described it when talking about the fact that over seven houses around them are under the threat of being demolished, she said: "It is as if one has no place to breathe" (*ye-fadfed, ye-tnafas*). Salwa expressed a similar sentiment, stating: "I feel that the Israeli occupation follows us like our breath...and accompanies us like our breath." Salwa's and Samar's narratives insisted that the fear of losing one's home, and the constant worry of being displaced and losing the security of the homespace, the neighbors and the immediate family's support increased their anxieties, as reflected in their inability to even share their concerns with those surrounding them to the degree of not being able to breathe. Salwa revealed her worries about losing her home by stating that not only is there no place to breathe, but no place to even walk: "I keep on dreaming of losing my ability to walk and losing my power to breathe."

Women's expressions of the constant fear of the sudden invasions on their homes led them to keep their children in their beds at nights. Nawal told me that in the six months that preceded the demolition of her house, she slept with her three children aged three, six, and seven in one bed, with her husband. Almost half of the women interviewed stated that they sleep fully dressed out of fear of abuse or harassment if bulldozers arrive to demolish the house. Manar recounts:

For the past three years, after I wash up at night, I have gone to bed with all my clothes on . . . I fear to even wearing pajamas to sleep, because you never know what will happen; just ask what happened to Hoda when they demolished their house and you'll understand why we sleep with all our clothes on.

Hoda describes the demolition of her house:

When they demolished the house, I was still in my sweatpants. I only realized that when I saw the pictures in the newspaper. I was without my veil, and only in my sweats! I will never forgive them for violating my privacy and my right to safety in my own house. Because of that, even today, I refuse to take off my veil and my *dishdashah* [long dress] when I'm at home in my rental unit. Since the demolition last year, I don't know what sleeping means. I feel they even deprived me of the right to sleep and to sleep safely.

Nawal and Salma tell similar stories of loss and fear, but delved into explaining the humiliation they encounter in living their lives. As Salma stated: "filled with humiliation, stripped of any sense of safety or dignity, when one can't even go to the market without worrying that maybe when she is away, her house might be demolished. You know, women's houses are all they have, and to come one day and find that it is gone is a clear catastrophe." They talked about the homespaces that they organized, decorated, painted and preserved. They talked about the small homespaces they turned into enjoyable living spaces. They talked about their homes as part of and an extension of their bodies. The attack on their homespaces resulted in daily suffering. In Nawal's words:

We lost everything, every sense of safety. We can't get water without a struggle, we can't meet our parents without a struggle, we can't sleep, and we can't scream or cry out. And even if we do, no one listens. Even though both my husband and I are Jerusalemites, our children are not, and they do not have ID cards or numbers. They are all under constant

threat. We have lost all sense of safety and security. Sometimes I feel that being a dog or a cat is safer than being a Palestinian.

Nawal further explained:

Feeling helpless in your home, not being able to rest in your own bed, fearing that they will attack you, scare your children and demolish the house, created a sense of a continuous Nakba. As my grandfather used to say, they [the Zionists] will never rest until they take over all our homes, all of them. This is why I am always alert. I worry about everything; even when giving birth, I was worried I would return from the hospital to find out that I lost my house, to see a demolished house.

According to Salma:

Safety is our main problem. Our children are being harassed on their way to school each and every day, and we are facing abuses inside our own homes. Then they come and demolish our houses, as they did to our neighbors last month. Three months ago, someone tried to kidnap my six-year-old daughter, and I had no one to ask for help, fearing them stepping inside my house. They want us out of this area and want to take over our homes as they took the house and property of my grandparents in 1948.

Two weeks after interviewing Salma, her house was demolished, and I went back to support her and talk to her. She was living in a tent, in the rubble of the demolished house and wearing black as Palestinian women do following the death of a loved one. Salma repeatedly used the word “Nakabouna” – that is, “they brought a Nakba on us.” The story of the demolition of her house was accompanied by her description of her severe anxiety and distress, and her sense of worry about the future of her children and family.

The attack on the homeplace and space is an attack that took women back to the Nakba period, to the voices of loss of their families, during which time homes, family property and land was taken; the memory of loss, pain and suffering is vividly alive in present-day Jerusalem. The everydayness of injustice, of lack of safety, constant terror and sense of persecution left no space to recover from the Nakba and the memory of loss.

According to the Special Rapporteur on Violence against Women (VAW):

Women are particularly burdened in having to adjust to new conditions when their homes are destroyed. The Center on Housing Rights and

Evictions noted that: “Women suffer immensely from forced eviction. Domestic violence is higher in the precarious and often stressful situation of inadequate housing, especially before and during a forced eviction.” In addition to domestic violence, house demolitions compound women’s responsibilities as they must sustain life in the domestic sphere. Whether or not women work outside the house they devote a significant amount of their time and energy to work in the home. While men and children may spend more time outside the house, the home is the only refuge for Palestinian women. Once the home is destroyed, women are not only left without a place of belonging, they must often carry the burden of rebuilding the home and coping with the inconvenience of moving in with relatives.

(Ertürk, 2005, p. 10)

House demolitions also have long-term effects on women, such as limiting or eliminating their access to educational opportunities, social services, medical services, support systems and economic resources.

Women’s gender roles have been tremendously transformed by the loss of home, the new responsibilities following the demolitions, the loss of economic means, the loss of shelter, the restrictions on movement, the constant humiliation and the increasing use of both secretive and public military measures to threaten and even capture those whose houses are at risk of being demolished. In addition, the policy of house demolitions provides a site where oppressive gender norms of femininity and masculinity can be further inscribed and the socioeconomic gap between men’s and women’s social status can be more firmly entrenched; as Hoda explained, women end up sitting and weeping on the rubble of their homes and looking after their traumatized family members, while the men can go out, talk, share or even run away from the scene.

Many women tried to explain the ways in which the destruction of the physical house also destroyed the emotional and metaphoric sense of “home.” As Maha succinctly stated: “Since they demolished the house, I stopped knowing who I am and what I should do... I feel *m’shatateh* [displaced]... I feel like a refugee in this world... I feel naked... They wiped out all my power.” Similarly, Ina’am said: “Not only was the house lost, but the entire home was lost; the curtains I embroidered, the bed covers I had, my own clothing, my personal things, the kids toys, dolls and books – nothing was left for us, and we ended up displaced and exiled.”

Following the loss of their houses and homes, women were left with unique burdens to support, care for and look after everyone, at a time when they had no power, as Hoda said, to move away from the rubble of the demolished home. Women repeatedly tried to explain to me the myriad problems they faced in creating yet another space for their families and themselves, a space which they knew was not necessarily secure from another arbitrary act of destruction. Samar, whose house was demolished, explained:

I am really lost. I do not know what I should do with the family, the children who are not going to school now, for I can't shower them, can't cook for them, can't even find their books. I myself am lost, have my period and can't find a place to shower. We lost everything.

Women were also impacted emotionally and psychologically by demolitions of the homespace. Despite strong feelings of despair, they needed to remain strong and calm for their children. Their experiences were simultaneously those of victim, survivor and agent. They expressed frustration and deep humiliation for having to go to their workplace, the market or school upset, desperate, hungry and at times without having been able to wash up or change clothes. Women pointed out how it was easier for their sons or brothers, who could at least sleep at the homes of family or friends; however, for them and their daughters, who were more vulnerable due to social restrictions placed on females, it was always much harder to survive these violent dislocations. Women spoke of incidents in which some of their daughters started menstruating at a premenstrual age after the trauma of losing their house. Some women stated that because girls are expected to react to the demolition of the house in a feminine manner, they were not able to give free rein to their emotions like their brothers, which affected their state of mind.

Palestinian women's experiences show us that, in addition to rendering inhabitants physically homeless, the loss of one's home causes severe mental anguish because of the home's intimate connection with a person's identity. Because the home exists within the realm of the private and of the intimate, the home is crucial to the full development of the person, particularly for women, within a society.

In her essay "Homeplace: A Site of Resistance," bell hooks (1990) traces the importance of the home as a site of resistance for African Americans throughout a long history of oppression in a white society. She observes:

Throughout our history, African-Americans have recognized the subversive value of homeplace, of having access to private space where we do not directly encounter white racist aggression. Whatever the shape and direction of black liberation struggle . . . domestic space has been a crucial site for organizing, for forming political solidarity. Homeplace has been a site of resistance. Its structure was defined less by whether or not black women and men were conforming to sexist behavior norms and more by our struggle to uplift ourselves as a people, our struggle to resist racist domination and oppression.

(hooks, 1990, p. 47)

According to hooks, the homeplace was about creating a safe space where black women could affirm and nurture one another as they grew and developed within the home as a “community of resistance” (1990, p. 42). As the only place of refuge, the home becomes a place for identity formation and community building. It is within this context that the home becomes a space of political resistance (Nash, 2005, pp. 326–328).

In particular, hooks notes the importance of the home as a source of empowerment to black women. She notes that the women have turned the domestic sphere, delegated to them by sexism, into a space of caring and nurturance for themselves, their menfolk and their children for confronting the dehumanizing forces of racist and sexist oppression:

Black women resisted by making homes where all black people could strive to be subjects, not objects, where we could be affirmed in our minds and hearts despite poverty, hardship, and deprivation, where we could restore to ourselves the dignity denied us on the outside in the public world.

(hooks, 1990, p. 42)

This conception of the home is to be distinguished from conventional feminist theories of the home, which have traditionally conceived of the homeplace as a site of oppression, subordination and abuse of women (MacKinnon, 1991, 2000; Schneider, 2002). hooks conceives of the homeplace as a site for the cultivation of personhood in a culture that is otherwise hostile to the affirmation of selfhood.

hooks’ observations on the significance of the home for black women residing in an oppressive, racially stratified society are applicable to the situation of Palestinian women in the OPT, primarily in the sense that the Palestinians live in a settler colonial context in which Palestinian women are oppressed in their homeland. Thus, the home is significant

in that it is a site for political resistance insofar as it pertains to community building and self-affirmation within an oppressive environment of occupation. As the site for “political resistance,” the private space of the home gains increasing importance to the individual.

For Palestinian women living in OEJ, the home takes on even greater importance as the epicenter for the cultivation of a person’s identity and well-being. As hooks argued, within an oppressive society, the home becomes one of the only places for the affirmation of self and for community building. Within this context, the home becomes more than just a private sphere; it becomes a space of resistance.

THE MEANING OF HOME AND FEAR OF HOMELESSNESS

My home was the family home; it was the place that we gathered the entire family member on Fridays, the place that most of our relatives came to ask for help when they were in trouble . . . It was a place in which we gathered on happy and sad occasions, during weddings, during births, when we lost someone, when someone was released from prison . . . It was the place I felt happy, in control, loved, appreciated, respected. A place to talk, cry, share, meet, relax, fight. I was so proud of my home, so strong and energetic . . . Now, it looks like a burial ground, now we are divided and very lost. Yet, when we remember it, when we share our past experiences of our lost home, we feel empowered, we feel our togetherness, and we start planning for future gatherings, future acts and plans against their [the Israelis’] uprooting.

(Samar, talking to the author after the demolition of her home)

Within the highly oppressive militaristic regime of Israel, the home is one of the few places where Palestinians have been able to find solace from the exigencies of a domineering government. As the only place of refuge, the home is an arena of personal growth and community building. As such, the home is an oppositional site within a military-state patriarchy and is a place where Palestinians can be safe from colonialism.

In connecting the homespace with the home lost during the Nakba period, Salim commented:

The entire family felt so desperate, so humiliated upon learning that our house was demolished. My two sisters were in a state of shock when one of them said: “You know, brother, this is what they did to us in 1948. They took our homes. And now they did it to you again. But we are still

together, we are still supporting and loving each other; and we are all in Jerusalem and will stay in Jerusalem, in tents, in the streets, with each other, in one room, as we are today. But, we are together. Your uncle opened his house for you, and we will all help you build it [i.e., a new one]. I will give you furniture, and help your kids in school. What is home? We are the home, we are.”

Palestinians who were interviewed discussed the psychological meaning of the spatial and non-spatial place of home. They discussed the symbolic meaning it carries, as a shelter, as a space for protected intimacy and as a source of courage, love and continuity.

In his book *The Poetics of Space*, Gaston Bachelard (1969) explores the psychology of the house from a phenomenological perspective. Bachelard argues that the “house is one of the greatest powers of integration for the thoughts, memories and dreams of mankind” and that “the binding principle in this integration is the daydream” (1969, p. 6). The house represents humanity at its deepest core. Bachelard argues that because the house serves as a conduit for memory and daydreaming, it creates a continuum of intimate space which, because it is so deeply rooted in our subconscious, marks the very essence of our being. Thus, he argues: “The house . . . is a ‘psychic state,’ and even when reproduced as it appears from the outside, it bespeaks intimacy” (1969, p. 72). As revealed through the process of daydreams, the house is, in essence, the embodiment of the human soul. It is deeply nested within the recesses of our psyche as memory and hope.

Through my analyses of the shared narratives, Palestinians reveal the importance of the “home” and the memory of it, a memory of resistance, power and survival that is so bound up with the individuals and communities. The destruction of the home is traumatic, for it amounts to destruction of the person. It is within this understanding of the home that the deprivation of the home gains more meaning, as revealed in the statements of Salim, Samar and other Palestinians concerning their ordeals when living with the danger of losing their homes or when surviving the loss of their homes. It is no accident that the meaning of the lost home during the Nakba and the loss of the home due to its destruction or the threat of its destruction reveal both the power of the resisters and survivors, and also the fragility of its inhabitants while living under systematic attacks and destructions.

The ideology of disrupting and subverting the existing logic, culture and familial power of the homespace creates a nihilist condition.

Such nihilism generates a new doctrine of fear and skepticism among Palestinians, from questioning parental ability to protect their own children when in their homespaces to questioning anyone's ability to challenge atrocities and protect or safeguard Palestinians, even when in the home. Living under the constant fear of being attacked and the constant uncertainty of what might happen tomorrow "unhomes" the homespace, damaging perceptions of privacy and security within the domestic space to such a degree that Norma states: "Even here, in the rental unit, and after losing my home, I feel that the walls are transparent and they can see us, reach us, track us."

THE ATTACK ON THE HOME: FROM TOPOGRAPHY TO TOPOLOGY

This chapter has shown that violence against and surveillance over the homespace, unhomed and further uprooted and dispossessed Palestinians, with the aim of eliminating not only the right to a home, but also the very memory of the Nakba (through the enactment of the Nakba law). The demolition of the homespace places Palestinians and their homes under constant attack and surveillance. It created fear of the loss of home everywhere in the home-land; even within the walls of the home, and against the meanings the homeplace carries, its power to shelter, and its memories. Invisible to the colonizers and located in a nihilist context, the Palestinian home and the memory of its loss can be eliminated whenever the Israeli regime deems it necessary, whether justified by security theologies or "sacred" Zionist/Biblical ones. The homespace, the meanings it carries and the home context in occupied Jerusalem provide a site revealing the policies that bring about destruction of the home and its space in multiple ways (social, economic and political) while the Israeli regimes fights a psychological war in order to repress the mere memory of the Nakba.

I argue that the actions of the Israeli regime through housing demolitions, as the case study of occupied Jerusalem has demonstrated, aims at intimidating and keeping Palestinians in a state of constant uncertainty and fear and under constant surveillance. The restrictions on memorializing the lost home through the Nakba Law, and the traumas attached to the demolition of the homes and the meanings this carries are all expressions of colonial power inscribed over the homespace. The inscriptions of colonial power over the colonized space rearrange the natives' spatiality, reorder spatial details, and confuse and create

chaos in the natives' topography. The construction of a fluid and uncertain topography reorganizes the representation of Palestinians on the map and situates them in zones of demolitions, zones of destructions and unpredictability. Directed by the settler colonial logic of elimination, colonizers impose constantly changing regulations and rules, and invoke innovative colonial bureaucracies of control. The unknown destiny of the home and its inhabitants, the changeability of life and the constant uncertainty of living under the threat of demolition, the severe suffering before, during and after the demolition – all these aim at preventing Palestinians from possibly confronting such violence.

The voices shared pointed out that colonial violence reordered their neighborhoods, demolishing homes of family members, uprooting some and leaving others in a state of tentativeness – a state that resulted in feelings of great apprehension toward the future. The attacks against the homespace created a sense of estrangement in their own homespaces, primarily during times when people were worried about the presence of surveillance devices inside their homespaces. Such estrangement was also apparent in the way in which the changing topography affects their life decisions, to the degree that it paralyzes their survival strategies. The attack against the homespace, first experienced as the inability to predict how, when and why the colonizer would attack and in what manner, can be understood through what Weizman calls a swarming strategy, quoting the explanation of Israeli military personnel:

A state military whose enemy is scattered as a network of sporadic gangs . . . must liberate itself from the old concept of straight lines, linear formations of units, regiments and battalions . . . and become much more diffused and scattered, flexible and swarm-like . . . In fact, it must adjust itself to the stealthy capability of the enemy . . . Swarming to my understanding is simultaneous arrival at a target from a large number of nodes – if possible, from 360 degrees.

(2006, p. 12)

In this chapter, Palestinians have related how their homespaces and memories of home are attacked from various angles – the political, the spatial and the social. They revealed how their space and time while at home, their bodily safety when in their bedrooms and while in bed, their children's safety when inside their rooms and their family spaces in general are all at the mercy of the "swarming" strategies of the colonizers. Such swarming attacks are strategies that turned homespaces and the stability and sheltering power of the home into fluid, unclear

and uncertain spaces. The changes to Palestinian topography combined with the swarming attacks against the Palestinian home and the memory of this topography should be understood through its power to invade Palestinians' very intimate spaces, and through its velocity, density and power to surprise, frighten and terrorize. Threatening to demolish a one-room home, or the actual demolition of that room, should be examined according to its power to disrupt family lives. The attack on the homespace has been shown here as a disruption of people's sense of safety in their homespace, one that affects their social relations, their children and all of the inhabitants' health and mental health. The brutality of the swarming attacks was also found to violate the sheltering effect of the home, the parental capacity to protect young children, and the family's ability to survive or plan its future. Reordering Palestinian topographies and the attack on the home when and while dealing with the swarming attacks against their spaces further disturbed the interactions and communications of the family. The voices shared in this chapter disclosed how what we are now calling the swarming strategies functioned in a non-linear manner. The application of the strategy attacked the physical structure of the home from all directions simultaneously. In psychosocial terms, such strategies produced familial strains, for these attacks do not differentiate between the young or old, women or men. The interviewees showed that they tried to use all paths available to them to challenge the possibility of an attack through applying for permits, requesting the help of lawyers who could communicate with the system and speak the colonizer's language, going to court, getting the approval of one official after another and so on; yet, and after years of spending money and trying to prevent the violence, their homes were demolished. The success of the swarming policy was achieved because colonialists control regulations as much as they control the roads, the spaces and, of course, control the manner in which the army, the police and the bureaucrats function. The lines of attacks and the attacker's movements are not straight, but instead progress in an uncertain, illogical, zigzag manner in order to disorient the colonized. In addition, the colonizer's micropolitics, its micromanagement of time and space, attempts to constitute a mental and affective state of mind that connects the homeplace intimately to the biological, psychological and social body of the Palestinian, the family and the community.

The historical and current attack on the homespace has broken the topographical characteristics of the Palestinian home and homeland, replacing it with a new topology that in time and with planning

will construct a new Judaized topography. The attack on the home-space is indicative of the dynamic nature of the struggle against the native's homeland, which works on various levels with overlapping spatialities – the Israeli-imagined geographies and planned spaces and the lived Palestinian spaces.

As is clear from the multitude of shared Palestinian voices facing attacks against home in occupied Jerusalem, the Palestinian home and its inhabitants lost their ability to define their zones of living. The homespace was transformed into a transparent space, one without walls in spite of their physical existence and having little power to provide shelter. The calculated, well-orchestrated force used against the homespace and the history of trauma and suffering, from the Nakba period to today's housing demolitions in Jerusalem, is manifested in the regime of power that inflicts spatial and geographic changes aimed at reordering geography and topography in order to delete history (as with the Nakba law), destroying present Palestinian homes while building new homespaces for Jewish settlers.

Furthermore, the voices shared in this chapter have revealed how the colonial politics of housing demolition are deeply concerned with intimate, minute calculations of the physical and social spaces of Palestinians. The aim of the swarming attacks against the Palestinian home and its memory, as I see it, is not to kill, but to build up fear and to construct hunting zones wherein death – the death and elimination of an historical and ongoing territorial dispossession – is slow. The slow deaths occurring in the hunting zones are inscriptions of power on geographic spaces, on social ordering and on bodies. The creation of hunting zones inscribes surveillance over the biological, social and physical home, and the body and mind of the colonized. The carving of power through the reordering of spaces and social relations is not always about complete physical elimination; it is primarily about the preservation of trapped spaces, trapped bodies and trapped lives, entrapments that remind the colonized of their powerlessness and keeps the colonizer's power as visible as possible (Shalhoub-Kevorkian, 2010c). The aim is to keep producing fear, to further the power of security's theology and create new hunting and hunted spaces that further reproduce fear among the Palestinians and the Palestinians as feared Others. Housing demolitions transmit “layered meanings,” for they trace the complexity of the colonial relations and colonial powers. Colonial atrocities reflected in the attacks on the Palestinian home go back to the settler colonial ideology of elimination, with its orchestrated attacks during the 1948

Nakba period, and move on to today's ongoing Nakba. Housing demolitions reveal how the changing of Palestine's geography and topography, the deletion of Palestinian homes from the maps, aims at eliminating the history and presence of Palestinians in their homeland. House demolitions are thus an intrinsic part of the settler colonial project, a project that marks new boundaries in order to delete old ones while physically and forcefully declaring the power of the state.

Technologies of demolition grant the colonial state the capacity to displace and dispossess families and demand submission. They allow the demolishers to take part in the spatial-Judaizing project that rationalizes their acts in legal and politico-religious discourses. In OEJ, housing demolitions become a technique of social engineering to Judaize Jerusalem both geographically and demographically. This is part of the social engineering that began in Palestine with the Zionist movement and continued through the attack on the Palestinian homeland during the Nakba. Violence against the Palestinian home, as in the Nakba Law and as demonstrated by the voices shared here, has changed Jerusalem's (and historic Palestine's) panoramic spatial and socio-demographic view so as to sustain the political ideology underlying such crimes.

Yet, in many cases, the Palestinians, with their homespaces and the layered meanings that these transmit – even when this homespace is made absent through demolition but remains alive in memories, family histories and pictures – were able to create, keep together and produce individual and family power to rebuild, fight back and resist such injustice. It is through enlivening the death of the homespace and through the challenging of the technologies of hunting that I theorize surveillance. It is through the denial of Palestinian history, through the refusal to acknowledge the Nakba Day as a commemoration of the trauma of the loss of the homeland, that I conceptualize surveillance over the Palestinian home. The conceptualization of the history and present status of the Palestinian homespace as “enemy territory” places the home outside the “democratic” regime and beyond the “rights” discourse. The attack on the homespace and the layered meanings it transmits allows the extension of power into intimate family places and destabilizes the social, political and legal order in the Palestinian homeland. With the home no longer physically, socially and psychologically solid, its function and power collapses or is at least deeply weakened. It is no longer stable, clear, solid or sheltered from uncertainty. Unhoming the home becomes a form of destroying, reorganizing, remapping and reinterpreting it.

It is through this history, the current condition of injustice and the reality of uprooting and trapping that family members enact their power of survival and resistance when dealing with the swarming attacks against their homes. Simultaneously, this same violence against the Palestinian home, and the resistance to it, informs Israel and its supporters in the production of hegemonic order and in constructing its sacred theology and supremacy. It is through the preservation of such theologies that systematic practices of coordination between colonial and neo-imperial bureaucracies, politically motivated security rationalizations, political-economic hegemonies and organized industrial military machinery that the attack on the Palestinian home is practiced. I therefore wish to argue that the attack on the Palestinian home and land can neither be understood nor stopped unless it is located in the global politics of negligence and racialization, a politics that includes the Western world's denial of Palestinians' suffering and its refusal to acknowledge the injustices and injuries caused by the violent crimes and continuous swarming attacks on the Palestinian home and collective psyche. The mode, structure and epistemic power of the security theology will remain indistinct and hidden if the laws, systems of oppressions and dispossessions, and other related rationalizations of the colonial state continue to delegitimize the importance of protecting individual safety (Mbembe, 2003) and instead support the use of violence in the name of "homeland security," "security necessity" and the "security needs" of the powerful. The future questions that all the above leaves us with concern whether unhomeing the homespace constitutes a form of murder. If so, is there a way to criminalize such murder and enact globally approved protections against anti-Nakba laws?

CHAPTER FIVE

DEATH AND COLONIALISM: THE SACRED AND THE PROFANE

In the context of exercising control over death and dying, this chapter considers the following question: How is power manifested and deployed over the dead body? Based on Mbembe's theorization of necropolitics, of how sovereignty resides in the power to dictate who may live and who must die (2003), I examine here the domain of death over which power has taken control, in an attempt to understand the manner in which death is allowed (if at all) and to expose death after death, as well as death before death.

My understanding of securitization and sovereignty, as expressed predominantly in the right to kill, even after death, is rooted in Mbembe's analysis of necropolitics and his reading of Foucault's notion of biopower:

I relate Foucault's notion of biopower to two other concepts: the state of exception and the state of siege. I examine those trajectories by which the state of exception and the relation of enmity have become the normative basis of the right to kill. In such instances, power (and not necessarily state power) continuously refers and appeals to exception, emergency and a fictionalized notion of the enemy. It also labors to produce that same exception, emergency and fictionalized enemy. In other words, the question is: What is the relationship between politics and death in those systems that can function only in a state of emergency?

(Mbembe, 2003, p. 16)

Biopower, as Foucault (2007) explains, divides people into those who must live and those who must die. Such a division, as I wish to argue,

presupposes the distribution of people into groups not only when living, but also when dead. Operating on the basis of such a split during death inscribes power over the dead body and establishes the difference of the otherized. The experience of otherness in death is linked to the politics of race and racism. The politics of race and racism is, in Foucault's terms, a technology that permits the exercise of biopower, which in turn decides who must live and who must die. Control over the dead body, the economy of life and death, and of life in death, and the racism embedded in the division that separates the Other regulate the ability to "put to death" and the ability to die in dignity. Exercising rights to control death suggests that the Other's death is perceived as a danger whose management, control and elimination strengthens the potential and life of the sovereign. For the colonizer, life passes not only through the capacity to kill the Other in order to live, but also through the capacity to control the death of the Other, even after they are dead.

Death and dying in Palestine offers an opportunity to explore the relationship between colonialism and the dead bodies of the colonized. Rather than examining who has the right to kill and allow others to live, I focus on who has the right to die and in what manner. Under what practical conditions is the death of the Palestinian managed? And what does the implementation of the right to die, the right to be buried and the right to dignity during and after death tell us about life? Death is present in life and thus can tell us about life and its limits. It is my claim that death does not annihilate the meanings of life, but rather reveals the power and meaning of life during and after death. Understanding the politics of death and dying in the context of Israel/Palestine, when linked to violence and the experience of loss, requires comprehension of the boundaries of the colonized body beyond its physical apparatus and of the loss of boundaries in the colony.

Moreover, the politics of death and dying can be further understood by invoking Jacques Derrida's (1993) theorization in "Awaiting (at) the Arrival." Derrida's theorization articulates what he calls a "topolology of mourning" and argues that "no politics without an organization of the time and place of mourning, without a topolology of the sepulchre, without an anamnestic and thematic relation to the spirit as ghost, without an open hospitality to the guest as ghost, whom one holds, just as he holds us, hostage" (1993, p. 62). Derrida's analyses marks the manner in which colonial politics is founded on controlling the space/topos of burial; yet, simultaneously, colonial surveillance cannot completely control the spectres, ghosts of the colonized dead, who, in effect,

continue to hold “hostage” and interrogate the very legitimacy of the colonizer.

Death and dying will thus be used as a site for understanding the politics of and relationship between colonized and colonizer, and the modes of managing, controlling and maneuvering the already-dead Palestinian. The aim is to examine the workings of the colonizer’s fear when inscribed over the colonized’s dead body and show how fear can be theologized to justify and further control the colonized.

ENLIVENING THE DEAD AND KILLING THE LIVING

The security theology and the political economy of fear from and through death can be seen through the eyes of Nuhad and her husband Ismael, a Palestinian political prisoner. Nuhad explains:

My husband was in prison, and he suffered a lot and was hoping to be released earlier. In his last days before he died, he was very sick, and he wanted to be with us before it was too late, but Simon, the prison guard, told him that he would leave prison only in a black bag – as a dead body. The nurse in the hospital told my husband that he could file a complaint against the prison guard, and he did, but he died four days later . . . When they sent us his body, I wanted it free . . . out of the black bag . . . the one that they use to wrap dead prisoners. I knew what he wanted us to do . . . I knew he wanted to see me and tell me he is free now. When he was in prison, he was worried that when he would be released, he wouldn’t be able to handle the heat in our house, so I told him that we managed to buy a small air conditioner, and he will be released and enjoy that room very much. So, when he died, we washed him, and wrapped him in a white shroud. I saw his face, he was happy that it is not that black bag. I told them all that he wanted to be in the air-conditioned room, and we brought him and let him enjoy the room . . . We all stayed with him there . . . and enjoyed him, and he was happy . . . he even squeezed my hand to express his contentment. The entire society, everybody, came to see him in that nice room . . . as if he was really alive and free.

Nuhad’s voice demonstrates the marking of power and surveillance over her husband’s about-to-die body and the securitized mode of treating the ghostly power of his dead body. Her voice reveals the way in which the power of the dead body was furthered by the family’s and the community’s practices of giving his body and their society life and agency in the face of death. The making of new meaning of such loss, the positive outlook, the building of hope and the spirituality it carries can be seen

as an expression of the community's ability to speak back to colonial power.

The death of Ismael and the acts of Nuhad and the community, contrasted with the violent interaction and rhetoric of the prison guard, reveals how one party wants to enliven the dead (Daher-Nashif, 2011), through the use of the dead body and its burial as a political act of resistance, while the other party wants to kill the living, by imprisoning it in an eternally trapped, closed, dark, black bag. Even though Ismael was deprived of the ability to bear witness to his own freedom from incarceration, even though society failed to celebrate his life, the meaning his released dead body carried when the black bag was exchanged for white shrouds, and the temporal stability and sense of connectedness it brought to the family, if only for a while, enlivened his dead body and the community. As Nuhad related:

When we managed to get him home, all the people came... political leaders, Abu Mazen's [Mahmoud Abbas, the head of the Palestinian authority] assistants, representatives of political parties and many people I had never met. The community cooked and fed all the mourners... I felt that some people were jealous he got so much attention and was so loved and respected. His death and his loss made them all want to continue his struggle, his cause, his aim... They all promised that his death would push all Palestinians to never surrender... This is exactly what he wanted... what he told us. His death was filled with hope and power... You could feel it in the air, in the number of participants, in the house... Even when the military told us that we should bury him at night... They made my son sign a paper committing us to bury him at night... Even then, I heard him... Yes I heard him asking me not to allow them to do so... He wanted to be buried in the sun, in the daylight... I told my son, and he asked the politicians to respect his father's wishes to be buried in daylight. The whole community walked with us... his funeral was like a wedding, very big, very respectful.

Ismael spoke not only by proxy. The dialogue between Nuhad and her husband, and her husband and his community created a new transversal space for the community from endings in death to the future in life. The fact that Nuhad and her community lack a secure speaking position turned death into a means to claim a new space in life. The impossibility of speaking was turned into a space for the community to talk back and speak truth to power. As Daher-Nashif suggests:

[S]ocial-political processes enliven the bodies of the dead at the same time as the body of the dead enlivens and constructs these processes. The bodies of the dead are thus understood as socially active “actors” ... [that become] a medium for the maintenance and continuation of various social, religious, institutional and political structures and systems.
(2011, p. 275)

The dead body is thus an active social agent and, as such, it comes back to life.

This chapter depends on Derrida’s (1993) theorization and argues that the dead body is not a lost body, but rather a site that holds great significance and meaning, revealing the relationship between death, sovereignty and securitization. Although death interrupts the production of meanings by the dead, for it curtails our dialogue with them and prevents them from speaking to us, death does not suspend the meanings themselves, nor does it remove our expectations and hopes that those who are gone may still speak to us. In his examination of ways to mediate with the dead, while speaking in their place, Colin Davis (2004) indicates that listening to what has been left unsaid by the dead gives them a voice and maintains the hope that they can speak to us from beyond the grave, providing us with new meanings:

Listening to the dead in the sense suggested by de Man, Levinas and Agamben entails attending to signs which irrupt as a surprise, and which signify without any ascertainable signifying intention. They cannot be determined in advance or attributed to a conscious subject. They may be anywhere that we don’t expect them. Perhaps they are all around us.
(Davis, 2004, p. 89)

By bringing the voices and ordeals of those who enliven the dead, and who the dead enliven to center stage, this chapter examines the system that violates both the living and the dead. Thus, fear is examined through the inscription of power over the dead Palestinian body.

The sacred and the profane

The multiple modalities of violence in a colonial world are divided into compartments. Such divisions track and trace the lines and contours of force and violence, reminding us of the existence of the poor and rich, the equal and unequal, the controlled and the controller and, in our Palestinian case study, the “chosen” sacred people and the profane unpeople. As Fanon (1963) argues in *The Wretched of the Earth*, the worlds of the colonized and of the colonizer contain different species:

The originality of the colonial context is that economic reality, inequality and the immense difference of the ways of life never come to mask the human realities. When you examine at close quarters the colonial context, it is evident that what parcels out the world is to begin with the fact of belonging to or not belonging to a given race, a given species. In the colonies the economic substructure is also a super-structure. The cause is the consequence; you are rich because you are white, you are white because you are rich.

(1960, p. 40)

As Fanon indicates, policing the boundaries between the native and the settler requires that the colonizer maintain the power to dominate in the mundane treatment of the colonized. I argue that policing death and dying is a technology that dispossesses the native bereaved of the ability to mourn the dead. The violence of such dispossession deprives people of their ritual, culture and language, and reveals the inscription of power in the present colonial order, when the land (as seen in the treatment of graveyards as a space of the homeless) and the human body, dead or alive, are marked as different, as lower in their humanity, as open to violation and damage. It further suggests that the only way in which such bodies can be managed is through a force invoked in an everyday manner. The policing and management of the body is embedded in everyday routines and is worn on the living and dead body of the colonized. As Razack explains: “The colonial project is secured through the ongoing eviction of aboriginal peoples from the colonial city ... [A]boriginal bodies do not belong in public space” (2011b, p. 93).

Legalized spaces of difference: Court decisions on cemetery desecrations

The cemetery, its space as the last territory of the Palestinian body, offers an additional opportunity to explore surveillance and fear in the context of death, and marks the manner in which colonial control is founded on control of the Palestinian space/topos of burial.

It provides new insights into tracing the depth of the inscription of power over the Palestinian dead body. It is a site that allows us to comprehend the way in which law operates and the way in which legal and political systems manage the relationship between colonizer and colonized.

Looking at how Israeli law operates with respect to Palestinian cemeteries can contribute to an understanding of the intimate and

regular violent contact between the sacred and the profane, showing how graveyards are turned into additional spaces under scrutiny and subject to dispossession. The following looks at court decisions regarding violation of the rights of the dead and the desecration of three cemeteries – the Muslim cemetery at Tel Aviv University, the Mamilla Muslim cemetery in Jerusalem and the Muslim cemetery of Bab Al-sbat in Jerusalem. The first two cases refer to the eviction of Palestinians from old cemeteries, while the last refers to graveyards that are in active use. As the decisions will show, a dead Palestinian body is not a dead Jewish body. Discussion of these cases aims to show how desecration of the colonized's dead is embedded in the structural and well-orchestrated violence of the colonial system. The analyses of the state's violence point to the way in which the colonizer is haunted and held hostage by the living power of the already-dead body.

The court case regarding the Muslim cemetery at Tel Aviv University was in response to a petitioner who opposed construction on the site of the cemetery and the removal of the remains of a loved one to a different location. The court decision in this appeal stated:

The claim common to all the respondents is that the handling of the remains of bones and graves located in the original area was done carefully and with the sensitivity required under the circumstances, in coordination with a representative of the Ministry of Religious Services, and in accordance with the directives issued by the Attorney General in 1994 on the handling of human bones.¹

Such language suggests that what matters is that handling of the remains was carried out in coordination with the Israeli Ministry of Religious Services. The court does not recognize any violation of the public interest to preserve the memory of the dead, any affront to the dignity of the community to which the deceased belong or even the need to protect the Muslim community's right of property. Indeed, the decision explicitly concludes that “denial of the application and continuation of the construction work do not significantly harm the dignity of the dead.”² Clearly, the court does not question the authority of Israeli official bodies to “coordinate” the eviction of the Palestinian dead from the land and memory of their people.

To support the legality of the continued construction on the land, the court went so far as to suggest that “it is doubtful that development of

¹ Point 13 from H.C.J. 5703/12A *Muassasat Al-Aqsa Company v. Tel Aviv University* (2012).

² *Ibid.*, Point 14.

the original land is prohibited under Shari'a law." This dabbling in religious discourse, over the question of whether the Islamic religion allows construction and development of land that holds graves, is proffered as a justification for construction over a Muslim graveyard. Raising this argument is intended to further silence and diminish the applicant's petition, thereby denying a voice to preservation of his right to dignity when alive and the right for respect of those passing after death, as well as ignoring the responsibility of the society to respect its members who have passed away. The use of the Shari'a law as a justification to control the Palestinian topos of burial requires, as Derrida explained, unpacking the manner in which the organization of time/space is conducted.

A similar case involves the construction of a Museum of "Tolerance and Human Dignity" on top of Muslim graves in the Mamilla neighborhood in Jerusalem. The court had to decide whether construction could be continued in light of a stop work order. The proposal was to remove the remains in what the court defined as "a professional, respectful, and proper manner, in accordance with Muslim law, and under the supervision of Muslim religious officials." Claims that the procedures of recording were illegal were turned down, despite expert opinions that supported such illegality. The claim that the land was classified as waqf land, which prevents the legal registration of the land in another name, was also rejected.

The irony of desecrating this cemetery to build a museum for human dignity seems to be lost on the court:

Under the Town Planning Scheme, which was given final validity, a structure intended to be a museum of tolerance is about to be erected in the center of Jerusalem. The main content of the museum revolves around tolerance between peoples and between one person and another, and its objective is to instill in the public the idea of human dignity, to safeguard values of mutual trust and brotherhood in society, to promote education to respect the fundamental values of democracy, to mediate conflicts between people and segments of the population, and to continue to create deeper consciousness of the value of peace and love in people's lives.

The idea to build a center of tolerance was that of the late Simon Wiesenthal, who experienced the destruction of European Jewry. He acted in his special, individualistic way, in learning the lessons of the Holocaust, by locating Nazi criminals around the world and bringing them to justice. In the context of this commitment, Simon Wiesenthal

sought to establish a spiritual center whose contents and activity would focus on transmitting the message of tolerance to the entire world. It is no surprise that he chose to realize the idea in Jerusalem, as the capital of Israel and of the Jewish people, and as the world center for three of humanity's large religions.

The Museum of Tolerance is intended to reflect the lessons of the past, and to instill these lessons in values of tolerance and brotherhood for the future. It is intended to link the past, present and future, with fundamental rights of the individual being viewed as a supreme value in human life and in the regimen of peoples and states.

According to the court, the museum builders cannot forgo the execution of their original plans, as they have already invested considerable money on it and any change might ruin the artistic plan. The need to preserve an integrated plan was supported by "humanizing" the physical space, suggesting that its "heart" lies in the area of the Muslim cemetery:

Removal of one component of the plan, which relates to construction in the "purple area" [where the cemetery is located], is liable to cause real harm to the overall planning and violate its purpose. Also, the component is the very heart of the entire structure... Moving the said structure to a place outside the city center will not enable retention of the museum planning as it is, since the planning is attached to and integrated in the special landscape and formative characteristics of the city center and cannot be integrated, from an architectural and artistic perspective, anywhere else.

This was supported by expert testimony that further "humanized" the construction, instilling in it the ability to breathe:

This professional opinion on the planning of the museum as one artistic whole, which cannot be changed and divided by removing "the purple area" of the plan's site, is supported also by the opinion of 29 January 2007 of the architect Ada Carmi, in which she discusses the potential effects of prohibiting building the museum in this area. She states that, in light of the work method of architect Gehry, which is built on the conception of integration of architecture and sculpture, and on the close connection between all the project's components, removal of one central component from the overall planning by prohibiting construction in "the purple area" is liable to destroy the entire project and require re-planning of the whole museum structure from the beginning.

Architect Carmi is of the opinion that this position is strengthened by the planning intended for “the purple area,” which constitutes a unique characteristic of the structure, and which she calls “the lung of the project.”

The wording of the court and the experts, which enliven the unfinished physical building of the museum, giving it a heart and lungs, is brought into sharp contrast with the neglect of the dead Muslim bodies and their memories in the hearts and minds of their relatives. The court response sheds light on how, through the idea of difference and through “humanizing” a physical space, law conceals violence and turns Palestinian dead bodies and spaces into sites that can be dehumanized and made insignificant.

The last case relates to the Muslim Cemetery in Bab Alsbat (or Bab al Rahmeh as some Palestinians call it), where a petition was brought by Jews against the Jerusalem municipality to halt construction and burials in the Muslim cemetery of Bab al Rahmeh in the Old City. The petitioners claimed that the location of the lot, which is in the Ofel Way, adjacent to the Wailing Wall, requires the state to be more attentive to security, archeological and religious Jewish considerations:

In recent years, Arab Muslims have begun burying their dead on the Ofel Way site and have built dozens of burial compartments for future use that were purportedly purchased by Muslim families from the mukhtar of the Silwan neighborhood in East Jerusalem. The petitions also claim that the burial and the digging for burial purposes being carried out in the Ofel Way site are unlawful and in contravention of the Public Health Ordinance, 1940, in that the Minister of Health has not authorized burial there. Also, the petitioners claim that the Old City in Jerusalem and its nearby surroundings were declared an “antiquities site,” and, as such, any action on the site requires the approval of the director of the Antiquities Authority, which has not been given in our case.³

The petitioners claimed that the Old City site is an open public area that does not permit construction of graves, is intended for renewal and preservation, and carries great archeological weight. They disregarded the fact that the cemetery serves the Muslim population, that the Old City of Jerusalem is an occupied area and that the Jerusalem municipality confiscated the land in 1995 – as did the court, which stated: “The petitions further stress that the Ofel Way site has great archeological

³ H.C.J. 7192/04 *Arieh Yitzhak King v. Israeli Police and others* (2009).

importance, and that construction of the graves there conceal ancient remains and also make future archeological excavations impossible.”

As to the petitioners’ complaint against the municipality for its negligence in applying the law, the court decision contended:

The state’s first and insufficient position was that, although attempts are made to prevent further expansion of the cemetery, the dead should not be removed from the graves, and burial should not be prevented in existing burial structures given the sensitivity of the place. After additional discussions were held, in which some of the relevant officials took part, the state changed its position and decided that, in addition to effective enforcement actions to prevent the digging of new burial structures, the Israel police will aid the Jerusalem municipality in preventing burial on the site, all subject to security considerations and public order. The state further undertook to provide police assistance to implement the fencing, gardening, and arrangement of the Ofel Way site, which was planned by the Nature and Parks Preservation Authority.

To conclude, the court stated that:

The state prepared a fencing and gardening plan for the Ofel Way site. It began to execute the plan and undertook to continue to execute it, while taking into account security considerations and considerations relating to maintenance of public order. In these circumstances, I am of the opinion that the petitions have exhausted themselves and there is no reason to leave them pending before us. The presumption is that the state will act as aforesaid; in any event, the petitioners have the right to return and petition in this matter, so long as they have grounds to do so.

The court’s words suggest that the Palestinians’ dead bodies and spaces are subject to the surveillance of the police and municipality, taking into account “security considerations” and “maintenance of public order.”

The bodies and spaces of Palestinians are seen as inflammatory symbols that should always be watched and should be answered by acts of violence. The cemeteries, as the spaces in which Palestinians reside when dead, are the sites of mourning that are organized in a topological manner (Pugliese, 2013) and, as such, it marks the manner in which the Israeli control/surveillance politics is founded. The Israeli control over the topos situates the Palestinian mourning places and dead bodies in spaces of exception, in the abyss. The ideologies used by the courts to deal with them justify land grabbing; they are ideologies of difference, of fear and of securitization.

The three court decisions confine Palestinians to the space of their difference. This is a place that situates them outside the law, while ruled by the law. They are trapped by an Israeli securitized system that requires them, for example, to obtain the approval of the Ministry of Health for burial in Bab Alshat cemetery. This “legal” requirement reflects the anxiety and apprehensions of trespassers who fear being caught, and it haunts and constantly interrogates the very legitimacy of the colonial state. The arguments raised in court – that the land is sacred because it is close to the Wailing Wall that it has archeological importance, or that the building has a heart and lungs – all lead to the same conclusion: that dead Palestinians should be evicted. However, the court discussions sidestep the process and system of evictions, focusing instead on “the facts” of the case discussed. They disregard the brutality of the system of control, the suffering of the community and individuals, and how Palestinians are treated by the court, the police and the entire state-controlled system.

The court acts as the guardian of the settler ideology; it represents not only the legal system, but also Jewish-Israeli domination over the native Palestinian. Its words and decisions are the outcomes of uprooting and dispossession. The court’s narrative relocates the land and reappropriates the right of those who are robbed of their right to have rights (as Arendt [1973] would say).

The desecration of cemeteries challenges the Israeli legal system’s integrity, opening the way for consideration of the meaning of the colonial ideologies embedded in such a legal system. This raises questions about accountability for the violence inflicted against the dead, as well as how the legal system obscures and hides violence against the living and the dead. Furthermore, it becomes clear how law and court decisions are forms of military occupation that stage the Palestinian difference, portraying Palestinian bodies as “unharmful” and uncounted through the violence of planning and building. This legal narrative of the Israeli authorities that take the land, confiscating or owning it, opens the door to considering the meaning of the desecration of graveyards and the pursuit of the dead as part of the authorization and operation of violence in colonial and conflict areas.

The inscription of power over the Palestinian dead body

So as not to confine this discussion to spaces of difference and in an attempt to place the life-and-death experiences of Palestinians within

a historical, social and political context, I now turn to narratives of everyday ordeals when facing death and needing to bury loved ones. My focus is on dead bodies and rituals of death as they happen in the fragmented space of East Jerusalem. The narratives presented here come from a dataset of interviews of thirty-two Palestinian families who lost their loved ones following the onset of the second Intifada in 2001. By reading through stories of death and dying, hearing the voices of Palestinian family members and interviewing community members, I aim to problematize colonial surveillance over the always-disappearing dead and living Palestinian bodies. In this way, I hope to reveal and discuss the structural grammar of the machinery of security theology, which allows the epistemological movement of Palestinians from the dead or living body to the feared body that must be erased. In this context, I also reveal how Palestinians turn the body into a sacred, enlivened entity, resisting the securitized reading of the living power of the Palestinian dead body.

NUHA: BURIAL BY STEALTH

It was during two weeks of political unrest and violent demonstrations in East Jerusalem that I heard about Nuha, a seventy-seven-year-old woman who lived in the Old City. Her neighbor had called a family member, who called a friend of mine, who then called me. They wanted to know whether I could help Nuha's children obtain a permit to arrange and attend her funeral. Nuha had five children, two of whom held Jerusalemite IDs and were able to visit and take care of their mother, while the others had lost their residency when they rented an apartment in a nearby West Bank village (only twenty minutes away) and could only see their mother when she visited them. Nuha's two children with Jerusalemite IDs were out of the country on the Haj pilgrimage in Mecca when their mother passed away. The other three children, despite numerous attempts, were denied a permit to cross into Jerusalem and care for their mother in her death. The following outlines the traumatic trials and tribulations faced by Nuha's family and community in their attempts to pay respect to the dead and bury their loved one in her place of birth.

Nuha's death put her neighbors, who wanted to help the family reach their home in Jerusalem, in extreme danger and aroused considerable fear in the community. Nuha's daughter Salwa explained:

The feeling of knowing that your mother is lying dead in your house, while you are unable to reach her and kiss her before she departs, paralyzed me... I was totally anesthetized... I wanted to rush to her, but I knew there was a barrier, they wouldn't let us. She was there, alone, in that house that once was filled with us all, and now, none of us are there, and she is dead, alone, in the cold, and I could not even go ask her forgiveness for not seeing her in her last week... I so wanted to go, my brothers also tried their best... but we didn't know who we should talk to, what to do... It was cruel, really cruel.

Salwa later explained that they decided to consult with a clergyman, who consulted with a lawyer, who then called an official trying to figure a way out: "We tried everybody, from our neighbor who works as a janitor at Hebrew University, hoping that he could get help from someone there, to family, friends, relatives... everybody." Following an exhausting consultation with Nuha's children, various family members and Palestinian officials, the neighbors decided to follow the recommendation to bury her without delay, using the Islamic burial service in the Old City, close to her house. The family rationalized such a decision by their fear that the political situation would get worse and Nuha's body would not get the proper respect due according to Islamic religious codes and cultural rituals and beliefs. Hence, her neighbors decided to see to the burial of the body even though her three children were denied a permit to cross into Jerusalem and those children who could enter were outside the country. Members of Nuha's extended family and community managed to get a death certificate from a local doctor, and even to obtain formal confirmation of her death by a Palestinian physician who works in an Israeli health maintenance organization (Kupat Holim). While trying to obtain the burial permit, the family discovered that Nuha had lost her Israeli right as an officially acknowledged Jerusalemite three months earlier. Her daughter explained:

Three months ago my mother fell, and I decided to bring her to stay with us for a while. It seems that the fact that she was away from our home in Jerusalem made some officials decide to cancel her ID [i.e., her residency rights in Jerusalem]... We didn't know that, and she didn't know that if she visited us she would lose her rights... to the degree of losing her right to be buried in Jerusalem... You must know that we can't bury anyone without an official burial certificate from the Israelis.

Knowing that Nuha, who was born and raised in Jerusalem and who had raised her children there, had become an entity deleted from official acknowledgement, to the degree of losing her right to a burial certificate, created much bitterness and apprehension in the family and community. The sense of outrage and loss was exacerbated by the uncertain and violent political situation, as her daughter explained: “Here we are twenty minutes from my mother’s house, from my mother . . . and she is spending her last hours without her own children at least kissing her hands, and seeing her face . . . I was twenty minutes away.” The news of additional violent exchanges in the surrounding area made community members, clergymen and relatives decide to go ahead, wash her dead body, pray and prepare her for burial in the Bab Alsat cemetery close to her house, even without the required burial license.

En route to the graveyard, the group of mourners was stopped by an Israeli security patrol accompanied by soldiers, who requested the death certificate and burial permit. It was a very embarrassing and painful situation for a dead body to be awaiting a permit to pass. As Nuha’s brother-in-law recounted, in their failure to convince the authorities, they had no choice but to turn back: “She was a great and good woman and, following the advice of her son who was in Amman, Jordan, we decided to refrain from fighting back.” Her sister explained: “Our pain was great enough, we could not handle more.” Moreover, her son, a father of five, was worried that defying the authorities might cause him and his family to lose residency and thought that it would be better to find a new cemetery. The family’s fear of losing their rights in Jerusalem, together with her neighbors’ fear of being hurt or tagged as political activists or rebels, made them decide to take her body back home, without knowing what could be done at such a late hour and under such conditions. The very cold Jerusalem weather allowed them to keep the body, alone, at home. Her sister explained:

That night, none of us was able to sleep or close our eyes. We all felt that she deserved better treatment. We all wanted to show her our love and respect, without worrying about the Israeli rules . . . We spent the night discussing alternatives, new options, but then my daughter – the one who studies at university – started screaming at us, crying hysterically. She told her father, “Just go . . . take *khalti’s* [Auntie’s] body, take my brother and our neighbor and bury her . . . don’t leave her hanging between life and death, when she is dead.”

At 3:40 the next morning, Nuha's body was taken in silence, in an attempt to hide it from the Israeli surveillance system. She was buried in silence, invisible to the occupier, without even a record of her name near the grave, fearing that identifying it might cause additional harm to the family and the community.

The authorized eviction of Nuha's body from the Bab Alsbat cemetery is similar to the eviction of the Palestinian from the law, the space, the place and the society. The refusal to permit her family to bury her allows those who deny her the right to passage to inscribe their power over her already-dead body. Such an eviction turns her into an unseen, unnamed, profane entity. Her unburied body and her family's unheard voice allow us to engage with the lived experience of Palestinians, with the ways in which their minds and bodies are entangled in self and homeland through the case of death and dying.

The horrifying journey of Nuha's dead body (and others like her) is familiar to those in occupied Jerusalem. What is provocative, however, is a complex dynamic of simultaneous living and dying, where the deceased's identity and personhood are eclipsed by the anonymity in which they are presented. The dead body is profane; it is a body of difference to the extent of being considered a security threat unless it is "certified" by formal Israeli permits. Its difference requires it to stay in what Andrea Smith (2010) calls a "state of disappearing" – as a Palestinian who has lost the right to remain, even as a dead body, in Jerusalem, and must be buried in silence in an unmarked grave.

RASHA: LOSING HER BABY TWICE

"Security" and the knowledge that one is being watched all the time are concerns that control the mind and actions of the colonized. This is clear from the narrative of Rasha, the mother of a child who died during a military raid on a Palestinian neighborhood in Jerusalem:

They invaded our area, and started throwing tear gas bombs, and [the baby] was in my lap . . . But the smell of the gas was so strong that she could not handle it and stopped breathing. The area was packed with soldiers and it took us a while to convince them to allow us to take her to the hospital . . . I carried her out . . . took her to the street . . . showed the soldiers that she is not breathing . . . that she needs a hospital . . . I ran with her in the middle of a street filled with military jeeps, soldiers and police cars, but we were late . . . too late . . . She died in my arms . . . I couldn't do anything to help her.

In occupied areas and during political violence, the colonized and occupied are erased and turned into a body (dead or alive) that needs to be controlled and silenced. Rasha was not seen or noticed, her call for help was not heard, her attempt to save her baby, jeopardizing her own life, failed.

Yet, the trauma was not over with the child's death; in fact, it had just begun. Rasha continued: "My daughter suffered . . . not only when alive, but also after her death . . . Her little dead body did not get the proper respect." The baby's father, Samer, explained:

We tried to help her, but it didn't work . . . She died in the hospital after they allowed us to pass and reach the [Israeli] hospital, and then the police came . . . They – the hospital – called the Israeli police . . . Yes, the hospital called the police, and the police started questioning the doctors, the nurses; they interrogated me and my brother and wife. We were under interrogation until 2:30 a.m. Then they asked us to get a medical report from our family doctor. They specifically asked the family doctor to write that she [his daughter] was suffering from a cold and fever . . . and that is true, but cold does not kill, it is the gas that suffocated her. It was a long process . . . and they all spoke Hebrew . . . the doctors, the nurses, the hospital officials, the police . . . and here I am sitting, holding my head in my hands . . . closing my ears . . . She is dead . . . they killed her, and I am still trying to control myself, or else I will lose her . . . again.

Rasha interrupted:

You know, they all work with security, they are all Shabak [the Israeli General Security Service] . . . They are all *quwwat khassa* [special forces] . . . And here we are . . . we've just lost our baby . . . and we were afraid we would lose her again . . . I was terrified they would take her from me . . . She was cold . . . dead . . . but I wanted to hug her . . . smell her . . . feel her . . . [crying]. We wanted to give [the baby] a proper and respectful burial, but the investigation took so long, and she was kept alone in the cold, in the fridge in the hospital, while we all were kept in the police station for investigation . . . After long, very painful hours . . . while all of us are in shock, in a state of loss, not at home, not with our daughter, not even with the family, but rather in the police station . . . they allowed her uncle to take the medical report, go to the police station at Salah al-Din Street [in East Jerusalem], get the papers needed, and take those papers with the hospital death certificate and the family doctor's medical report to the Ministry. Her uncle then brought the burial permit and we all went to Bab Alsbat [cemetery]. The police stayed with us all the time. Can you believe it? . . . They didn't allow us to enter the burial

grounds . . . They only allowed fifteen people – although the entire family came to meet us there. But the police cars and the military jeeps filled the area, and they prevented people from getting into the burial site and help[ing] us out. That was not enough . . . The police also prevented us from going back home . . . Then, they prevented me from reaching my neighborhood again, and we all went to my parents in the village, we opened a *Beit Azza* [a space of mourning, in which people can come, participate and pay condolences]. We all said, this is a baby, no need for a big space or a massive arrangement, but lots of people came, the media came, human rights organizations, political parties, many keynote people and politicians, and they all wanted us to have a big ceremony.

As both parents told me, such surveillance over the baby’s dead body created much suffering and fear that they would lose her again. The parents’ suffering was attached to the way in which the baby’s dead body was perceived, not only as an unwanted dead body, but as a profane specter entity, who continues to remind the colonizers of their crimes. Fearing a second loss, yet being unable to listen to the language of the occupier, silenced both parents and increased their pain. The bureaucracy embedded in the death-related formalities – in the medical report, death certificate, burial permit and institutions such as the Ministry of Health and the military apparatus – exemplifies a particular political logic against the profane unwanted Other: to count the dead and the living, to document, control, surveil and limit access. The institutionalization of such bureaucracies reminds Palestinians of their subjective and marginalized position vis-à-vis the occupier, and situates them in spaces of difference. The parents’ and the dead body’s mobility, identity and rights were under the scrutiny of the Israeli surveillance regime.

“SNEAKING” BACK HOME: SETA’S FIGHT TO RETURN

Seta, a mother of three girls, died suddenly in her sleep while visiting her mother in one of the West Bank villages near Jerusalem. Not only did her family need to have two ceremonies – her West Bank family members, who live only twenty minutes away from her home in Jerusalem, are not permitted by Israeli law to enter the city – but the family also needed to lie about her place of death and sneak her dead body in, at night, through a heavily technologized military check-point, so as to allow her to be buried in Jerusalem. Her husband Musa explained:

My brothers explained to me and the girls that we might not be able to bring her back home to Jerusalem, and that caused more trauma to the girls and to my wife's sisters and family. We called two lawyers and another friend who works in a lawyer's office. We consulted with many...and learned that we might deprive her of getting a proper farewell in the church that she loved, among her friends and family. So, I decided, without even telling anybody...while the girls were asleep, to drive her back.

I was driving my car, with my wife sitting in the back seat, dead. [At the checkpoint] I presented my ID card and her permit to be in Jerusalem to the soldier. He asked me to step out, checked the trunk of the car and then allowed us to pass...I was afraid...but you know what, not really...I was sad...I lost her, I wanted her to be happy that I did that for her and the girls...I looked [the soldier] in the eye and told him we are going back home...I did...I brought her back home.

The words of Seta's husband reflect the way in which Israel's security is inscribed on Palestinians' lives. The biopolitical technologies of security and fear of the Israeli colonial state are inscribed over Seta's dead body, and occurred in a non-recognized and unapproved topos. Alarmed by the "fears" of the Israeli authorities of the "insecurity" power stemming from Seta's dead body, Musa subverted and challenged the oppressive system by bringing his wife's dead body safely back home. Despite his fear of being prevented from doing so and his subjugation as a Palestinian, he reappropriated his family and challenged the securitization of his space.

Surely a family that has suddenly and unexpectedly lost one of its members should not be forced to consult lawyers, doctors and other experts in order to look for ways to maneuver around a strong system of security which presupposes that danger is inherent in the burial of a mother, wife, daughter or friend. This is not a case of entering and working through bureaucracies, as one must normally do after the death of a family member or a loved one, but rather of working *under*, *over* and *around* bureaucracies, all with the knowledge that loved ones are configured as unwanted and an insecure threat to the state.

The situation left the family in an extreme state of trauma created by the continuous and unending dilemmas and uncertainties of how to bring her body to Jerusalem – who will write the death certificate, how can they bury her and would they get the permit to allow her mother (who, as someone living in the West Bank, carries a different color ID) to participate in the funeral? Moreover, what about her daughters? How

could one impose on them to lie about their mother's place of death? The consequences of the manner of her death was especially apparent on her daughters, among them Maysa, a ten-year-old girl who suffered from severe psychological trauma. Maysa was extremely agitated, anxious and visibly shaking when she saw the police driving toward them during the funeral, when members of the family and community were carrying the dead body of her mother. She was sobbing, pulling her hair hysterically and ultimately wetting her pants, while the entire community desperately and helplessly looked on.

Maysa wanted evidence of her mother's death story. She wanted her loss to be discussed and acknowledged; she wanted to preserve her mother's death story, but, being the Palestinian, unwanted profane Other silenced her voice in and while mourning the loss of her mother. Maysa's family, aware of the "sacred's" insecurities and their profaneness, needed to have their suffering made invisible in hopes of preventing further agony. Maysa's family, aware of their status as profane Others, and cognizant of the unwantedness of Seta's dead body embedded in Israel's securitization and fear was apparent in the grandmother's words to me:

Ishi bi khawef... ishi bi khawef [it is so scary...it is so scary]... They have their own rules, and if we say something wrong... we might lose more... After we lost [my daughter]... they scared the girls... and all of us... Her husband was totally lost... not knowing what to do and not to do... [The Israeli military forces] disrespected the death by preventing us from reaching the cemetery safely... Do you think they care about Maysa? Do they want us all to be buried with my daughter?

Seta's dead body was stuck in an in-between space for an entire day, with her family uncertain as to whether she would be acknowledged as a Jerusalemite, and hence approved as a dead body with a Jerusalemite death certificate and burial permit. Because she passed away in a profane space, a space not identified as her home, her dead body became unwanted security threat, with no right to return home to Jerusalem or to be buried there. Marking her dead body, as a monstrous, scary, profane one, forced her family to search for ways to turn her into an acknowledged body. Her sudden death in a space unrecognized by the colonizer caused her body to occupy both trajectories: To be both wanted and unwanted, visible and invisible. Thus, fearing her living body as a Palestinian continued even after her death. Her mundane decision to visit her mother on that day posed new sets of challenges to the

family and allowed the occupiers to exert and carve their colonial hegemony over the living power of her dead body. Her body and entity were enlivened only when the family managed to “sneak” her back to her home, turning her into an acknowledged, formally approved and wanted body that can enjoy being buried in a sacred space/topos. But this was at the price of displacing the death story in its invisible and invisibilized compartment of profanity. Any attempt to visibilize the death story to the occupying authorities might result not only in further surveillance of the family, but also in further loss. This was apparent in Musa’s words: “If someone finds out, we will all lose our right to stay in Jerusalem . . . and you know . . . they might even demolish the house . . . They did it before . . . They are after us when we are alive, and even when we are dead.”

The methods used to maintain such control are both material and psychological. The attack upon the dead and living bodies during death, and the incredible trauma that ensued from seeing one’s loved one violated after death, is a prime example of this dynamic. What is critical here is the invasion and control of both dead and living bodies. Death and mourning are no longer a private matter; the living are forced to endure harassment in the public arena as they transact the requirements of caring for their deceased loved ones. If the dominant can render space itself into a grid that can be continually marked as profane and the occupants of that space can be tracked and located, where the Other is always feared and assessed for potential “jeopardy,” and if such assessment calls for action – to detain, derail, humiliate or trap – then the powerless can be kept in a state of constant precariousness. In executing the principles of this militarized security theology, control of the body (dead or alive) and space becomes an integral ally.

MAY AND REHAM: THE FIGHT TO RETURN

The profanity of and surveillance over the dead body haunts Palestinians even when they are away from Jerusalem. My final case study addresses the rights of May, a young Palestinian woman from Jerusalem who married a Jerusalemite man, but, due to the economic hardships facing young educated Palestinians and their inability to find employment at home, both decided to leave to work in the Gulf. May’s father died four years after her departure, and she and her husband both failed to obtain a permit in order to return to participate in her father’s funeral. Shortly after her father’s death, May invited her youngest sister,

Reham, to spend some time with them. Reham met up with her sister and her husband, and together they drove to a resort area. The meeting of the two sisters allowed May to cry and share with Reham her frustration and disappointment in failing to attend her father's funeral or see her mother for the past four years. They talked all night, shared, cried and exchanged. May asked Reham: "Promise me you will help me return to Jerusalem." Reham explained that her sister gave her money to pay for the best lawyers to allow her to come back to Jerusalem.

May died in a car accident during that trip. Reham fought with everything she had to get her sister's dead body buried in Jerusalem. Her encounter with the bureaucracies involved was long and complicated. She consulted lawyers, politicians, human rights activists, tribal heads who knew people that might help, family physicians, friends and more – but to no avail. She explained to me:

All I wanted was to get my sister's dead body to Jerusalem to be buried beside my father, but we live under occupation in exile, and we die in exile under occupation . . . They not only control our life when alive, they control us when we are dead. My father did not get what he deserved, to be with his daughters when leaving us . . . when he died . . . and my sister could not be brought back to her family, to her home, to be buried in Jerusalem . . . *Ghurbeh hitta bil mammam* [we are in exile even when dead].

By preventing May's dead body from reaching Jerusalem, officials not only managed and marginalized it, but also threatened and silenced it, and punished the family. The biopolitical management of the dead population silenced the dead body's voice.

MUNDANE SURVEILLANCE AND SECURITIZATION

The everydayness of surveillance in colonial contexts, compounded by high levels of securitization, a constant sense of danger and the feeling of relentlessly being watched (Shalhoub-Kevorkian, 2011), has permeated Palestinians' dead and live bodies alike. The pervasiveness of such surveillance affects their daily acts and behaviors, placing everyday functioning in the "risk/danger" category, in a space of difference, to be monitored and controlled. As is the case in colonial contexts, the efficacy of surveillance rests mostly on its visibilization, if not hypervisibilization, as colonizers promote their police forces, soldiers and other regulatories of control. Such surveillance creates fear among the colonized, but also compels them to look for ways to cope, maneuver

and resist it. Sharing the death stories of Jerusalemites and the contents of the court decisions regarding Palestinian cemeteries reveals how colonial control carves its power on both dead and living Palestinian bodies, further connecting the grievances of the colonized.

Some of the critical aims of securitization and surveillance have been to render invisible the victims of such a theology; to hide the visceral nature of authorized (indeed, mandated) state terror; to cloak the enforcement of those practices as “security”; and to justify that terror as being necessitated by “the way things are.” The sheer incivility of the surveillance over the movement of Palestinian dead bodies is neatly sidestepped within the semantics of the ostensible aims of “security.” Part of the internal dynamics of colonial domination is that, in order for the execution of colonialism to be effective, certain assumptions are inviolate. In working through the rubrics of such assumptions, in unpacking and unraveling them, we can lay bare the workings of the oppression over living and dead bodies.

Securitization and surveillance created a sense of urgency among Palestinians to act against it and challenge it. This was clear in Rasha’s and Reham’s reaction, but it was Musa’s act of sneaking Seta’s dead body that showed the effect of such surveillance on the move from invisibility to visibility and hyper-visibility. Musa invisibilized his wife at the checkpoint in his attempt to preserve the dead body’s right to “live” its last hours in a socially recognized manner, with dignity and respect and the right to proper burial. By crossing a checkpoint “illegally” and invisibly, Musa recognized the power of such an invisibilized entity and allowed the community to “preserve [the dead’s] rights to respect and honor before burial.”

The checkpoint is a pertinent example of unrecognizability and erasure, as well as simultaneous hyper-visibility and invisibility. Checkpoints are generally a matter of control, ostensibly based on issues of “rational security,” where a state attempts to contain and maintain the space that legitimately belongs to it. However, when checkpoints become the location for the execution of policies based on arbitrary fear in the form of racism so that the Other can be rendered visible anytime and anyplace, the dynamics of both the concept of a checkpoint and that of visibility and invisibility are changed from how we normally comprehend those terms. Such dominating invisibility can quickly become the hyper-visibility of a dangerous object once the hegemonic power of the military is challenged by a Palestinian. When we consider the dynamics of the “invisible” as it ironically relies on

visibility, as I have been arguing here, we also need to consider the ways in which technology complicates this.

There is a unique dynamic of visibility and invisibility in the Palestinian context. Both the state and the victim are playing out their power (or lack thereof) within desires to be rendered both visible and invisible. It is fair to say that those who are oppressed, surveilled and controlled seek to play down their visibility in the hopes of avoiding greater surveillance, yet they also desire to be visible in a way beyond the needs of the dominant state to render them so. The oppressed want to be seen and heard; they want to air their grievances in some “court” or forum, however imaginary those places may be. I contend that the notion of attainable justice, of the desire to be heard, is as much psychic as material. Consequently, while the state renders the victims (and their ordeals) visible in order to track them across the spatial grids where they are surveilled, it also paradoxically manufactures a security theology that aims to render the Other invisible so that they cannot register their grievances. To be misrecognized as an intrinsic security threat, indeed, to have one’s very humanity and personhood eclipsed by institutionalized *non-recognition* promotes not only psychic disturbance, but also a psychic drive to be seen as one wishes to be seen (see Honneth, 1995). The state’s tracking of the bodies of the colonized in the name of “security,” surveilling them to the point of anonymity, as simply unnamed “Palestinians” (as one can learn from Maysa’s voice when losing her mother and from Musa’s voice when sneaking in the dead body of his wife), thus creates a psychic process of simultaneous domination and resistance to domination, a subordinated space in which agency is propelled and enacted.

The sophistication of death and dying in such contexts as those described here, along with many other invisible Palestinians who are facing the everydayness of the surveillance of their living and dead bodies, raises many questions, most of which are beyond the scope of this chapter. What I do want to elaborate upon is the necropolitics of the economy of the sacred and the profane.

NECROPOLITICS AND THE ECONOMY OF THE SACRED AND THE PROFANE

This chapter has revealed necropolitics inscribed over Palestinians’ dead bodies. It showed how the security theology, as reflected in the reorganization of space and the anxiety and fear of the dead body,

operated in the militarized context to reproduce Palestinians as feared Others and maintain their definition as profane Others. Moving from the living to the dead, to the graveyards and back to the living dead, the analyses offered and the narratives shared show how the Palestinian dead body is simultaneously reduced to an object that is a cause of anxiety/fear to the Israeli and to an object that can be forgotten, built over, moved, erased and evicted.

Colonial logic that creates spaces, places and bodies of difference remains the center of my analysis. By portraying the dead body and the cemetery as spaces of difference to which the Palestinian living and dead are confined, violence is legalized, marking the incoherence of the place of the Palestinian as someone to fear. To borrow Sherene Razack's (2011a, 2011b) analysis of the aboriginal's death in custody, the space of difference to which the native is confined in law and society is a space in which violence is authorized. This is concomitant with Agamben's (1999) theory of the state of exception, as applied to the Israeli settler colonial project (for more details, see Rifkin, 2009). Following Agamben's perception of the state of exception as "a space of indistinction where law has authorized its own suspension" (Razack, 2011a, p. 88), the place of the native Palestinian in Israeli law is regarded as both outside and inside the state's boundaries, but nevertheless as falling under Israeli sovereignty. Such a space of indistinction keeps both sides in a state of fear and anxiety, with Israel's power established not through situating the Palestinian in a state of exception, but rather through routinely evicting him or her from law (Razack, 2011a) and, I would add, evicting them from their spaces, even spaces of death, as dead bodies. Furthermore, Mbembe's (2003) theorization of necropolitics, the right to kill as the absolute articulation of sovereignty, is echoed when he states that "colonial occupation itself was a matter of seizing, delimiting, and asserting control over a physical geographical area – of writing on the ground a new set of social and spatial relations" (Mbembe, 2003, p. 24). Dead bodies, buried in the territory of colonial occupation, become part of the geography that must be "seized" and "controlled." Social and spatial relationships can only be erased and rewritten through a continuous, everyday assertion of sovereignty – through necropower over the colonized.

The production of the Jewish-Israeli space depends upon rendering the native's existence, and their enlivened dead bodies, as "bare life," "different" and "unique," and therefore should be disciplined and controlled. Such racialized legal acts, inscribed in the state's power and

backed by its “experts,” reaffirms the geopolitical rearrangements and necropolitical power of the colonizer’s sovereignty. The route to the cemetery becomes a useful example of how law operates as an executive authority of colonialism, to impose control, grab land and evict the native outside the law. As we have seen, the courts operate in a manner that grants the preservation of control and hold of territories, while expanding the zone of eviction that Palestinians inhabit, even when dead. The story of the graveyards and the dead bodies are but one example confirming that the native, living or dead, should not be in charge of the land.

Examining the policing of the just-dead and already-dead body reveals the contours of the colonial world and the management of the Palestinians through violence, including the violence of the law and the violence of desecrating dead bodies. The relationship between the legal body and the Palestinian dead bodies clearly reflects who is considered to be outside the framework of humanity, and thus defined and treated as profane. In such a condition, the Palestinian dead bodies can simply be reduced to non-bodies and unpeople, while simultaneously expanding the power of the state and its people to maintain their sacredness.

The path to the graveyard is a space of confrontation between the native’s history and the colonizer’s history; between the sacred and the profane. It is the encounter between demonizing control over the social life and the death life of the native. The dead bodies and the space in which they reside are conquered and live under a regime of securitization. These are bodies and spaces that are dispossessed and uprooted from their land, even after a long death. The Palestinians’ routinely evicted bodies haunt the settler. The dead bodies, as well as the spaces in which they reside, remind the colonizer that the unseen bones are there to tell a story, and the story could only be silenced by erasing the bodies themselves.

Palestinians are not passive when faced with the Israelis’ death politics as necropolitics. They resist the way they are treated by doing their utmost to respect and honor their dead; yet, every time they resist, every time they subvert the system, they destabilize Israel’s technologies of security and simultaneously provide Israel with new ways to define their “sacredness” and further their “fear” claims. These acts of resistance are suffocated and curbed by the effectiveness of the securitized machine of control through the enforcement of laws, regulations and colonial bureaucracies.

The relational dynamics of time and space, marked over the Palestinian dead and living body during death, as this chapter has shown, lead to the material deconstruction of existing territorial arrangements and, as Mbembe explained, to the “creation of mobile spaces and spaces of enclosure” (Mbembe, 2000, p. 284). The use of security technologies of coercion constituted new systems of control that lead to the deterritorialization and demonization of the Palestinian in time of death. It established an economy of fear whose objective is to uproot the population and fragment it, even when dead. This economy’s central project is not the struggle for autonomy, but rather the material destruction of the Palestinian human bodies and populations to reaffirm the sacredness of the Israeli. It is the operation of necropolitics: the ‘power to dictate who may live and who may die’ (Mbembe, 2003, p. 11).

Placing the Palestinian body under intense scrutiny resulted in disciplining both individuals and communities to techniques of power, techniques that observed, surveilled, analyzed, measured and managed bodies and lives. The Palestinian dead bodies became a product of security and fear, a product of knowledge and power. As the voices and texts analyzed show, necropolitics was played through laws and regulations that distribute power, fragment societies and re-define the sacred and the profane in the everydayness of life (and death). The disciplinary power of the necropolitical game subjugated the life of Palestinian dead bodies to the power of death. It situated the Palestinians (dead and alive) and marked and managed them as profane Others.

The political nature of Palestinian death and dying calls into question the blurred boundaries between life and death, and precisely between those that have the right to live and those that should die even when dead. While we might agree that our bodies as our lives are extremely politicized, the stories collected and the narratives shared, indicating the marking of the sacred Jewish-Israeli and the profane Palestinian, suggest that death is not the limit of colonial power. The biopolitical administration of life has been challenged by securitized technologies that disciplined the Palestinian community as its dead bodies and left the profane Palestinian exposed to both death and operations of power. Places of death, spaces of burial and times of loss of beloved ones were turned into particular spaces of power that aimed at terminating the life of the already dead and further politicized the boundaries between life and death.

Beyond its absurd nature, controlling the living and the dead during times of loss and mourning maintains a racialized state of fear and

legitimizes the state's control over spaces/times of death and mourning. Necropolitics engenders "new and unique forms of social existence in which vast populations are subjected to conditions of life conferring upon them the status of *living dead*" (Mbembe, 2003, p. 40, emphasis in original). Necropolitics in Jerusalem has become a matter of theater, of an overt and even capricious display of the power by the occupier (e.g., Pugliese, 2013). Dead bodies, funerals, burials and mourners in Jerusalem, like birthing bodies (as will be seen in the following chapter), are repeatedly violated by Israel's technologies of power. Violations of space/times of death are not a matter of "security," but rather of displaying and maintaining the sacred: a way of stating yet again I am God's chosen people, the "promised land" is under my control and, mostly, "I have power over you."

CHAPTER SIX

BIRTH IN JERUSALEM

When they took me to the operating room before the delivery, I was going mad, I was crying, with much bitterness; I wanted my mother to be by me. I begged my husband to leave me in the hospital and find a way to sneak my mother into Jerusalem. I was horrified, alone, in such pain, and felt as if I was miyyti laballi [dead alone]. My parents live right after the checkpoint, very close to here to the checkpoints, the checkpoints are blocking our breathing, and I ended up having my first son, alone, with no one [near me]. I am sitting alone, like an orphan, hayatna yutum [our lives are orphaned]. But today is Friday; maybe my mother could get a permit to reach Jerusalem to pray in the Al Aqsa Mosque, maybe she will come and see her first grandchild.

(Haifa, a twenty-year-old woman, interviewed in the hospital the third day after her delivery)

Haifa's words, her feeling of being isolated, as if she were an orphan in this world, her fears and anxieties as a woman about to give birth and the way in which such fears are implicated and bound up with the politics of the region – an occupied *time* and *space* – are the overarching thematic concerns of this chapter. Haifa's words are not just expressing the individual fears and concerns of a woman feeling deserted and helpless at a critical moment in her life – as she is about to bring another life into her world – but also testify to larger issues that surround so many moments of birth for Palestinian women in East Jerusalem.

As Haifa's words indicate, she experiences very real fears that are specific to the OPT, such as the daily surveillance of those who are perpetually presented as "security concerns." We note that Haifa, along with almost everyone else whose narratives are presented in this chapter, specifically makes mention of the mundane surveillance over their home, neighborhood spaces and the checkpoints – the checkpoints that are capriciously established by the Israeli military forces. The testimonials invoked in this chapter, including that of Haifa, raise new questions as to the nexus of issues that should inflect our understanding of colonial theologies and their industry of fear, of the fear inflicted on the politics of birth in conflict zones. Haifa's words call attention to the

ways in which power comes to be exercised over the corporeal body of the pregnant woman and, as I intend to argue in this chapter, over her psyche as well. How can we understand, for example, an ostensibly material issue such as surveillance, executed let us say for the sake of argument through the “checkpoint” (though there are many other ways)? In that space, the constant fear associated with the ever-shifting dynamics of the checkpoint and the emotional residue of that fear seeps into the very mind and body of the subject. In other words, the material reality of the checkpoint and the induced fear that results becomes a psychic reality as well. To borrow from Mbembe’s theorization in his discussion of necropolitics (2003), settler colonial logic and thinking determines who will live and how, the kind of dreams that are possible for the colonized, and the kinds of limitations that can and should be placed on any ostensible agency granted to them by the colonizer.

What repeatedly emerged from the interviews from which the salient content of this chapter was generated are the ways in which these women have come to assimilate a sense of ontological unrecognizability and unwantedness as *Palestinian women*. Even though the daily and ordinary dreams of these women – dreams that it seems fair to me to say have certain universal qualities in that they are common among all women who are about to be mothers (under ideal conditions) – often cross and break the borders and boundaries of any arguable normalities surrounding childbirth. Once again, given the material and psychic realities that Palestinian women must face daily, such dreams also expose the very colonial *appropriation* of that dream space. As the mothers and about-to-be mothers repeatedly said to me, such errant dreaming becomes most acute during the time of the birth of a Palestinian child.

The narratives provided by these women expose us to the various and multifarious operations of power, particularly gendered and racialized power. These are systemic deployments of power that play out, once again, within physical borders, but ones that are epistemic and psychic as well. As I read and re-read and so attempted to assimilate and understand the powerful words of these women, I must confess that my effort was a difficult process of attempting to map the various ways in which practices of dominance and control are knitted into the everyday life of the Palestinian mother. By undertaking such a mapping project, this chapter will examine pregnancy and birth under conditions of colonial surveillance in Jerusalem. I also intend to focus on the extent to which the colonizing state and its institutional apparatus of practices, policies

and knowledge production mobilizes, produces and maintains a state of institutionalized fear regarding the newborn Palestinian child.

This chapter privileges the voice of Palestinian women, for our purposes here specifically the voices of those women involved in the process of giving birth. As the testimonials from the Palestinian women suggest, the violated birthing space is often the resultant affect of the production of a “secure” space for Jews in Jerusalem. In addition, what the women provide witness to is that pregnancy and childbirth are highly politicized events. Untangling the skein of experiences described and inscribed in their narratives yields an understanding of the practices embedded in the structures and workings of power. Perhaps this is not unexpected and would hold true in conflict-ridden areas in general in addition to the particularity of the context of Palestine, a space where reproduction itself is an arena for struggle – an open field of both context and contest in which dominant powers attempt to exercise their varying controls and in which resistance struggles are also played out. Within such an arena, the specific experiences of pregnant and birthing women, as well as their everyday life experiences (by which I mean the daily process of living, of making it through each day), can also shed light more generally on the general dynamics of conflicts and the settler colonial apparatus – especially the lack of protection for basic human rights that prevail in such places. For example, the testimonies offered by the women provide us with an opportunity to observe how the nexus of reproductive issues that obtain within certain groups are comprehended by the dominant powers. And we see how the vexed arena of “reproduction” affects, in significant and dangerous ways, the status of those groups. Such a dynamic is a harbinger of the consequences and the continuation of reproduction itself as a specific type of “conflict zone” within the larger, prevailing colonized zone. Not only do pregnant and birthing women suffer very specific effects as a result of the occupation, but the particular childbirth experiences of Palestinian women are indelibly tied to the politics of the conflict. This is especially pronounced in the context of OEJ, a city which in many ways is at the “frontier” of settler colonialism in historic Palestine.

To understand birthing in Jerusalem as a case study of birthing in a colony, I engage with and discuss the realities of life and death during birth for a specific group. According to my perspective, the dynamics of childbirth as it applies to the women under discussion translates and reconstructs the workings of power. The dynamic of the execution of

that power relies on a sense of “embodiedness,” by which I mean policies and procedures that implicate the woman’s body in structured and systemic ways. This embodiment often goes unnoticed because of the “everyday” character it has assumed; an embodiment that is a particularly dangerous infiltration of the body because it has become casual. Childbirth is a particularly fecund area (no pun intended) for exploring the ways in which birth and death are intimately connected to the body (in ways that are both obvious and less apparent), and since the body is also intimately and always already connected to time and space, exploring how power relations are manifest in matters of childbirth and/as the body is critical. To examine birth in Jerusalem, one needs to explore the way in which relations of power write themselves on the body and trace that body as it moves through space, living out the everydayness in the midst of conflict.

The primary data provided in this chapter – the narratives of the women themselves – come from thirty-seven interviews conducted between June 2011 and February 2012. Of these, twenty-seven interviews were conducted by the author and the remaining ten were undertaken by a research assistant to ensure that the author’s mode of interviewing and interacting with interviewees did not affect the stories the women had to tell or influence their modes of telling their stories (Shalhoub-Kevorkian, 2012a). As such, the decision to involve another data collector allowed me to validate the findings. Interviews with the women were conducted while they were in the hospital, following the birth of their child and during the first two years after the birth of their children. In addition, narratives were also gathered in March–May 2012 in the context of the “Bereaved Women” program conducted with the support of the Women’s Study Center in Jerusalem.

This chapter brings alternative voices to the forefront within a context in which the hegemonic voice is usually privileged and in which the official story that is state-owned is freely repeated and disseminated. Consequently, the aim of this chapter is not only to overwrite the false projections of the dominant narrative, but also to engage the readers and share with them the devastation visited upon the bodies of Palestinian mothers – and, as I want to discuss, on their psyches. Thus far, the vast majority of the extant literature on childbirth in conflict zones has focused on the important issues of maternal and infant mortality. This focus is understandable given that mortality rates are obviously critical to women’s health issues at the most elemental level. However, there is a considerable lack of deeper analysis looking at

the politics of childbirth and the social and cultural practices surrounding pregnancy. Interestingly enough, in the literature on childbirth in *non-conflict* and *non-colonial* contexts, the attempt is to understand the complex of meanings (cultural, social, political and gendered) that are ascribed to childbirth. In other words, these are attempts to study the more abstract and ephemeral issues that obtain within any discussion of pregnancy and birth: For example, how do women conceptualize motherhood? What feelings are associated with it? What social or cultural rituals are observed? And so on. However, when pregnancy and birth have been studied in conflict zones, the topic has been treated very one-dimensionally, reduced to issues of life and death, as if any joy, happiness, sense of peace or contentment simply does not hold in such spaces and for such women. I find this approach to researching birth and pregnancy issues in conflict zones to be yet another reinstatement of familiar binaries such as “us” and “them,” self and Other, observer and observed. Such a reductive approach has elided the subtlety and nuance of women’s pregnancy and birthing experiences in conflict areas, let alone under settler colonial atrocities, and consequently our understanding has been limited. When the existing research has attempted to look at the relevant issues related to pregnancy and childbirth for Palestinian women specifically, much of this literature has been limited to quantitative analyses of health data and has not spoken directly to the individual and social impacts of sustained conflict and extended occupation on issues that obtain within discussions of pregnancy and birth. Furthermore, the existing research does not fully address the specificities of the conflict for women as expressed through their embodied experiences and everyday lives. My intent here is to break the limited scope of the extant literature on this topic and to look at the relevant issues within a much broader frame.

In what follows, this chapter is divided into sections with the following headings: Time and space; The everyday: Calculus and revolt; Invisibility and liminal space; and Ontological claustrophobia: Trying to take a deep breath. These specific sections are then followed by concluding remarks. More often than not, the words I have chosen to title the sections grow out of the testimonials of the women themselves. Thus, I hope that as the reader experiences the voices of the women presented here, the meanings of these titles will become clear and will resonate with the complex nexus of meanings that are embedded in the voices of the women. The chapter begins and ends with a sharing of the narratives of pregnant Palestinian women, and it then follows

through to the birth of their child. Sharing these women's voices gives us glimpses into their everyday lives (replete with "everyday" rebellions), shows us the way they conceive the time and space that makes for a day and their awareness of their pregnant bodies as the body continually surveyed, and demonstrates their struggle to interrupt and overcome the borders and boundaries that are continually imposed upon them.

TIME AND SPACE

I am twenty-nine years old, from Silwan [a small village in Jerusalem], originally from Eizareyyeh [an area that is about a ten-minute drive from Silwan]. I have four girls and just had my first baby boy. I [have] actually had two miscarriages, because I am always worried about being caught by the soldiers while visiting my family in Eizareyyeh . . . You know I do not have a blue ID [referring to the color of the ID that Jerusalemites carry]. I do not visit any doctors, or go for medical check-ups while pregnant. I fear, fear being caught by the soldiers. My reality [has] changed so much, everything changed. I don't know what is going on any more . . . the rules and laws change every day. The world keeps on changing. Life [has] changed; I used to commute from Silwan to Eizareyyeh easily, sometimes twice a day when I was engaged, there is nothing I can do about it now. I could cry, get depressed, go crazy, [but] nothing would change.

I feel so sick, so weak, so out of power. If I was to walk from here – I mean by foot – I could reach my parent's house in less than forty minutes. If only I could show Bash-shar [her son] to my parents. I [feel] choked, totally choked, tired from living in this *khan'aa* [suffocation]; they do not want us.

(Haya, interviewed in her house three months
after the birth of her son)

Haya's words and those of Haifa which began this chapter have some obvious similarities, such as the sense of isolation and the logistics involved in covering distances that are not so great in terms of actual distance (Haifa spoke of her family as being near the checkpoint, which was near the hospital where she found herself alone; similarly, Haya spoke of her family home as being a forty-minute walk away). But these distances become impossible, impassable spaces within the colonial design and its surveillance over occupied territories, for within these spaces, geography is reconfigured, re-imagined and overwritten as necessary.

In a policy paper produced by a think tank, “Demography, Geopolitics, and the Future of Israel’s Capital: Jerusalem’s Proposed Master Plan,” Nadav Shragai (2010) explains the importance of cutting off Palestinians from each other, the actualization of this as a process of urban planning and especially the importance of this strategy as a way to prevent the strengthening of the Palestinian argument, with its demand to connect the West Bank with Jerusalem:

Creating urban contiguity between eastern Jerusalem neighborhoods and Palestinian neighborhoods outside the city reinforces the Palestinian demand for political contiguity as well. The District Commission’s decision to cancel many of the green open areas that constituted a barrier between the Arab neighborhoods within the city and the Arab neighborhoods outside the city’s municipal boundaries, and earmark them as housing areas for the Arab population, exerts a geopolitical influence that may prove decisive in formulating the contours of a future political arrangement in Jerusalem. Linking the built-up Palestinian areas within Jerusalem to the built-up Palestinian areas outside of it can only reinforce the Palestinian demand to recognize the West Bank and eastern Jerusalem as a single political entity and demand the identical political arrangement for the West Bank and eastern Jerusalem. In other words, such contiguity can reinforce the Palestinian claim in favor of partitioning the city and turning eastern Jerusalem into the capital of a Palestinian state, if and when it is established.

(Shragai, 2010, pp. 7–8)

In addition to the overarching purpose of Shragai’s paper – to prevent spatially contiguous Arab/Palestinian neighborhoods – it is important to note the language and the metaphors used by him to present his case. Quite explicitly, Shragai approaches the material space under discussion as a textual/discursive space that is open to revisioning and rewriting to benefit the maintenance of Israeli power. He speaks of the “erasure” of green spaces (and their adverse affects upon Israeli intentions) and correspondingly argues for the reinstatement of divisions between Palestinian and Israeli spaces. While Shragai fears contiguous Arab neighborhoods that would disrupt the colonial strategy of establishing clear boundaries and divisions between various Arab neighborhoods, keeping them as isolated entities, disconnected and powerless, he has no hesitation about continuing colonialist control that is geographically connective and uninterrupted.

In many cultures, there are proverbs that speak to the concept of “the fabric of our lives,” meaning the continuous weave of interactions that

make up a human life. For example, the use of this very metaphor in many Western cultures refers to family, friends, rituals, familiar spaces (such as a family home or one's first residence) and specific places (the place of one's birth, one's "hometown," parks, playgrounds, even restaurants or shops that one might regularly patronize), all of which form the continuum of their lives – those familiar aspects of one's daily life that weave the "fabric" of our existence. Given the text of Shragai's paper, it would appear that he is also familiar with the metaphorical and conceptual sense of the "fabric of our lives," and it is this very fabric which he admonishes must be torn into pieces to protect those with power and cultural dominance. Clearly, the other explicit purpose of the paper, as is made explicit by him, is to impose upon both the material (geographic) and social space of the region a complex web of separations – *cordons sanitaires* – that keep the unwanted Other at bay.

What may surprise the reader, if she or he takes a closer look at the words in Haya's testimonial, are the ways in which that of which she speaks so closely reflects the proposals and intents of Shragai's paper. Though her words are laden with the obvious, indeed I would say with the *reproductive* stress of the conditions under which she must live, she echoes a sense of isolation, of borders that she cannot cross even though they do not materially constitute vast differences. Even the ease with which Shragai argues for rewriting the geographic space, of instituting other "erasures" that would re-design the space to this purpose, is echoed by Haya when she speaks of constant changes. She talks of her life, laws and rules changing; "everything changed," she laments. Of course, for her these changes do not have the cold calculus of Shragai's intentions and design, which is to tear at the fabric of the geographic and psychic space and so separate the unwanted Other (another point noted by Haya). Rather, Haya perceives the changes as inexplicable, as capricious, and she is unable to keep up with the ostensible logic of it all. The result is a confusion not just of the rules and regulations that she is nevertheless obligated to follow, and indeed finds impossible to follow, but also a distortion of space and, as I noted earlier, of *time* as well – yet another common theme among the narratives gathered for this chapter. For Haya, the continual changes result in a changeless, abeyant time, a moment in which she is perpetually trapped. When she attempts to take stock of her life, the only conclusion she can come to is that "nothing will change."

Colonial methodologies and manipulations that count the number of Palestinians who can keep their residency as Jerusalemites, of

course, directly accounts for and implicates Haya's body as well, situating that body in very specific articulations of space, place and time. This accounting and precise location of Haya's body must also be understood as the body of a pregnant woman who has given birth (the same dynamics holds true for a woman who is about to give birth) – this is a political topography based on a continual counting and accounting of even the most subtle shifts in population. Both the methodologies and ideologies behind such an accounting praxis are readily verifiable by looking at official Israeli documents which reveal the dynamics of discussions on population shifts and demography. For example, Protocol 132, composed by the Knesset “Committee for Immigration, Absorption and Diaspora Affairs,” reveals anxieties concerning the demographics of the Jewish population, namely, a perpetual, almost anxious checking to see if the Jews indeed hold a significant margin of numerical superiority within the total population. From the transcripts of the discussions shared in the protocol, the anxiety of which I speak is clearly revealed in the various ways in which the numbers are crunched and in the discussion of the corresponding and multifarious ramifications of the fluctuations in the numbers under consideration (Committee for Immigration, Absorption and Diaspora Affairs – Protocol 132, 2011). The numerical data on the Jewish population of Israel is subjected to precise mathematical formulation, *equations which are tenable only when calculated against the menacing possibilities of an ever-shifting Arab population*. Of course, what the equations also reveal is that the anxieties which fuel further and more vehement colonial oppressions, as a justification for those anxieties, is always already reliant on a calculus of the threatening Other and its population increase. As so much of the paradigmatic scholarship on colonial and post-colonial studies has revealed, the colonial self, which perpetually sees itself threatened by an irrational, threatening and proliferating Other, is ultimately reliant on the Other for the definition of the beleaguered colonial self that is imagined. As Professor Sergio Della Pergola, the leading authority in demography and statistics, responding to a question on calculating the percentages of Jews inside Israel by an MK, concludes: “When the Jewish population stays the same Jewish population [meaning consistent], this [i.e., the fact of this consistency] is very substantial, and this [again the consistency of the Jewish population] is the *foundation of the thinking for the future* [to maintain the Jewish state]” (for a more detailed account of the exchange between the various experts and committee

TABLE 6.1 Population, birth rate and natural increase in selected cities, 2010

Total population	Live births	Crude births rate per 1,000 population	Natural increase per 100	Place	Research institute
2,513,283	65,350	26	2.3	West Bank	PCBS*
1,535,120	60,237	39.2	3.7	Gaza Strip	
6,121,30	125,505	20.7	–	Israel Jews	CBS** & JIIS***
1,573,80	40,750	26.2	–	Israel Palestinian	
404,336	7,618	19.6	–	Tel Aviv-Yafo	CBS** & JIIS***
268,215	3,393	14.1	–	Haifa	
504,200	14,084	28.1	23.0	Jerusalem Jews and others	
283,900	8,299	29.6	27.2	Jerusalem Palestinian	
382,041	3,042	8	0.7	Jerusalem	PCBS*
600,364	19,652	32.7	3	Hebron	
301,296	7,570	25.1	2.2	Ramallah	
340,117	9,565	28.1	2.5	Nablus	

* PCBS: Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics (2011)

** CBS: Central Bureau of Statistics (2011)

*** JIIS: Jerusalem Institute for Israel Studies (2011)

participants, see Committee for Immigration, Absorption and Diaspora Affairs – Protocol 132, (2011).

Table 6.1 compares population, birth rates and natural increase in various selected cities. It demonstrates the differences between the numbers of Palestinians in East Jerusalem according to the Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics (PCBS) as compared to the numbers provided by the Jerusalem Institute for Israel Studies (JIIS), which in turn are based on statistics from the Israeli Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS) and the Israeli Ministry of Health. The natural increase of population, the number of births and the rate of births per 1,000 persons according to the CBS (2011) is significantly greater than that given by PCBS (2011) data.

As one can see from the data for 2010 concerning population growth, the birth rate in Jerusalem varies from one source to another and exemplifies the colonial logic of a demographic threat posed by the colonized. This is only an example of the way in which the number of Palestinians is produced in a manner that aims to create panic. The Israeli CBS together with the JIIS reported that the total population on the Palestinian side of Jerusalem was 283,900 persons, while the PCBS reported 382,041. The discrepancy between the two sets of numbers was not only limited to the total population, but also to live births; the CBS and the JIIS reported a number of 8,299, while the PCBS reported 3,042, less than half the number reported in the Israeli statistics. Moreover, when looking at data regarding the crude birth rates per 1,000, the CBS and the JIIS reported 29.6, while PCBS reported a crude birth rate of 8. Such discrepancy in statistical reports leads the CBS and the JIIS to report that the natural increase per 100 was 27.2, while the PCBS reported that the natural increase per 100 was 0.7.

The two datasets tell two different stories. The first is one that fits the Israeli narrative, which produces and constructs Palestinians as a demographic threat through a high rate of population growth, and the other, a story of a smaller population that is hunted by the Palestinians and which has a lower birth rate compared to the first. Statistical reports and data produced in the OPT including East Jerusalem, describe both the shadow that colonial formations spread over Palestinians' intimate biosocial ecologies and the power politics that seeps into the production of knowledge. The discrepancy between the two sets of data, as boldly embedded within the notion of the demographic threat of the Palestinian terrorists (including those yet to be born), violates Haya's and many other Palestinian women's rights to give birth within safe and secure conditions and spaces. The Israeli figures aim to tell a story that serves the colonial agenda and logic.

The reading of the above-contested numbers are at the center of my argument, for these numbers cut into the very fabric of Palestinian existence and contribute directly to a production of knowledge that destroys Palestinian women's chances for a safe pregnancy and delivery. The reading poses questions about that which is hidden behind the numbers. What is embedded in the control over the social fabric of everyday life, birth and death? Edward Said's *Orientalism* (1978) points us to the fact that what lies behind the archives of the colonizers, as behind the statistics of occupiers as in our study, are racial ideologies and hierarchies. It is the obsession of the occupiers and their

bureaucracies and bureaucrats with the intimate details of who is sleeping with whom, who is marrying whom, who is giving birth and whose children are to be recognized.

THE EVERYDAY: CALCULUS AND REVOLT

These Manichean processes of accounting and the consequences of this practice on the daily lives of Palestinian women are marked in startling and poignant ways by the words of Reham. I interviewed her about a month after her delivery:

Everyday another story, another worry; every movement is calculated here in our area, they are after us, even in our own homes. Listen to me carefully, they are after the babies in our wombs. They are – they are scaring us, hoping we will end up unable to bring children into the world. They want us all *aqer* [unable to give birth]. If I tell you only my story of the five days before, during and after giving birth to my third child, you will understand why I say they are after us.

I am thirty-six years old and have two children. We live in Um al Sharayet, past the Qalandia checkpoint. I needed to go have the baby in Jerusalem, so I went from one office to the other, got a permit to pass into East Jerusalem. It was hard, they drove me mad [going] from [one] doctor to [another] doctor, getting medical reports – as if there is a need for a report; they could see [with] their eyes that I [was] pregnant. That day, I got a permit for three days only, so I had one [day to] be away from my children and two days to have the baby while staying with my sister-in-law in Jerusalem. The days were long. I was worried about not being able to pass the checkpoint, and it was hard; people were pushing me, the soldiers made me wait for a long time and I was extremely tired.

I managed to cross the checkpoint. I was so exhausted, but I needed to go to the doctor and ask her to find a way to help me have the baby as soon as possible and before the permit expired. I needed to rest, but also needed to have the baby so as to be able to return to my daughters. The doctor said that all I could do to expedite the birth was to drink *mairamiya* [sage] tea and honey, so I did that all day long, and on the second day, early morning, I had the baby. I could have had the baby in another hospital, but my husband was worried that he might lose his residency if the child were to be born in Muhtadi hospital. They control us, they control our bodies. You know, my parents are in Hebron now, for they lost their residency rights and their house in Jerusalem was demolished.

During my pregnancy I was afraid to move. I did not visit my parents. Each day missed my parents so much. This pregnancy made me miss

them so much. During my pregnancy, I used to call my mother and would tell her that I was afraid that I would have a mentally disabled child, for they keep invading the house and scaring us. I was afraid of not being able to have the baby during the [time period of the] three-day permit. I could not sleep for entire nights. I used to dream that someone was choking me, but even when suffocated, you need to behave as if you are not depressed, for you still need to cross the checkpoint, accept the humiliating acts of the soldiers, be patient. They control every breath we take, every step, every tear.

There are once again some obvious – if not surprising – similarities between the testimonies I have offered thus far (one might even generalize about these common aspects as being understandably “human”) – for example, the sense of isolation and aloneness, an intense sense being persecuted and surveiled, and an overwhelming sense of helplessness. These are the particularly acute reactions of a woman about to give birth who feels she cannot, or perhaps more critically *may not*, count on the presence of her husband, her parents and her extended family at such a time. And because those who have power over her (and we must note that this power comes only and precisely because she has been identified by the state as a Palestinian woman) do not count her as human. Given the conditions that obtain as Palestinian women prepare to give birth, the ensuing anxieties, as noted in all of the testimonials, are both understandable and, again, unsurprising.

However, what struck me about Reham’s narrative is an interesting dichotomy at play that actually engenders all that she feels – a sense of a doom that comes across as capricious, incalculable, a kind of menace that could strike at any time. But the dichotomy is that while Reham experiences the consequences as random, and thus consequently more threatening, *the elements contributing to her feelings have in fact been calculated in every detail*. She mentions the various material manifestations that are the cause of what she feels: the denial of the obvious fact that she is pregnant; the difficulty of obtaining the right “permits” and “documents” that would allow her to find a doctor; the precise amount of time she has been allotted (three days) for a situation which is, in reality, open-ended (while a timeframe for giving birth can be established, a precise moment cannot be determined); the perpetual anxieties of navigating the “checkpoints”; and the rudeness and inhumanity of the soldiers who man the checkpoints. All this she speaks of, and it is not difficult to see or imagine the cumulative effect of these stresses on her body – and as I have been insisting, on her psyche as well.

But in re-reading Reham's words, I notice something else, which is both startling and in some way cause for hope: *Reham herself is aware of the dichotomy of which I speak*. Namely, the precise calculus that is at the base of the seemingly random assaults upon the daily activities of her life are in this case further aggravated as she must process her life as a pregnant woman in a conflict zone. For Reham herself notes in her testimonial that "they are after us." These words suggest to me that she is able to imagine the unseen and vast apparatus of the state as an indomitable will that asserts its power upon her body and all the detailed aspects of her life. And I argue that in her understanding of this truth not as random (however random the affects may appear), but as a meticulous calculus, she is triumphant. This may be a Sisyphean victory in her act of giving birth in Jerusalem, when such birth becomes a political act; an act of defiance: "They are after the babies in our wombs." But as Albert Camus (1942) has pointed out in his celebrated analysis of this Greek myth, Sisyphus curses the gods for the punishment they have devised for him – the utter alienation of futile labor – and in that ability to curse, to recognize the nature of the cruelty being inflicted on him, Sisyphus is victorious. Similarly, in being able to decipher the will of the state beneath the random surface of the assaults upon her, I argue that Reham gains a victory beyond the materiality of successfully birthing a new human being.

As is evidenced by Reham's voice, we must unpack the motivations and ostensible logic of the perpetual threat to Israel's security as inscribed on Reham's body; the inscription on her body is conducted in the very politics and structure of everydayness. For any and all aspects of these particular colonial strategies of everydayness, and the particular colonial occupations within it, are constructed as an effect and after-effect of concerns over "security" and its production of fear. Reham was able to perceive that, while her body and her psyche, as she gave birth, were extreme in their fragility and that she was virtually defenseless against anything that might be done to her, her body at the moment of giving birth and beyond that time was inextricably connected to discourses, ideologies, technologies and techniques of surveillance and control. What is also critical to note here is that from the moment of birth, the body of the Palestinian child is under colonial control.

The ideology behind such attempts at complete control, and the actions taken to execute that ideology, is reiterated in the policy paper (the name of the document is itself telling) by Nadav Shragai (2010),

wherein he explains the complex of state-ratified “reasons” for annexing the human rights of Palestinians in Jerusalem to the discretions of the Israeli state. In this policy paper, he describes national fears and anxieties (ostensibly) based on demography, and he consequently justifies the need for the ethnic cleansing of some areas. He explains how the shifting of populations is deemed necessary to ensure that the Palestinian population does not ever get large enough to constitute a “threat to Israeli security” beyond the already-existing fact of its present existence. The continual defensive posture of the Israeli state, one that creates economic strangleholds leading to the inability of Arab families to pursue their daily life activities, often causes these families to become unable to safeguard their own homes and families and to live under constant humiliation and fear. In his paper, Shragai simply labels this as a way of “safeguarding Jews” (Shragai, 2010, pp. 11–13).

One of my salient concerns has been to privilege the voices of Palestinian women who are always already silenced. My work in any and all capacities always begins with these voices, for they articulate and point to the atrocities that are committed in the region, but in these narratives I also find evidence of the conviction and courage of the women. The fact that these voices remain to be heard, that these women continue to resist colonial oppression attests to their triumph in the midst of chaos. In the stories told by these women, the centrality of everyday life remains – maintaining one’s home, cooking and caring, keeping children and the family as safe as possible. As Reham spoke to me, she recalled the everyday acts that sustained her: the coffee in the morning; the persistence in keeping her residence as a meeting place for friends; crying on her husband’s shoulder when she felt emotionally spent; the food she prepared for her sister-in-law who had hosted her during her delivery; and much more. For many, these acts may sound to be not worthy of note. But as I listen to Reham and many others like her, I came to realize that it is through these daily acts of living that these women create their creative spaces, and therein lies their political impact and value. To my way of thinking, there is an authentic resistance in simply deciding to live with as much dignity and sanity as possible, for in all structures of power, no matter how pervasive, are also the seeds of their subversion. Foucault never argued or suggested in his work that “power” as a schematic system will always be overthrown, but instead stated that the resistance inherent to power will always cause power to be re-defined. And acts of subversion, no matter how minute or futile they may appear, play a productive

role in determining the direction of such resistance. Similarly, as Adriana Johnson writes in her essay “Everydayness and Subalternity,” the everyday is the level at which hegemony functions, the “threshold at which it seeks to become invisible as such, its violence buried deep, so that it is lived as consent rather than domination” (2007, p. 23); yet, it is also the level at which hegemony fails to function. Of particularly relevance here is the work of de Certeau (1988) and especially his insightful definition of the “postmodern condition” as the failure of a “master narrative,” one that is replaced by what he has called the competing and plurivocal “*petits récits*” (“small narratives”). For these multiple voices reveal the creative and unpredictable ways in which people manipulate, evade and negotiate their own environments (see also Felski, 2002; Tan, 1996). They are, as de Certeau himself notes, the “tactics of the weak” (1988, p. 37), but he also affirms the potential capacity of such tactics to subvert what might seem like unmitigated strength.

INVISIBILITY AND LIMINAL SPACE

There are some inherent complexities in arguing for and characterizing the acts of daily living as being and/or as having subversive potential. For often, such acts and their consequences do not have the impact – both symbolic and material – of more dramatic or obvious revolt. In fact, the quotidian acts of living are often invisible, being enacted by those who are themselves invisible. Thus, the dynamics of such subversion, as I am arguing, that are more often than not enacted by Palestinian women frequently take on the characteristics of shadow play that is difficult to decipher precisely. As I have noted in my article on the politics of researching invisibility (Shalhoub-Kevorkian, 2010b) and as other scholars have noted, invisibility is often difficult to theorize (Harootunian, 2004; Johnson, 2007; Ries, 2002). The voices of these women provide a context for understanding the daily negotiation of (often random) violence and may also provide, in turn, a way of understanding the invisibility of which I speak. It is important to understand that I am not speaking of the arguably “invisible” nature of the powerless here, but rather something more specifically contextual to the context. I generally hesitate to use the word “culture” (or “cultural”) as a way to suggest an understanding of difference, because I think the word is often used as a panacea for very material gaps in Western scholarship about the Other and the resultant failure to actually understand

“difference.” However, in this case I do think that the inherent subversion of “invisible” acts by the invisible have to be accounted for in cultural terms. The everyday acts of living are not only to be understood as simply gendered, as with the notion that “keeping the home is a woman’s domain.” But what I am arguing is that, despite that gendered division, the willful act of deciding to continue surviving and giving birth is itself perceived as political – as subversion, revolt and agency – *by the women themselves*. In other words, the subversive or political nature of continuation of resistance is not an afterthought resulting from “theoretical” speculation, but rather is inherent to the act itself, to *being woman* in the given context.

The voices of these women convince me that we should refuse didactic and absolute inscriptions of the dominated and subordinated, the protected and the protector, and should instead consider the space of invisibility as one that is more inherently liminal. To consider such liminal possibilities, let me present the voice of Lama:

I was born in Jerusalem, but then my father started teaching in Bethlehem, so we rented an apartment there because it was hard for him to handle the checkpoints and reach his work without being humiliated in front of everybody. After a while, the Israelis took our Jerusalemite IDs, although we returned to our house in Jerusalem. I am a nurse. I studied nursing in Bethlehem University and I work in the hospital there, so I used the hospital’s ambulance to pass the checkpoint, to cross and have my baby in Jerusalem. This is how I managed to get to the hospital without dying from fear of being caught by them [the Israelis], although I was in a state of horror, even more, it is hard to express.

My husband is Jerusalemite, but they still can’t decide whether I deserve the Jerusalem ID or not, although my family is from here.

My pregnancy was filled with severe anxieties, fear, feelings of depression, always constrained and thinking about each and every act, feeling always trapped, to the degree [that I was] dreaming about being tied up with wires. You know, the wires the Jews put on the checkpoints, those filled with edgy ends – the barbed wire – that was my dream, being tied up with barbed wire around my face, even inside my body, preventing my lungs and heart from working.

The night before I had my baby – I had him four weeks before time [the due date], I was on duty in the hospital. I closed my eyes to rest and [then came thoughts of the barbed] wires, the inability to breathe, and [I experienced] so much anxiety, then I started feeling pain. I called the doctors and my husband, and they ordered the ambulance for me.

At the checkpoint they questioned my pain; do you think they count us as human? To question my pain, when I am wet, all wet, and they can see it. I lost my water; the baby is drying up, just look at us. We have stopped [thinking of] ourselves as human, we are all imprisoned, we were held at the checkpoint without even having anyone look at our faces or talk to us; they did not talk, touch or look at us, as if we are animals. Even the hospital here is like a prison, look at all the women around you, each one has a story, we are all persecuted prisoners.

(Interview conducted in the hospital four days following the birth of her child)

I noted in Reham's testimonial an awareness of an experiential and epistemic split in terms of the daily disruptions (and violence) she experiences, disruptions that appear as both random and calculated. A similar dichotomy of experience and knowledge, a dual *knowingness*, is noted by Lama: She speaks of the invisibility, a sense of not being valued to the point of feeling as if she were an animal. Yet the experiences she relates point to her extreme visibility as she traverses the spaces allowed to her. Once again, I argue that her words reveal her own knowledge of this duality at the heart of what she experiences, a duality that renders the space of her being as one that is liminal, continually being (re)inscribed and transacted by those who have power over that space and, by implication, over Lama herself.

In speaking of the duality at the heart of many of the experiences described by the women's voices, we need not only examine the abstract – the fears, the anxieties and sense of impending doom that they describe. We can look at material manifestations of this duality as well. Note, for example, the repeated reference to the appropriate forms of identification that is required for Palestinians in Jerusalem – from state-issued IDs to “papers,” “documents” and the like. But what the narratives repeatedly reveal is that ultimately the ID is worthless, in that any value it has, any “clearance” it may provide, any movement from place to place that the ID may authorize is ultimately dependent on the caprice of the person to whom that ID is being presented. In fact, so many of the testimonials in this chapter point to the fact that the issuance of the ID itself seems illogical in the extreme. As they point out, there is in fact no rationale behind how the ID identifies one or where one's residency may be located. For example, Lama points to the fact that even though her husband is identified as a Jerusalemite and that her family is from Jerusalem, the authorities remain undecided about her eligibility to a Jerusalemite ID and are hesitant to grant her

a similar status. So, once again, we have the tension of rendering one invisible by *giving them an identity that renders them hyper-visible, for the ID (as well as its attending and ultimate worthlessness) always already identifies the carrier as a trespasser.* Lama carries an ID that renders her invisible and that posits her in a realm, to invoke Julia Kristeva's (2002) concept of absolute abjection, in which "they did not talk, touch, or look at us, as if we are animals."

As horrific as Lama's testimony is regarding her humiliation at the checkpoint after her waters had broken, it is almost needless to say that her story is hardly unique. Delays, abuses and humiliation caused much suffering to birthing and pregnant women, and in some instances resulted in women being forced to give birth at the checkpoints (see Abdul-Rahim et al., 2009; Giacaman et al., 2005; Giacaman et al., 2006; Kitzinger, 2005; Long, 2006; Round Up, 2005). In fact, such stories are many and can be heard repeatedly (as Lama said, "look around, every woman here has a story"). Moreover, the wide provenance of such stories is supported by a soldier's testimony, one of the few who has chosen to break the silence of what often happens at the checkpoints. He speaks of an occurrence in Nablus in 2003 that he will never forget. He refers to the case of a girl, around sixteen years old, who was on her way back home after having given birth. She claimed to have proof of having given birth in a box that she was carrying. The soldiers asked her what was in the box and she replied that it was her baby who had died while she was in labor and that she was returning him to the village to bury him: "The general then wanted to see if this was true, so he opened the box and saw the baby; he did not speak for a week afterward. This was a white fetus" (Breaking the Silence, 2003).

Again, it is important to keep in mind that as horrific as such a story may be, the event is neither unique nor atypical. Such narratives and testimonies reveal once again the perverse and dark side of Israel's ostensible "security theology." What has ensued is a total militarization of space both as material and as a more conceptual notion involving citizenship/residents and the rights that obtain (or should obtain) therein. With regard to the ways in which both of these spaces are inscribed on the body, it is interesting to note some contemporary scholarship on the concept of "embodiment," particularly in terms of research on childbirth. Walsh (2010), for example, explores the ways in which lived experiences of the body are connected to wider social inscriptions such as birth settings and professional and societal attitudes (see also Davis and Walker, 2010; Reiger and Dempsey, 2006).

As Lama and I were talking, Salwa, a thirty-four-year-old woman who was sitting up in her bed beside her listening to us, began sharing her own ordeals with me. As I re-read the transcripts of her narrative, I was reminded once again not just of the common threads among these testimonies that build into a larger, communal conversation but also of the insights and *intuition* that these women bring to the discussion. While the attempt to extract a “theory” from the chaos of data and experience is important – indeed, critical – I am always moved by the implicit implications in the lived experiences of these women. In her words, Salwa unself-consciously points to the invasive inscriptions of the state. She told me, with a pervasive melancholy in her voice, about what has been lost in her life, in the lives of the women around her:

You know, in the past, women used to have their babies in their home. They used to control the place, they arranged their support, stayed around their children and got all the help needed from those around them.

Now, because we are afraid of not having our kids registered by the Israelis, because we are worried that we will be uprooted again and again, and because medicine is more advanced, we have lost our ability to control our lives and our bodies.

The time of giving birth, as my mother told me, is precious. Women knew how to ease the pain of birthing on women, by asking her to push, to breathe, to be slow and patient. Now, look at us, waiting at check-points instead of being in our own beds. Being exposed to soldiers and doctors, instead of someone we trust, just to be registered by them, just to be counted. And listen to Lama, to Taghreed [another woman in the hospital], to my own experience, and you will learn how everybody is weakening us.

Clearly, Salwa remembers and laments the loss of women’s communal sharing during times of pregnancy – very much a matriarchal system wherein women helped women not just with the immediate birth, but with the passing on of experience and wisdom. Salwa puts it simply, although so much is implied by her words, that “women knew how to ease the pain.”

There is another critical lament in what Salwa says – the loss of control, an agency that she has clearly given up, has had to give up, because of the intrusion of the state. As she states, birth in state-controlled hospitals is now a necessity because it is an event that must now be “registered” by the state. Of course, an official record of birth is in itself

hardly irregular, given that this is the policy of most nations. However, as we have heard from the testimonials of pregnant women (and I am only presenting here a fraction of the thirty-seven interviews we conducted), there are many realities that obtain when a Palestinian woman goes to the hospital to have her baby. This is a reality that Salwa depicts succinctly and starkly by formulating the shift in terms of the checkpoints and the difference from the comfort and security of one's own bed, surrounded by caregivers one knows and trusts. Salwa's conclusion is to "Ask anyone, there are stories everywhere."

ONTOLOGICAL CLAUSTROPHOBIA: TRYING TO TAKE A DEEP BREATH

Throughout this chapter, I have paused here and there to point to the commonalities in the narratives shared by the women whose voices are present in these pages. Most of these thematic repetitions have to do with the material travails that the women confront daily: the overarching setting of one's life in which one needs to have the appropriate ID papers; of having to be aware of where and how one travels through the spaces of occupation; and the almost obsessive concerns with the checkpoints (it is critical for the reader to know that these checkpoints are not permanent or fixed, but that a checkpoint can be set up anywhere and at any time – this random aspect of the checkpoints is a critical source of the sense of insecurity and fear that they inspire). Aside from such material references common within all of the testimonials, there are some other themes in the narratives, be they of feeling trapped, persecuted or out of breath, that are less easily understood or explained and that can be perceived as abstract. But I would like to make the claim that any such inherent abstraction that may obtain does not make these references any less critical to understand or examine. One set of references that continually emerge among the voices of these women are issues related to breathing: being able or not able to take a breath; feelings of being choked, suffocated or gagged (literally and symbolically – not having a voice); a sense that the material and conceptual space around one is always closing in, collapsing in. We might think of it as a kind of *ontological claustrophobia*.

Not surprisingly, the women were deeply emotional when they referred to issues of breathing – primarily described as sensations of being suffocated. At times as I listened to the women, I felt that their being able to give voice to those feelings was cathartic for them, even

if only in a small way. It is not always possible, within the limitations we must adhere to here, to present these conversations in their full context or richness, but let me present some of the significant fragments from the voices I heard that were related to me in ways both material and conceptual to the simple, human act of “taking a breath”:

Here in our village, the Jews always throw gas grenades at us, and I smell it all the time, even when no one else smells it. I fear one day I will stop breathing because of the gas. The pregnancy was hard; during the delivery I was checked, they gave me oxygen to breathe, no breathing. Even in a prison you get a space for breathing. So, you become silent, you carry on, breastfeed your child, enjoy his smell, his laughter, his development, without words, without complaining, and sometimes without breathing. I feel that even my lungs are persecuted; even when I breastfeed my son, I worry about his breathing. All I want, all I am asking for, is a breathing space.

(Hana, thirty-three years old)

I was pregnant for thirty-one weeks when I visited my parents in Bethlehem. Then, I felt pain, and they took me urgently [as an emergency visit] to the hospital. I was told that I would have an early delivery, in Bethlehem. I was informed that I would soon have the baby, and I could not leave the place. Fear . . . and my lungs felt choked. I needed to decide and fast what to do. I was in pain and my husband was not with me. I just pulled myself from the bed and told my brother-in-law to take me to the checkpoint in Jerusalem. The doctor made me sign a paper that I was responsible for my newborn, which I did. I cried all the way to the checkpoint. All the way, my husband was on the other side of the checkpoint. When we arrived at the checkpoint, I was in immense pain and started knocking on the car windows, screaming, asking them [the guards at the checkpoint] to allow us to pass; when we arrived [at] the hospital I could not breathe. I fainted; I felt I [had] lost the child.

After I was back in the room, after the operation [a C-section], I asked to see the baby. But I was told that the baby was in danger and might not make it, his lungs did not function, he did not breathe well, and they gave him injections for his lungs – each lung, one injection.

(Areen, thirty-one years old)

I came to the hospital with my brother-in-law. I actually used my sister-in-law’s ID card to pass the checkpoint and we managed – to be honest with you, I am not willing to live in Jerusalem; they control our breathing and I now live in a better place than this prison called Jerusalem. I just

came to give birth here, to make sure I was not hurting my children's future . . . I will do all I can to allow my children to live.

(Enam, twenty-seven years old)

What comes to the forefront in all these narratives is once again the daily trials that Palestinian women must endure in order to go about the daily activities of life, and also the way in which these trials become acute and aggravated during unusual circumstances, such as the crisis described by these women during their pregnancy, specifically the time just before they gave birth. Each one has differing details to offer (though some common elements prevail once again), but they all speak – I think on a material and metaphoric-psychic level – of the difficulties of breathing.

Some of these difficulties, no doubt, come from the trauma that is induced by the extreme situations they must endure – the uncertainties and insecurities associated with the births they describe. But on another level, the act of breathing, especially the desire to be able to breathe peacefully, takes on the quality of a lament, a dirge, a kind of song. As Hana puts it so poignantly: “Even in a prison you get a space for breathing.” But we should note that the material fears commingle with the psychological trauma: Hana begins with the actual trauma of the tear gas that she has become so familiar with. That reality subsequently blends into a surreal zone where she always smells the gas, suspects its presence even when others cannot. For a while she can counterpoise the persistence of that awful smell with a smell that is more pleasant and life-giving, namely, the scent of her baby, a scent she associates with laughter and his growth, and of the bonding of a mother and son. But such moments are necessarily scarce given the conditions of life in the OPT; such moments are fleeting. Even more worthy of note is that the fears of the mother often get projected onto the children they have given birth to (by this I do not mean that her concerns are not real or are illegitimate). Hana imagines her baby gasping for breath as she breastfeeds him: a moment of nourishment, of life-sustaining maternal milk passing from her body into his becomes traumatized, stigmatized by her own fears of not being able to continue breathing. Similarly, Areen projects onto her son her fears for her child's ability to take his life-giving breaths, to breathe peacefully. She reports that he has a breathing problem, that his lungs are not functioning as they should, and she uses graphic language not just to describe the procedure her son endured, but also, I believe, to reveal the fear that still haunted her words: “his lungs

did not function, he did not breathe well, and they gave him injections for his lungs – each lung, one injection.”

This perpetual merging of actual situations, real events and actual breaths with the realms of the surreal and metaphoric, where “breathing” becomes associated with peace, with open space, where the world does not seem to be pressing in on the subject and suffocating her, is to my mind very telling of settler colonial invasive violence. The metaphor of the prison comes readily into play. Hana mentions feeling imprisoned, of not having room to breathe. Enam speaks of the prison that is Jerusalem, a prison that she is condemned to give birth in, but also speaks of it as the only space for life, where she wants her child to be born. The inherent contradiction between feeling imprisoned in the same space that she finds life and future for her child reveals another complexity of giving birth in Jerusalem. For a child, not to be born in Jerusalem is perceived as a kind of death, of being unrecognized as far as the legality of his or her birth status is concerned. Consequently, Jerusalemite parents try to do all they can to ensure the child is born in a place where the legality of his or her birthing certificate as Jerusalemite can be officially registered.

A report of the National Council for the Child (NCC) stated that:

A group of children living in Israel without full rights is the group of children without Israeli citizenship. It is difficult to estimate the exact size of this group inasmuch as it includes, among others, children of illegal foreign workers who do not register in the Ministry of Interior. Nearly 6.8% of children in Israel do not have Israeli citizenship. More than two thirds of them are residents of East Jerusalem. The rest include children of legal foreign workers, immigrant children whose status has not been resolved, and children of mixed marriages between citizen and non-citizen, especially between an Arab-Israeli and a Palestinian resident of the occupied territories. This group of children living in Israel without Israeli citizenship is considered high risk due to their limited rights. Israeli society must consider the fact that it is creating a growing contingent of children who are discriminated against due to their parents’ status. These children are exposed to the dangers lurking over children in general, while the law does not recognize them or protect their basic rights.

(NCC, 2012)

As we heard in the stories that Enam and Areen had to tell, Jerusalem becomes a place of interiorized conflict, of further suffocation. Despite their descriptions of Jerusalem as a militarized and suffocating zone

that impacts their bodies, their movements through space and time, and their psyches, they nevertheless know that to be born outside of Jerusalem is to be born in a virtual dead zone. Areen risked her own health and life to reach Jerusalem; although she reached her destination, sadly, her baby did not survive.

The women often spoke of their breathing problems lasting throughout their pregnancies, sometimes persisting for months at a time. Hana had described to me how her breathing problems had overwhelmed her at times, actually positioning her in a space that she described as one of overwhelming silence. But as she asserted, the one thing she did not do was succumb to the silence. She protested by affirming her and her children's claims to life – to be born in a space of recognition that is Jerusalem. Hana spoke of her father and brother being shot by a settler Jew and of the added stigma she had to endure because she was especially feared as the daughter of a *shaheed* (a martyr). As such, there were further regulations and controls over her life. For example, she mentioned that she could not ride in their car with her husband on the night she gave birth because there is a special fine imposed on those who carry West Bankers (such as Hana) in their car. Such examples of resistance are everywhere. However small or benign they may appear to others, the women spoke to me of their acts of resistance with pride and conviction. Aida, a twenty-two-year-old mother, told me her story of strength. She spoke of her experiences at the checkpoint. At one point while pregnant, when the soldiers were looking at her, she looked at her belly and told her unborn son: "Listen my child, look at those soldiers, never, do you hear me well, never behave like them, never."

I feel it is fair to say that Hana's and Aida's dialogue with themselves and their unborn children, at the very least, modifies the conditions of their surveillance and control through space and time, even if their words and acts do not materially change it. Their agency challenges their oppressor's attempt to tear them away from themselves and break them down. It is important as feminists and as women to acknowledge such moments of resistance, to see that women like Aida and Hana (and all the others) are not passively accepting of the limited possibilities of the very tight spaces they find themselves in, spaces that at times literally cut off their breathing and make them feel, to use their own words, "choked" and "suffocated." These women always find ways to overcome the negativity and violence of the present and also to recast their lives in a creative and affirming manner, and thus overthrow the

tenets of the “security and biblical theology” perpetrated by those who oppose them.

INSCRIBING POWER OVER WOMEN'S BIRTHING BODIES

Women giving birth in occupied Jerusalem and under the Israeli settler colonial regime must contend with long, and sometimes dangerous, journeys to medical centers or to health professionals who are often located far away (if they are available at all), and, as I have been illustrating throughout the discussion, available health care must be negotiated within spatial and military organizations that are specifically designed to frighten, limit and obstruct the movements of the population.

The impairment of movement through the geopolitical structure of space has been acute in Palestine. The shared narratives revealed that the mobility of specific Palestinian women is aggravated by physical hardships such as the checkpoints and roadblocks, especially during pregnancy and in times of childbirth. The effect of restrictions on mobility is much greater on women than that of men, due to gender-specific regulations such as restrictions on travel without male accompaniment and so on (note the specific testimonials of several of the women in this chapter; see also Macklin, 2004). As a number of authors have shown, the intricate and complex system of surveillance, the permits required, the military checkpoints and closures throughout the occupied West Bank and East Jerusalem have all had significant implications for women's experiences of childbirth, not only rendering journeys to medical facilities exceedingly problematic, but also in some instances resulting in women being forced to give birth at the checkpoints, as mentioned above.

The inscription of power over women's birthing bodies – be this by subjecting them to checkpoints, preventing them from having their babies in a safe and secure manner or denying them access to hospitals and the support of their loved ones when in labor – deeply burdened women and increased their suffering. Disputing their status as legal entities (by refusing to give them and their newborns ID numbers) and through other reproductive policies displays a structurally embedded colonial political economy of otherization – a clear logic of elimination. The politicization of childbirth indicates that Israel's biopolitical concerns, especially those concerning the production, maintenance

and control of “undesirable” populations, reconstitute the Palestinian woman’s birthing body as a security threat and thus as a body that should be disciplined or made to disappear, or at least to suffer. Ginsberg and Rapp (1991) examine the ways in which states have historically been vested in population control and eugenic pursuits by actively encouraging the reproduction of some groups and discouraging the reproduction of others. But in a settler colonial context such as in East Jerusalem, population control exhibits additional ideologies and technologies of control. Palestinian women’s ordeals reveal that colonial concerns, methodologies and manipulations invaded their bodies and lives for the purpose of counting the number of Palestinians who can keep their residency as Jerusalemites and for the purpose of who can give birth, where, when and how. Their ordeals demonstrate the way in which the marking of pregnant bodies and lives is a heavy form of surveillance that situates some Palestinians in very specific articulations of space, place and time. This surveillance and the precise location of bodies inscribed a political topography on those bodies based on a continual counting and accounting for even the most subtle shifts in population. Both the colonial methodologies and ideologies behind such an accounting praxis is readily verifiable by looking at official Israeli documents that reveal the dynamics of discussions concerning population shifts and demography. Birthing women, their bodies, as well as their spaces did not escape the subjugation of time when about to give birth. Their knowledge, as with their narratives, refused to accept the hegemonic discourse of “security” and biblical rights for dictating what is to be considered sacred and profane. Their acts, dreams and even breathing (or lack thereof) aimed at challenging colonial theologies – both biblical and securitized – and the everydayness of the latter’s policies of annihilation. The unseen and unacknowledged Israeli practices, laws and modes of domination, as demonstrated in the narratives shared here, are not solely made up of fixed and finite sets of regulations. They are the interchanging and malleable conditions of racism, for they combine both fixed and fluid elements, turning racial violations of women’s bodies and lives into mobile, fluid, mercury-like racism. I argue that such colonial terrorism is infused into everyday practices, to impose surveillance through technologies of control and through securitized hegemonic knowledge production such as Israeli physical restrictions and statistical production of knowledge.

Furthermore, in listening to narratives of birthing women’s ordeals, their fears and discussion of “birth” in Jerusalem, we have to take into

account the various economies of birth that are prevalent in the OPT. What complicates such a discussion is that the physical and conceptual aspects within it meet at a middle ground where the psyche and the body must inevitably be discussed in tandem. In the testimonials of various Palestinian women discussed here, the body space and the material time and space become implicated in their experiences; ironically, time comes to be conceptualized in their words as a place/space of timelessness, an eternity of waiting and wishing for the multiple assaults on their daily lives to be over. Days, months and moments merge together in a confluence of suffering that is so continuous that the measuring of time passing becomes meaningless, nothing short of impossible. The women's testimonials call attention to the ways in which power comes to be exercised over the corporeal body of the pregnant woman, as well as over her mere ability to breathe.

CHAPTER SEVEN

CONCLUSION: NEWBORNS, NEW DEATHS AND THE "GRAVEDIGGERS"

May, a pregnant twenty-nine-year-old teacher, started feeling pain in her abdomen following a long walk home. Earlier, she had been running away from tear-gas grenades thrown close to the school in which she teaches. She had walked for over fifty minutes after failing to convince the soldiers surrounding the school that her pupils and the teachers might be injured by the tear gas. The soldiers were after three boys accused of throwing stones at a military vehicle. May ended up taking the long route home, escorting her pupils through gas clouds and smelling something she described as "suffocating." Her pain was great, but this was her first pregnancy after five years of marriage and she refused to leave home to go to the doctor, fearing she would encounter additional gas on the way to the hospital.

After the gassing, May had stopped feeling her fetus' movements, and four days later the doctor explained to her that her baby was dead. However, she refused to abort the pregnancy for over two weeks. When I interviewed her, she explained:

I was in such pain, physical [pain], but more psychological [pain]. My heart was aching. I felt that their military occupation not only occupied my womb – they managed to kill my baby while it was inside me. They succeeded in deporting my baby, succeeded in uprooting my baby, while it was in my womb. I refused to do the abortion for a long time; I kept him dead inside me. I walked during the two weeks, walked and walked in silence, I barely spoke to anyone, not even my own husband. I wanted my son to know I did not abandon him [crying]. I tried my utmost, but they are after us, after the young and the old, even the unborn.

May’s refusal to abort, her trial to keep a dead fetus inside her in order to state clearly her quest for life, for continuity and for hope, traces the outlines of the inscription of pain over the native’s life and body. Her ordeal marks the contours of her desire for life. Her intention in carrying her dead fetus for two weeks was to defy the soldiers’ security reasoning and deny their power over her.

Her loss and her power, her pain and her statements (both silent and vocalized) should be understood within the complex of the theologized political economy that leaves no space for newborns, new lives and new languages. Her voice and her acts at the very moment of birth and death, and prolonged for a period of two weeks, suggest a new opening but also a new closure of the analysis of the theologized and securitized political economy of fear under conditions of settler colonial violence. Her voice, as with so many of the voices shared in this book, and her wounds – both the bleeding and non-bleeding ones – amplify the claims for justice and the safety of those living in exile at home. Keeping her dead fetus “alive” while dead silently allowed her to survive (and resist) death – along with the suffering of each and every moment and every day – while creating power and agency out of the nothing that was left. Keeping her dead fetus “alive” allowed her to search for new ways, new orders and new possibilities in her confrontation with an internal death, the loss of an unborn child. The performative power of colonial Israel, in producing what Edward Said (1978) described as imaginative geographies, was inscribed over May’s birthing body as her community’s spaces of living and dying created the ways in which Palestinians are understood, and in which they are codified and produced. The asymmetric colonial productions of the Other, as other, shape its constitution of its identity, actions and determination.

Violence against newborns, as the violence, terror and war over Gaza in July 2014 and other Palestinian territories, captures the heart, nature and essence of the settler colonial project; this violence erases the future and the reproductive and productive power of the colonized, along with their agency and hope for a new and better life. In the midst of the harrowing massacres and debris of body parts pulled from the ruins in Gaza in July 2014, I conclude my theorization of security theology and its political economy of fear. The inscription of power over the unborn future of Palestinians and the unborn child of May is a language that attacks the most sacred shelter of all – the womb – and transforms it into a profane, “threatening” machinery to be feared and kept under surveillance. May’s act of keeping her dead fetus “alive” within her body

reflects a sense of shock, or perhaps a state of aphasia, but it also speaks loudly against violence, in both an actual and metaphoric voice. Her silence in her walk, and her walk in silence, disobeyed the rules and orders of her doctor, partner and family, and it shocked those around her and endangered her life. Her acts enhanced her dissent and her refusal of further dispossession at the same time as she sought some moments (indeed, days) of silence, some shelter in her own wounded body. Her speech, apparent in her desperate act of keeping the dead alive in the face of a regime of dispossession, struggles to open a dialogue for life, a space for some morality, or perhaps to raise some responsibility for those wounded by the long history and present condition of violent dispossession. In May’s act of holding her dead baby in her wounded womb, she signified her struggle to refuse aborting her child and her quest to give life, even in death. Her body demonstrates the inadequacy of the language of “security” and “fear,” while signaling her refusal to surrender to the colonial logic of erasure.

SECURITIZING THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF FEAR

What does it mean to take up the category of the “feared Other”? How can an investigation of the construction of a “feared Other” reveal the discursive relationships that produce their objects? And how do the sentiments involved with such fear replace the history of the otherized with the history of the powerful?

In examining the political economy of fear, I argued first that we must look beyond the binaries of colonial taxonomy that detects who is deserving of life and who does not have the right to life – to understand how fear functions and how is it reproduced through the colonizing “liberal” and “democratic” claims.” Second, I demonstrated how the power and violence of this taxonomy is intensified through technological means, through “advanced” and “civilized” tools, to separate and further surveil colonized peoples. In understanding the politics behind fear, and thus the fear industry, my aim was to invite the reader to discover the severely pervasive nature of the “hierarchies of distinction” in the otherized spaces of Palestinians in historic Palestine. In unveiling the hierarchies of distinction, the book uncovered the divisions between those who qualify and are entitled to be acknowledged as humans and those who are not. On the one hand are those who are deserving of internationally acknowledgement as humans. These are the ones who are deserving of internationally acknowledged human

rights, with secured and protected lives, with residency and citizenship rights, safe homes, dignified deaths and safe deliveries; they are thus classified as “deserving Others.” On the other hand are those who are always portrayed as “undeserving Others.” The book showed how global and local theologies based, first, on the Judaeo-Christian belief in the “chosen people” in the “promised land” and, second, the security theology blocked all means to negotiate the challenging of such otherness, while also maintaining a hierarchy of distinction between deserving and non-deserving Others. This hierarchy classified communities and created feared Others within a global political economy of denial of the Palestinians’ continuous day-to-day suffering and denial of their right to life. All such classifications and distinctions have been made “legally,” based on “liberal” means and “democratic” rules. The legalized and “moralized” acceptance of such a hierarchy of distinction, between deserving and non-deserving Others, has classified communities and circumscribed bodies, families, collectivities and spaces, and has assisted power holders in constructing a securitized political economy that dictates what, where, when and how fear can be used as a tool for dispossession. How can the fear industry supported by “liberal” and “democratic” “peace-seeking” claims allow or deny acknowledgement, disqualify some as being human and unequally distribute power?

The analysis of fear and the industry surrounding it opened up new spaces for understanding how politics (both global and local), histories of religion (of the sacred and the profane), continuous victimization and global sentiments toward some groups delineate the markers of race (see also Gregory, 2004). Racial hierarchies formulate an economy that dictates who is a security threat and who should be feared. Racial hierarchies further reflect that which constitutes “the political” and the mode in which the grammar of inequalities, recognizability and race operate and thereby determine who is a feared Other – thus demarcating who should live without security, without a home, and thus be denied safety even in the womb or the grave.

From reading the injustices marking Palestinians’ bodies and lives to reading the writing on the walls and understanding what goes on in the everyday, in bedrooms, in the most intimate moments at home, during birth and death, the chapters of this book have walked the reader through the complexity of the grammar of rights and the hierarchies of victimhood, arriving at the claim that the question is no longer how and why colonial discrimination is managed and operated through

securitized fear, but, rather, how can such a racial hierarchy continue without serious moral and political resistance? Hence, the goal of each chapter has been not only to illustrate the surveillance over land, minds and walls, as in the case of Tag Mehir, but also the surveillance over bedrooms, over who sleeps with whom (the Citizenship Law), surveillance over memory (the Nakba Law), surveillance over the home/land manifested in home demolitions, and the surveillance over the dead, the newly born and even the yet to be born, as examined in the previous two chapters. My analysis made inquiry into the intimate, the mundane, the unseen, unheard and unacknowledged spaces of Palestinian life and death. I sought to consider the demographic, familial, social and physical ordering of colonized spaces, the systems of control over dead bodies and burial, and how marital and sexual relations are saturated by securitized policies and practices. Thus, I chose to end with two very intimate zones of colonial governance: death and birth. Articulations of “security threats,” demonstrated in women’s birthing narratives and experiences, reveal the way in which zones of life – of birth itself – and spaces of love, parenthood and familial continuity become territories of colonial dispossessions and the “ground zero” for producing fear of the Other, maintaining a “hierarchy of distinction.”

Listening to the details of birthing mothers while following the intricacies of their experiences in moments of life and giving life, we begin to see the chaotic, confusing, loving, painful and happy moments of their family life. Yet, at the same time, we detect the “imagined geographies” that perform the racial grammar of security and fear, and that shape and bound these moments. The marking of difference of whose safety and lives matter, and who is unwanted, unseen and unacknowledged emerges from the depths of these stories. It was through this grammar of racism for marking difference, embedded in the colonial history of “liberal” and “democratic” values, that I became aware of the totalizing essentialisms at work in singling out the feared Others. And throughout this book, I have emphasized the differences and distinctions of racial dispossessions. In this way, accumulation by dispossession is inflicted in conjunction with racialized fear and is managed through a machinery of surveillance for assisting both global denials of the plight of Palestinians and Israel’s colonial control. This accumulation by dispossession establishes, produces and reproduces power in the intimate, the everyday, the bodily – including the womb – space and time, while manipulating a political economy of fear.

TOPOGRAPHIES AND RELATIONS OF POWER

What struck me when organizing the chapters of this book, whilst living through the attacks on Gaza in July 2014, was the topography of relations between power holders who maintain control over definitions of “security” and the accompanying politics and economy of maneuvering through this landscape. This topography can be clearly found in Supreme Court Judge Asher Gruin’s statement, which examined the Israeli Citizenship Law: “Human rights are not prescriptions for national suicide.” The “liberal” “democratic” state, with its “High Court of Justice” and through its “civilized” and “modernized” judiciary, has maintained its ability to mark when human rights can and should be respected and how the “national” interests of those in power are at the top rung of the hierarchy of “just” rights. This topography – as the preceding chapters have shown – is reflected in ordinary, routine, everyday practices: language, vocabularies, bureaucracies, spatial arrangements and control of time, space, place and home. During my research, violent phrases, such as Judge Gruin’s words or Tag Mehir’s phrase “Death to the Arabs,” would cause me to pause, for they seemed to capture, better than academic readings or political analysis, the control of the mind and the construction of the psychology and political economy of fear exercised by Israeli colonial power and its supporters. Phrases, acts and inactions (such as keeping a dead body at a checkpoint without giving it the right to passage), policies of dislocation (such as that revealed in [Chapter 4](#) on housing demolition) and the various laws examined in this book uncovered the manner in which colonizers constructed an actual impossibility of living and being in order to maintain a dehumanizing order of things.

The topics I have chosen to discuss are, astonishingly, largely invisible to the Western and Israeli eye. The actions of Tag Mehir, the regulatory policies of the Citizenship Law, the attempts to criminalize and erase memory (illustrated by the Nakba Law), the demolition of homes or the surveillance and control over living, birthing and dead bodies have been – and remain – uncountable, unseen and unrecognizable, and all are left with impunity. The re/productive energies embedded in the machinery of fear, stimulated by the everydayness of colonial violence, are sustained through the unsettled and unsettling order of things in the colony. Sustaining them by producing fear of the Other preserves the topography of relations between power holders for maintaining the theologized analyses of colonial “security.” The violent preservation

that such a theology reveals, supported by a religious, Judaized narrative of the “Chosen” people and maintained by securitized claims, becomes a serious challenge to those living and dying in the colony.

This book allows readers to hear the stories behind the data and statistics, and listen to narratives and voices that help us to understand and contextualize the religious and security theology, a strategically “rationalized” system of control found in colonized Palestine. The voices of the Palestinians shared here assist us in comprehending the effects of the settler colonial regime and its industry of fear, its efficacy in instilling a heavy sense of persecution and entrapment in the everyday lives of Palestinian communities. The intensity of the horror and terror produced, the fragmentation of families, the threats of deportation and dislocation, the prevention of a safe and secure birth or the refusal to grant a death certificate to an already-dead person – these are all times, spaces and events that I have sought to describe and analyze while unveiling the topographies of power relations.

As Palestinian homes are demolished, in the smell of the ruins, in the taste of bitterness after failing to find a way to prevent such demolition, the grammar of rights that Palestinians must navigate daily became visible. The grammar of rights is located in the laws, bureaucracies and regulations authorizing home demolitions, leaving families in fear of the unknown, in pain and burdened by a deep sense of loss. Writing [Chapter 4](#) on surveillance and securitization over the home, in detailing the surveillance over memory and in revealing the agonies of losing one’s home, led me to realize how Palestinians as the feared Other detected the contours and politics behind the colonial project. I realized how Palestinians were left without anyone to trust, for they are dispossessed of ownership over their truth; yet, they keep searching for justice. Their homespaces have been invaded, hour by hour, and controlled by dispossession justified by each and every letter of the law to further dispossess them of their just cause. Their narratives revealed an endemic violence embedded in the colonial “common sense” that crafts its control in the intimate, personal and political spaces.

By revealing topographies of power, I hope to problematize securitized theologies with the technologies of surveillance and fear used to unsettle the order of things in the settler colonial context under study. By disclosing technologies of destabilization, as in the political economy of fearing the Other, I hope to emphasize the importance of being attentive to concept formation such as those involved with the concepts “illegal” and “unregistered” and categories such as “non-citizens”

and “Arabs.” I set out to understand the discursive relations that produce objects and subjects, the sentiments, emotions and affects that appear in time and space, for these are spaces and temporalities of power.

SURVEILLANCE, EVERYDAYNESS AND “COMMON SENSE”

The racialized ideology produced by Israel’s security and religious theology has become “common sense” thinking for both Jewish-Israeli society and for global political actors. Racism is folded into and masked by a “liberal” logic of the state’s biblical rights and security needs and thus is normalized as acceptable, unremarkable, even necessary, hence the need to unpack and analyze in-depth the coercive power of such “common sense” in its capacity to rationalize its fearing of the Other. The “common sense” and mundane power of surveillance affects ways of seeing, as demonstrated in formal discussions in Israeli courts, the Israeli Knesset and the wordings of officials, as well as appearing in the words that go largely unheard but are imperative in reproducing imagined geographies. The concept of “common sense surveillance” demands that our analysis return to the history of colonial dispossession, for we form an incomplete understanding of surveillance today without historicizing the processes resulting in the “common sense” of securitized control. It also demands that we unpack the way in which surveillance over bodies and lives, spaces and times, even surveillance over memories, results in the disciplining and punishing of communities. Through Foucault’s (1995, 2007) analyses, we learn that there is no need for segregation to discipline, as with prisons, for discipline can be achieved through the micropolitics of everydayness, of control not only of the space that the body inhabits, but also of control over the body itself.

In the settler colonial context, as in the case of that studied here, the normalcy of the colonial theologized “common sense” surveils the very intimate relations. The narratives and analyses offered in the various chapters stress that it is crucial to analyze colonial “common sense,” its disciplining power, and the pornography of the body and self it reveals. The disciplining power of the theologized colonial “common sense” includes the production of alienated subjects that, if not “obedient” to colonial control, are feared, and thus should be surveiled and eliminated. For example, colonial “common sense” is apparent in

Hillel Cohen’s notion (2006) that Palestinians in Israel should be “Good Arabs” in the way that he defines them and, if not, then they should be imprisoned, deported and displaced, and their houses should be demolished. Consumption of colonial “common sense” embedded in Israel’s settler colonial logic suggests new relations of subjugation and importantly signals an emergence of sustained necropolitics (Mbembe, 2003). By sustained necropolitics, I refer to a historically perpetuated political process through which colonizers – through violence – produce bodies, social relations and political order. My focus most specifically is on how colonial “common sense” politics is maintained and reproduced through theologized war against the colonized everyday intimate life. This “common sense politics” in some cases justifies waging violent attacks and wars against Palestinians, and in other cases controls and surveils communities and traps them in racialized policies and politics, as in Foucault’s inversion of Clausewitz’s dictum that defines “the continuation of war by other means” (Foucault, 2003).

But what differs in the settler colonial context is that the politics of the Israeli colonial state needs to initiate both actual wars against the colonized to preserve its security theology, as well as maintain an everyday control over Palestinians through its “common sense” colonial politics to preserve its religious biblical claims in the “promised land.” Justifying violent politics with theologized wars and racialized “common sense” becomes a well-calculated political economy that allows colonizers to reframe political sanctions, enact and change laws, propose new regulatory sanctions and reproduce dangerous and feared Others. This political economy of fear informs relations of power through “institutions, economic inequalities, language, and even the bodies of individuals” (Foucault, 2003, pp. 16–17). The invocation of fear functions beyond the simple disciplining of the Other, allowing the state to “protect” and “secure” its borders and maintain its control over the body and mind of the colonized, as well as over social and political relations. The maintenance of a theologized “common sense” accompanies the colonial state’s accumulation by dispossession, even when its “benefit” to the colonized community is not realized. The theologized logic and politics, with its concomitant “common sense,” aims at keeping Jewish-Israelis in an insecure psychosocial state, accompanied by a belief that their space and life are constantly threatened by the otherized Palestinian. Failing to debunk, historicize and politicize such logic that oppresses and demonizes Palestinians results in furthering an

eliminatory, violent, military spirit inscribed over the bodies and lives of civilians. Accumulating and reproducing such an economy of fear turns security into a theology and biblical religious claims into effective, non-negotiable means to regulate the bodies, sexuality, lives and the very intimate social relations of the colonized, and further surveils and dispossess them as feared Others.

Nonetheless, the policies leading to accumulations by dispossession and the surveillance over the minute details of the theologized colonial “common sense,” reflected in colonial norms, machineries, structures and relations of power, catalyze Palestinians’ resistance and provide new modes of survival. Palestinians’ survival modes, reflected in the narratives shared, reveal power in times of total powerlessness and challenge the eliminatory political logic of the theologized surveillance and control. The various narratives of resistance shared here convey the power of the colonized to nourish their continuity and history. The rationality of surveillance as “common sense,” challenged by the narratives related in the previous chapters, urges us to sketch the contours of colonial theologies, tracking the noise they make to produce fear, and sheds light on what falls in and out of colonial reason. The aim of understanding the “common sense” of surveillance is not to succumb to the temptation of proposing a resolution, but rather to unsettle the intellectual work produced in relation to the politics of identity and the grammar of race in Israel’s colonialism.

THE EPISTEMOLOGY OF THE DETAILS

What constitutes a colonial design? The proliferation of security and “anti-terrorism” studies erase and silence the voices of those defined as “dangerous Others.” The chapters in this book have revealed a deeply theologized colonial regime, one that invades and dominates the everyday spaces of Palestinian life. The constant and continuous dispossessions sustained by a colonial political economy of fear, maintained by bureaucracies of control, were revealed throughout the chapters in the narratives of violence, of daily traumas, of intrusions into intimate life. The voices spoke to the changing contours of colonial logics, from surveillance over tangible spaces, walls and homes to surveillance over memory and even over wombs. These voices tracked, traced and shed light on the mundane dispossessions as they are registered on bodies, families, homes and communities. They informed us of the twists and turns that allow colonialists to keep the Other marginalized and feared.

Further, these voices showed how the construction of their “threatening,” “feared,” and imagined bodies assist colonizers in inscribing their power and dictating whose bodies and lives will be maintained and classified as unpeople. The voices shared further allowed us to realize how the feared Others are kept “legally” within a disadvantaged condition, positioned on the bottom of the hierarchy, and controlled by colonial ordering.

The racial coding of granting, for example, a Palestinian the status of an Israeli citizen – portrayed in [Chapter 3](#) discussing citizenship and entry law – or refusing to acknowledge the traumatic memory of the Nakba, or the suffering when losing a home as portrayed in [Chapter 4](#) – become painful performative modes marking the grammar of race and (racialized) rights. Hence, the question that I wish to pose is not how the distribution of ascribed racial logics manages colonial inequalities, but rather how the marking of the hierarchies of race and the grammar of rights continue to serve the racialized state and the colonial rule with such ease. In [Chapters 5](#) and [6](#), I delved into narratives of life, birth and death as transfer points of racial power in order to place emphasis on the political economy of fear, and so question why colonizers care about who is where, who sleeps with whom, who moves where and who builds homes and why.

Analyzing familial arrangements, sexual relations and violence, social connections, geographic movements and birthing allows for a careful depiction of how and why Israel’s power as a racial state can be found in minute and intimate details, such as who pays their electric or water bills, who lives where and with whom, who is whose mother or father, who is sleeping with whom and so on. This inquiry into the intimate aided me in revealing, as [Chapters 5](#) and [6](#) on death and birth have shown, how Israel and the Jewish state govern zones of intimacy. Furthermore, the industry and political economy of fear operated through spaces of control – such as the home, the womb and the graveyard – turns such spaces into key sites where the grammar of race and racial differences are conceptualized and applied. Court decisions that refrain from acknowledging and honoring dead Palestinian bodies buried in graveyards, the voices of the relatives of the dead who remember their agonizing journey to the graveyard while trying to deal with the violence of the Israeli military and the pain of losing a loved one are but some articulations of the manner in which the industry of fear operates to sustain the colonial logic of erasure. Collecting these articulations in this book enabled me to theorize

an epistemology of the details, one that tracks the minute elements that mobilize the grammar of race, and so to point to the marking of difference between the seen and unseen, the people and unpeople.

When sharing the epistemology of details, as for example in [Chapter 4](#) on home demolitions, I hoped to illustrate that the grammar of race and the logic of erasure and elimination differ in different times and spaces, and that the enforced racial categories shift based on the racialized political economy of fear. The politico-racialized logic nested in governing Palestinians hides colonial hierarchies of credibility that, for example, birthing mothers are challenged minute by minute on their way to give birth. I took birthing mothers' narratives to be methodological entry points to show the way in which colonial politics circumscribes the mundane acts of the colonized and inscribes power over their lives. The dispossession of their safety, the intrusion into their dreams and the colonial policing of their steps – when about to become a mother or when having just become a mother – revealed the political matrix through which colonialism and its surveillance machinery functions. Looking at birth as death, as many women suggested, requires an analysis that rejects the available repertoires about birthing. Colonialism, with its invasion of intimacy, homes and dreams, deactivates the rhetoric of certainty expressed by birthing narratives in non-colonial settings, a rhetoric that insists on safeguarding and doing the utmost to protect mother and child. Palestinian women's displaced status and uncertain conditions, built around a racialized political economy of fear toward their unborn and newborn children, disjoints the general tendencies to safeguard and protect mother and child, and displaces it into zones of insecurity, unrecognizability and uncertainty. Listening carefully to women's narratives allowed me to learn more from their doubts and identify the ways in which the colonial regime imposes a continuous doubting around giving birth. Their narratives offered insights into the manner in which the colonizer's surveillance regime replaces the power of giving birth – of life – with fear, insecurity and death.

The analysis and voices shared here revealed how the colonial story is not a coherent one, for nothing is certain in a racial colonial state. Inquiring about life, under a regime of visible and invisible surveillance and within an industry and political economy of fear, by documenting atrocities and inequalities obliges the researcher to be attentive to minute details. Mapping and analyzing the epistemology of details sheds light not only on the colonial ideology and its violent

translation, but also on the strategies and tactics used by the colonized to endure and resist colonial violence. Unraveling and problematizing the details embedded in such violent translations can in turn reveal the modes in which colonial power ascribes racial attributes to the feared Other.

GRAVEDIGGERS

Settler colonialism requires a very close look at the details that construct the assemblage of the various elements composing fear. Fear assembles a corpus of reasoning and insists that the colonizer read the family and community of the colonized as threatening, unwanted, mistrusted, monstrous Others who should be kept under surveillance and control at all times. The machinery, laws and political economy of fear create a "fear doctrine," activated by the colonial state, to legitimize structural and institutional violence on the body and life of the otherized; this machinery is operationalized through colonial routine, "common sense" and the everydayness of dispossession. The daily strategies of survival of the otherized individuals and community, as this book has revealed, contests the colonial machinery's order, interrogates its structural manifestations and laws, and therefore challenges its very legitimacy.

Accumulation by dispossession through legal and extra-legal and local and international means, as perpetuated by the colonial regime (which includes the violent Tag Mehir tactics), emerges as a major factor upholding the fear doctrine and promoting the exercise of settler colonialism. The history of accumulation by dispossession in Palestine is saturated with racism regarding residency rights, land ownership laws, housing laws, housing demolitions, collective punishment and policies over birth and death. In the face of a politics of denial and otherization of the colonized, when totalizing theologies are rooted in a logic of fear to mark Palestinians' bodies and lives as uncounted unpeople, life and living become impossible.

This book's aim is but an attempt to produce a new feminist reading, understanding and writing of Palestine; a reading that hopes to create a different mode of seeing and hearing, one that includes hearing the voices of the dead, of newborns and of those made homeless at home. To close the circle of learning from Palestinian voices and engage with their decolonizing knowledge, I return to the voice of Samer Issawi, one of the many Palestinian political prisoners.

In a letter written on April 9, 2013 by Issawi (2013), in what has been called his “hunger speech” while on hunger strike, he stated:

I am Samer Issawi, the young “Arboush” man [an Israeli term used by military personnel to refer to Palestinians in a diminutive fashion] according to your military terms, the Jerusalemite, whom you arrested without charge, except for leaving Jerusalem for the suburbs of Jerusalem. I, who will be tried twice for a charge without charge, because it is the military that rules in your country, and the intelligence apparatus that decides. And all other components of Israeli society ever have to do is sit in a trench and hide in the fort that keeps what is called a purity of identity – to avoid the explosion of my suspicious bones.

I have not heard one of you interfere to stop the loud wail of death, it’s as if every one of you has turned into gravediggers, and everyone wears his military suit [i.e., uniform]: the judge, the writer, the intellectual, the journalist, the merchant, the academic, and the poet. And I cannot believe that a whole society was turned into guards over my death and my life, or guardians over settlers who chase after my dreams and my trees.

Issawi’s words recasted his aching, dying body at a time when he refused to accept Israel’s definition of him as a “terrorist,” an “explosive,” unwanted entity. He recast his dying emaciated body from one that would preserve the “purity of identity” of the Jewish state to an active, fully alive body and identity that calls on colonizers (whom he defined as gravediggers) to stop carving their power over the spaces, souls, and bodies of Palestinians. Issawi’s efforts, in those very moments between life and near-death, reveal the dynamics of power that regulates the norms that govern, guard and administer Palestinian life and death.

Issawi’s attempt to produce an anti-hegemonic knowledge, apparent in his words of power and written while chained to his deathbed, are meant to penetrate the boundaries, fixity and cruelty of Israel’s “racial self-segregation, racial exclusiveness, and racial supremacy” (Sayegh, 1965, p. 22). The injurious impact of the acts and policies of the colonizers as “gravediggers” were transformed into a resource for challenging the accumulative effect of settler colonialism and its logic of elimination and dispossession. His dying body becomes a defining space of colonial performativity embedded in – among many other things – legal sentencing and declarations of supremacy, exclusivity and power. But Issawi’s poignant and powerful letter challenges the silence of the gravediggers, the silence that signifies their (passive) participation in the colonial legal system of suffering. Issawi’s letter aims to replace the

colonizer’s silence with speech, to incite and mobilize Israelis to refute their identity as gravediggers and to demobilize ceremonies of settler colonialism in order to create new political terms for life rather than elimination.

Only by changing and challenging the very heart of the system, its very existence, by refusing “to use the master’s tools to dismantle the master’s house” can Palestinians live. The various chapters of this book have shared and analyzed the ordeals of and strategies adopted by women, men and their communities to challenge colonial racism while addressing the intersection of the state’s violence and Western colonial violence, including the refusal to see, hear or acknowledge the continuous suffering of the colonized.

Theorizing life in the colony, against “gravediggers,” as Issawi indicated, requires constructing discourses and actions that oppose silence and denial. It entails that we acknowledge and understand the pain and suffering pointed to by the voices and journeys shared in this book, and comprehend the meanings of this pain and suffering in the eyes of those affected by the fear doctrine. Unless we find a way to stop the necropolitical matrix of power, unless the unpeople are seen as people and unless we challenge hierarchies of victimhood and the grammar of race, the colonized as an “absolute Other” will remain unnoticed. This absolute otherness cannot challenge static theologies and the political economy of fear. As articulated by the narrative of May that began this chapter and that by Samer Issawi that closed it, establishing the possibility for life above and beyond the inflicted violence inscribed on their, or their loved ones’, bodies, with their creation of hope while dying and when losing a child, thereby insists on their and their people’s right to a dignified life. May’s and Samer’s speech critically interrogates the theological logic of and proprietorial ownership over security, safety and the right to be protected. If security and biblical theologians and surveillance experts continue to reproduce a political economy of fearing the colonized Other as young as a newborn or even a fetus, as yet another monstrous formation that enables the colonial order to continue its violence, and if “liberal” power holders do not challenge such theologies, they become “gravediggers” who refuse to prevent violence, allow the continued accumulation by dispossession and fail to pose questions of responsibility. In doing so, they bury any chance for justice and for life while keeping Palestinians in a state of no exit. Through keeping Palestinians hostages to the violent trajectories of living in the context of a theologized political economy of fear, while the

Judeo-Christian “God” is “biblically” supporting the right of the “elect” against the Other and while global hegemony and its physics of power is “democratically” supporting a security theology embedded in absolute otherness, necropolitics emerge as the only “contemporary forms of subjugation of life to the power of death” (Mbembe, 2003, p. 39).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abdel Jawad, S. (2007). "Zionist Massacres: The Creation of the Palestinian Refugee Problem in the 1948 War." In E. Benvenisti et al. (eds.), *Israel and the Palestinian Refugees*. New York: Springer, pp. 59–127.
- Abdo, N. and Lentin, R. (eds.) (2002). *Women and the Politics of Military Confrontation*. New York: Berghahn.
- Abdul-Rahim, H. F., Abu-Rmeileh, N. M. E. and Wick, L. (2009). "Cesarean Section Deliveries in the Occupied Palestinian Territory (OPT): An Analysis of the 2006 Palestinian Family Health Survey." *Health Policy* 93(2–3): 151–156.
- Abu-Lughod, L. (2013). *Do Muslim Women Need Saving?* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Abunimah, A. (2012). "'Flatten' Gaza Like Hiroshima and 'Mow' the Population, Israeli Public Figures Urge," *Electronic Intifada*, November 18, http://electronicintifada.net/blogs/ali-abunimah/flatten-gaza-hiroshima-and-mow-population-israeli-public-figures-urge?utm_source=EI+readers&utm_campaign=6cd235b610-RSS_EMAIL_CAMPAIGN&utm_medium=email.
- Adalah, the Legal Center for Arab Minority Rights in Israel. (2011). "New Discriminatory Laws and Bills in Israel Issued June 2011, Updated October 2012," http://adalah.org/Public/files/English/Legal_Advocacy/Discriminatory_Laws/Discriminatory-Laws-in-Israel-October-2012-Update.pdf.
- (2012a). "Adalah and ACRI: Israeli High Court Ignored the Chilling Effect Already Caused by the 'Nakba Law,'" www.adalah.org/eng/Articles/1188/Adalah-and-ACRI:-Israeli-High-Court-Ignored-the-by.
- (2012b). "Israeli Supreme Court Upholds Ban on Family Unification," <http://adalah.org/eng/Articles/1185/Israeli-Supreme-Court-Upholds-Ban-on-Family>.
- Agamben, G. (1998). *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- (1999). *Remnants of Auschwitz: The Witness and the Archive* (trans. D. Heller-Roazen). New York: Zone.
- (2005). *State of Exception*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Ahmed, S. (2003). "The Politics of Fear in the Making of Worlds." *Qualitative Studies in Education* 16(3): 377–398.
- Al-Haq (2004). "Four Years since the Beginning of the Intifada: Systematic Violations of Human Rights in the Occupied Palestinian Territories," www.alhaq.org/publications/publications-index/item/four-years-since-the-beginning-of-the-intifada-systematic-violations-of-human-rights-in-the-occupied-palestina.
- (2012). "Joint Parallel Report to the U.N. Committee on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination," www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/hrc/docs/ngos/AL-HAQ_BADIL_ADDMEER-WCLAC_Israel_CERD80.pdf.
- Al-Khalidi, W. (1959). "Why Did the Palestinians Leave?" *Middle East Forum* 35(7): 21–25.
- Alexander, J. (2005). *Pedagogies of Crossing: Meditations on Feminism, Sexual Politics, Memory and the Sacred*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Allen, L. (2008). "Getting by the Occupation: How Violence Became Normal during the Second Palestinian Intifada." *Cultural Anthropology* 23(3): 453–487.
- Amnesty International (2004). "Israel and the Occupied Territories: Under the Rubble: House Demolition and Destruction of Land and Property," www.amnesty.org/en/library/asset/MDE15/033/2004/en/2193fae2-d5f6-11dd-bb24-1fb85fe8fa05/mde150332004en.pdf.
- (2007). "Israel and the Occupied Palestinian Territories: Enduring Occupation – Palestinians under Siege in the West Bank," www.amnesty.org/en/library/asset/MDE15/033/2007/en/40f33a2d-d396-11dd-a329-2f46302a8cc6/mde150332007en.html.
- Antonius, R. (2003). "The Relevance of Principles of International Law to the Israel–Palestinian Conflict," www.er.uqam.ca/nobel/ieim/IMG/pdf/Int_L_Law_and_the_Israeli-Pales.pdf.
- Appadurai, A. (1993a). "Number in the Colonial Imagination." In C. A. Breckenridge and P. Van Der Veer (eds.), *Orientalism and the Post-colonial Predicament*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, pp. 314–339.
- (1993b). "Patriotism and its Futures." *Public Culture* 5(3): 411–429.
- (2006). *Fear of Small Numbers: An Essay on the Geography of Anger*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Arab Association for Human Rights (HRA) (2005). "Weekly Review of the Arabic Press in Israel, No. 253," www.arabhra.org/publications/wrap/2005/wrap253.pdf.
- Archibugi, D. and Young, I. (2003). "Envisioning a Global Rule of Law." In J. P. Sterba (ed.), *Terrorism and International Justice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 158–170.
- Arendt, H. (1973). *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, Vol. 1. Wilmington, MA: Mariner Books.

- Association for Civil Rights in Israel (ACRI) (2011). "Update: Top Anti-democratic Legislative Initiatives: ACRI List of Top Anti-Democratic Legislative Initiatives," www.acri.org.il/en/2011/03/12/1639.
- (2012a). "The High Court Failed to Uphold Basic Human Rights," www.acri.org.il/en/2012/01/12/citizenship-law-petitions-rejected.
- (2012b). "Freedom of Expression in Universities Must Be Protected," www.acri.org.il/en/2012/05/14/knesset-debates-nakba-day-event.
- Auron, Y. (2003). *The Banality of Denial: Israel and the Armenian Genocide*. New Brunswick: Transaction.
- Bachelard, G. (1969). *The Poetics of Space*. Boston: Beacon.
- BADIL Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights (2012). "Israel's High Court Exposes Israeli Apartheid Regime," www.badil.org/en/press-releases/142-2012/3399-press-eng-01.
- Barzilai, G. (2000). "Fantasies of Liberalism and Liberal Jurisprudence: State Law, Politics, and the Israeli-Arab-Palestinian Community." *Israel Law Review* 34: 425–451.
- Bates, R. H. (2001). *Prosperity and Violence: The Political Economy of Development*. New York: Norton.
- BBC (2006). "Israel Captures Pair in Gaza Raid," *BBC News*, June 24, http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/5112846.stm.
- Ben-Chim, A. (2002). "Rabbi Eliyahu: 'Allowed to Helicopter Olives from Palestinian Groves,'" *YNet*, October 24, www.ynet.co.il/articles/0,7340,L-2201836,00.html (in Hebrew).
- Ben-Dor, G. (2003). "The National Security Council Indices." Task Force Report, Herzlya Conference, National Security Studies Center, University of Haifa.
- Benvenisti, E. and Shaham, D. (2004). "Facially Neutral Discrimination and the Israeli Supreme Court." *New York University Journal of International Law and Politics* 36: 677–716.
- Berda, Y. (2012). *The Bureaucracy of the Occupation: The Permit Regime in the West Bank 2000–2006*. Jerusalem: Hakibutz Hameuhad and Van Leer Institute (in Hebrew).
- Bishara, A. (2011). *On a Jewish and Democratic State*. Doha: Arab Center for Research and Policy Studies.
- Bisharat, G. (2007). "For Palestinians, Memory Matters: It Provides a Blueprint for their Future," www.palestineremembered.com/Articles/General/Story2321.html.
- Black, I. (2012). "Israeli Politicians Back Ahmed al-Jaabari Assassination," *The Guardian*, November 15, www.guardian.co.uk/world/2012/nov/15/israeli-politicians-back-jaabari-assassination.
- Bonn International Center for Conversion (BICC) (2012). "Annual Report 2012," www.bicc.de/uploads/tx_bicctools/BICC_Jahresbericht_2012_en_LR.pdf.

- Breaking the Silence (2003). "She Had to Walk for Miles," www.breakingthesilence.org.il/testimonies/database/84427.
- Breyner, Y. (2010). "Price Tag? Gravestones Vandalized an Ancient Village in Samaria," *Walla!*, October 20, <http://news.walla.co.il/?w=/2689/1746811> (in Hebrew).
- B'Tselem (2002). "Land Grab: Israel's Settlement Policy in the West Bank," www.btselem.org/download/200205_land_grab_eng.pdf.
- (2006). "A Wall in Jerusalem: Obstacles to Human Rights in the Holy City," www.btselem.org/download/200607_a_wall_in_jerusalem.pdf.
- (2010). "Human Rights in the Occupied Territories: 1 January 2009 to 30 April 2010," www.btselem.org/sites/default/files2/publication/2009-annual_report_eng.pdf.
- (2011a). "Background on Violence by Settlers," www.btselem.org/settler-violence.
- (2011b). "East Jerusalem: Discrimination in Planning, Building, and Land Expropriation," www.btselem.org/jerusalem/discriminating_policy.
- (2011c). "Separation Barrier: Opinion of the International Court of Justice," www.btselem.org/separation_barrier/international_court_decision.
- (2011d). "Statistics on Revocation of Residency in East Jerusalem," www.btselem.org/jerusalem/revocation_statistics.
- (2012a). "5 March 2012: Appeal Filed by Settlers Convicted of Aggravated Assault is Rejected," www.btselem.org/settler_violence/20120308-appeal_by_violent_settlers_rejected.
- (2012b). "Planning and Building: Statistics on Demolition of Houses Built without Permits in East Jerusalem," www.btselem.org/planning-and_building/east_jerusalem_statistics.
- Callamard, A. (2001). *Investigating Women's Rights Violations in Armed Conflicts*. Montreal: Amnesty International and International Centre for Human Rights and Democratic Development.
- (2010). "Campaign to Preserve Mamilla Jerusalem Cemetery, Petition for Urgent Action on the Desecration of Mamilla Cemetery, Jerusalem, 10 February 2010 (Excerpts)." *Journal of Palestine Studies* 39(3): 188–192.
- Camus, A. (1942). *Le Mythe de Sisyphe* [*The Myth of Sisyphus*]. Paris: Gallimard.
- Carton, E. (2011). "Unsettling the Settlement: The Ideology of Israel's Hilltop Youth." Doctoral dissertation, Department of Religion, Haverford College, Haverford, PA.
- Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS) (2011). "Demographic Data for 2010," www.cbs.gov.il/reader/?Mival=cw_usr_view_SHTML&ID=629 (in Hebrew).
- Cheshin, A. S., Hutman, B. and Melamed, A. (1999). *Separate and Unequal: The Inside Story of Israeli Rule in East Jerusalem*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Chomsky, N. (1991). "Middle East Diplomacy: Continuities and Changes," *Z Magazine*, December, www.chomsky.info/articles/199112-.htm.
- Clyne, E. (2012). "Israel's New Supreme Court: Liberalism Don't Live Here Anymore," *JNews*, January 17, <http://972mag.com/israels-new-supreme-court-liberalism-doesnt-live-here-anymore/33220>.
- Cohen, G. (2012). "IDF Soldier Sentenced to 45 Days for Death of Mother, Daughter in Gaza War," *Ha'aretz*, August 12, www.haaretz.com/news/diplomacy-defense/idf-soldier-sentenced-to-45-days-for-death-of-mother-daughter-in-gaza-war-1.457649?block=true.
- Cohen, H. (2004). *An Army of Shadows: Palestinian Collaborators in the Service of Zionism*. Jerusalem: Ivrit (in Hebrew).
- (2006). *Good Arabs: The Israeli Security Services and the Israeli Arabs*. Jerusalem: Ivrit (in Hebrew).
- Cohen, S. (2001). *States of Denial: Knowing about Atrocities and Suffering*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Commission on the Status of Women, United Nations (2012). "Situation of and Assistance to Palestinian Women." Economic and Social Council, E/CN.6/2012/6, www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=E/CN.6/2012/6.
- Committee for Immigration, Absorption and Diaspora Affairs – Protocol 132 (2011). "The Impact of Immigration in the Last Decade the Demographic Balance in Israel," www.knesset.gov.il/protocols/data/html/alia/2011-01-24.html (in Hebrew).
- Committee for Interior and Environmental Quality (2003). "Protocol 47," The Knesset, July 14, http://knesset.gov.il/protocols/heb/protocol_search.aspx?comID=5.
- Curtis, M. (2004). *Unpeople: Britain's Secret Human Rights Abuses*. New York: Vintage.
- Daana, S. (2013). "Balfour 96: Palestine is Still the Question," *Al Akhbar English*, November 8, <http://english.al-akhbar.com/node/17554>.
- Daher-Nashif, S. (2011). "Constructing the Social-Political Enlivening of the Palestinian Dead Body: The Case of the Palestinian Forensic Medicine Institute." Doctoral dissertation, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Israel (in Hebrew).
- Darcy, S. (2003). *Israel's Punitive House Demolition Policy: Collective Punishment in Violation of International Law*. Ramallah: Al-Haq.
- Darwish, M. (2008). *The Butterfly Effect (A Diary)*. Beirut: Riyad El-Rayyes Books S.A.R.L.
- Davis, C. (2004). "Can the Dead Speak to Us? De Man, Levinas and Agamben." *Culture, Theory and Critique* 45(1): 77–89.
- Davis, D. L. and Walker, K. (2010). "Re-discovering the Maternal Body in Midwifery through an Exploration of Theories of Embodiment." *Midwifery* 26(4): 457–462.

- Davis, U. (1997). *Citizenship and the State: A Comparative Study of Citizenship Legislation in Israel, Jordan, Palestine, Syria and Lebanon*. Reading: Ithaca Press.
- (2003). *Apartheid Israel: Possibilities for the Struggle Within*. New York: Zed Books.
- De Certeau, M. (1988). *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- De Larrinaga, M. and Doucet, M. (2008). "Sovereign Power and the Biopolitics of Human Security." *Security Dialogue* 39(5): 517–537.
- De Mel, N. (2007). *Militarizing Sri Lanka: Popular Culture, Memory and Narrative in the Armed Conflict*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- De Sousa Santos, B. (2002). *Toward a New Legal Common Sense: Law, Globalization, and Emancipation*. London: Butterworths.
- Derrida, J. (1990). "Force of Law: The Mystical Foundation of Authority." *Cardozo Law Review* 11: 925–926.
- (1993). *Aporias: Dying-Awaiting (One Another at) the "Limits of Truth" [Mourir-S'attendre Aux "limites de la vérité"]*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Dillon, M. and Lobo-Guerrero, L. (2008). "Biopolitics of Security in the 21st Century: An Introduction." *Review of International Studies* 34(2): 265–292.
- Doumani, B. (2010). "Erased by the Book," paper presented at the conference "Beirut: A World Capital for the Book," hosted by the Lebanese Ministry of Culture and the Institute for Palestine Studies, Beirut, January 8.
- Dugard, J. (2003). "Question of the Violation of Human Rights in the Occupied Arab Territories, Including Palestine." Report of the Special Rapporteur of the Commission on Human Rights on the Situation of Human Rights in the Palestinian Territories Occupied by Israel Since 1967. Commission on Human Rights, United Nations Economic and Social Council, 60th Session, E/CN.4/2004/6. New York: United Nations.
- Dumper, M. (1997). *The Politics of Jerusalem since 1967*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Eli, Y. (2012). "'Tag Mehir' Sprayed on a Jerusalem Convent," *Ma'ariv*, February 7, www.nrg.co.il/online/1/ART2/334/553.html (in Hebrew).
- Ellinghaus, K. (2009). "Biological Absorption and Genocide: A Comparison of Indigenous Assimilation Policies in the United States and Australia." *Genocide Studies and Prevention* 4(1): 59–79.
- Ertürk, Y. (2005). "Integration of the Human Rights of Women and the Gender Perspective: Violence against Women." Report of the Special Rapporteur on Violence against Women, its Causes and Consequences. Commission on Human Rights, United Nations Economic and Social Council, 61st Session, E/CN.4/2005/72/Add.2. New York: United Nations.

- Etzer, O. (2009). "We Are Ashamed of the Battalion: Stop Evacuating the Homesh Settlement," *Arutz Shva 7: Israel National News*, November 11, www.inn.co.il/News/News.aspx/196414 (in Hebrew).
- Evans, B. (2010). "Foucault's Legacy: Security, War and Violence in the 21st Century." *Security Dialogue* 41(4): 413–433.
- Fanon, F. (1963). *The Wretched of the Earth* (trans. C. Farrington). New York: Grove.
- (1967). *Black Skin, White Masks* (trans. C. L. Markmann). New York: Grove.
- Farley, A. (1997). "The Black Body as Fetish Object." *Oregon Law Review* 76: 457–535.
- Felski, R. (2002). "Introduction." *New Literary History* 33(4): 607–622.
- Flynn, J. T. (1948). *The Roosevelt Myth*. Garden City, NY: Garden City Books.
- Foucault, M. (1977). "Nietzsche, Genealogy, History." In D. F. Bouchard (ed.), *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, pp. 139–164.
- (1980). *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972–1977*. Edited by C. Gordon. Toronto: Random House.
- (1990). *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction*, Vol. 1. New York: Vintage.
- (1995). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (trans. A. Sheridan). New York: Vintage.
- (2003). *Society Must Be Defended* (trans. D. Macey). London: Penguin.
- (2007). *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977–1978*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Frykberg, M. (2007). "Palestinian Cancer Patient a 'Security Risk,'" *Middle East Times*, November 29, www.thefreelibrary.com/Gaza+faces+medical+crisis%3A+Mel+Frykberg+reports+from+the+occupied...-a0174973274.
- Funkenstein, A. and Steinsaltz, A. (1987). *The Sociology of Ignorance*. Tel Aviv: Galei Zahal.
- Gardam, J. (1993). "Proportionality and Force in International Law." *American Journal of International Law* 87: 391–413.
- (2004). *Necessity, Proportionality and the Use of Force by States*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gavriely-Nuri, D. (2008). "The 'Metaphorical Annihilation' of the Second Lebanon War (2006) from the Israeli Political Discourse." *Discourse & Society* 19(1): 5–20.
- Ghanim, H. (2005). "Thanatopolitics: Dialectics of Life and Death under Occupation." *Theory and Criticism* 27: 181–186.
- Ghazi, F. (1996). "The 1948 Israeli-Palestinian War and its Aftermath: The Transformation and De-signification of Palestine's Cultural Landscape." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 86: 256–285.

- Giacaman, R., Abdul-Rahim, H. and Wick, L. (2005). "The Politics of Childbirth in the Context of Conflict: Policies or De Facto Practices?" *Health Policy* 72: 129–139.
- Giacaman, R., Abu-Rmeileh, N. M. E. and Wick, L. (2006). "The Limitations on Choice: Palestinian Women's Childbirth Location, Dissatisfaction with the Place of Birth and Determinants." *European Journal of Public Health* 17(1): 86–91.
- Ginsberg, F. and Rapp, R. (1991). "The Politics of Reproduction." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 20: 311–343.
- Gisha (2012a). "Student Travel between Gaza and the West Bank 101," www.gisha.org/item.asp?lang_id=en&p_id=1695.
- (2012b). "'Red Lines' Presentation Released after 3.5-Year Legal Battle: Israel Calculated the Number of Calories it Would Allow Gaza Residents to Consume," www.gisha.org/item.asp?lang_id=en&p_id=1700.
- Goldberg, D. T. (2009). *The Threat of Race*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Goren, Y. and Ashkenazi, A. (2011). "Headstone Desecrations in Jaffa: 'A Red Line Has Been Crossed, We Cannot Keep Silent,'" *Ma'ariv*, October 8, www.nrg.co.il/online/1/ART2/293/878.html (in Hebrew).
- Gradstein, L. (2011). "The Price Gets Higher," *Jerusalem Report*, October 23, www.jpost.com/JerusalemReport/PalestinianAffairs/Article.aspx?id=242436.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. Edited by Q. Hoare and G. Nowell-Smith. London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Green, J. A. (1995). "Towards a Détente with History: Confronting Canada's Colonial Legacy," *SISI Archives*, <http://sisis.nativeweb.org/clark/detente.html>.
- Gregory, D. (2004). *The Colonial Present: Afghanistan, Palestine, Iraq*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Guha, R. (1983). *Elementary Aspects of Peasant Insurgency in Colonial India*. Mumbai: Oxford University Press.
- Gurvitz, Y. (2014). "Price Tag' Attacks: It's Not about the Graffiti," *+972 Blog*, June 14, <http://972mag.com/price-tag-attacks-its-not-about-the-graffiti/92064>.
- Ha'aretz (2012). "The School of Lynching," August 2, www.haaretz.com/opinion/the-school-of-lynching-1.459559.
- Hajjar, L. (2001). "Human Rights in Israel/Palestine: The History and Politics of a Movement." *Journal of Palestine Studies* 30(4): 21–38.
- (2006). "International Humanitarian Law and 'Wars on Terror': A Comparative Analysis of Israeli and American Doctrines and Politics." *Journal of Palestine Studies* 36(1): 21–42.
- Hall, M. (2005). "Ridge Reveals Clashes on Alerts: Former Homeland Security Chief Debunks 'Myth,'" *USA Today*, May 11, <http://aolsvc.news.aol.com/news/article.adp?id=20050511071809990020>.

- Hallabi, U. (2011). "Legal Analysis and Critique of Some Surveillance Methods Used by Israel." In E. Zureik, D. Lyon and Y. Abu-Laban (eds.), *Surveillance and Population Control in Israel/Palestine*. New York: Routledge, pp. 199–218.
- Hammond, J. (2010). "Rogue State: Israeli Violations of U.N. Security Council Resolutions," *Foreign Policy Journal*, January 27, www.foreignpolicyjournal.com/2010/01/27/rogue-state-israeli-violations-of-u-n-security-council-resolutions/0.
- Hanafi, S. (2009). "Spacio-cide: Colonial Politics, Invisibility and Rezoning in Palestinian Territory." *Contemporary Arab Affairs* 2(1): 106–121.
- Hanauer, L. S. (1995). "The Path to Redemption: Fundamentalist Judaism, Territory, and Jewish Settler Violence in the West Bank." *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism* 18(4): 245–270.
- Harel, A. (2011). "Shin Bet: Solid Suspicion of Settler Terrorist Acts Planned against Palestinians," *Ha'aretz*, October 4, www.haaretz.co.il/news/politics/1.1488817 (in Hebrew).
- (2012). "Officers and Politicians in the Service of the Settlers," *Ha'aretz*, January 9, www.haaretz.co.il/news/politics/1.1612240 (in Hebrew).
- Harootunian, H. (2004). "Shadowing History: National Narratives and the Persistence of the Everyday." *Cultural Studies* 18(2): 181–200.
- Harper, D. (2004). "Delusions and Discourse: Moving beyond the Constraints of the Modernist Paradigm." *Philosophy, Psychiatry, and Psychology* 11(1): 55–64.
- (2008). "The Politics of Paranoia: Paranoid Positioning and Conspiratorial Narratives in the Surveillance Society." *Surveillance and Society* 5(1): 1–32.
- Higgs, R. (1987). *Crisis and Leviathan: Critical Episodes in the Growth of American Government*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- (1994). "The Cold War Economy: Opportunity Costs, Ideology and the Politics of Crisis." *Explorations in Economic History* 31: 283–312.
- (1997). "No More 'Great Presidents.'" *The Free Market* 15: 1–3.
- (1999). "We're All Sick, and Government Must Heal Us." *The Independent Review* 3: 623–627.
- (2003a). "Impending War in Iraq: George Bush's Faith-Based Foreign Policy," *San Francisco Chronicle*, February 13.
- (2003b). "All War All the Time: The Battle on Terrorism is an Excuse to Make Fighting Permanent," *San Francisco Chronicle*, July 6.
- (2004). *Against Leviathan: Government Power and a Free Society*. Oakland, CA: Independent Institute.
- (2005a). "The Ongoing Growth of Government in the Economically Advanced Countries." *Advances in Austrian Economics* 8: 279–300.
- (2005b). *Resurgence of the Warfare State: The Crisis since 9/11*. Oakland, CA: Independent Institute.

- Honneth, A. (1995). *The Struggle for Recognition: The Moral Grammar of Social Conflicts*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- hooks, b. (1990). "Homeplace: A Site of Resistance" In b. hooks (ed.), *Yearning: Race, Gender and Cultural Politics*. Boston: South End Press, pp. 41–49.
- (2000). *Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- Hovannisian, R. G. (ed.) (1999). *Remembrance and Denial: The Case of the Armenian Genocide*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.
- Human Rights Watch (2002). "Jenin: IDF Military Operations," www.hrw.org/reports/2002/israel3.
- Hume, D. (1987). "Of the First Principles of Government." In E. F. Miller (ed.), *Essays, Moral, Political, and Literary*. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, pp. 32–36.
- Hummel, J. R. (1996). *Emancipating Slaves, Enslaving Free Men: A History of the American Civil War*. Chicago: Open Court.
- International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) (1949). *Geneva Convention Relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War (Fourth Geneva Convention)*. 75 UNTS 287, www.icrc.org/ihl.nsf/full/380.
- Ir Amim and Bimkom (2010). "Jerusalem: An Open City?" www.ir-amim.org.il/sites/default/files/openCity.pdf.
- Israel National Council for the Child (2012). "A Collection of Data from the Annual Report on Children on Israel," www.children.org.il/Files/File/SHNATON/percent20percent202012.pdf.
- Issawi, S. (2013). "Samer Issawi's 'Hunger Speech' to Israelis," *MondoWeiss*, April 9, <http://mondoweiss.net/2013/04/issawis-speech-israelis.html>.
- Jabareen, H. and Zaher, S. (2012). "The Israeli Supreme Court's Decision in the Citizenship Law Case HCJ 466/07, *MK Zahava Galon v. The Attorney General et al.*" *Adalah* 89: 1–3.
- Jelin, E. (2003). *State Repression and the Labors of Memory* (trans. J. Rein and M. Godoy-Anatavia). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Jerusalem Institute for Israel Studies (JIIS) (2011). "Data for 2010," www.jiis.org.il/?cmd=statistic.304 (in Hebrew).
- Jerusalem Post* (2011). "Barak: Consider 'Hilltop Youth' a Terror Group," December 14, www.jpost.com/Defense/Article.aspx?id=249390.
- Johnson, A. (2007). "Everydayness and Subalternity." *South Atlantic Quarterly* 106(1): 21–38.
- Kapitan, T. (2003). "The Terrorism of 'Terrorism.'" In J. P. Sterba (ed.), *Terrorism and International Justice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 47–66.
- Kassim, A. F. (2000). "The Palestinians: From Hyphenated to Integrated Citizenship." In N. A. Butenschon, U. Davis and M. Hassassian (eds.),

- Citizenship and the State in the Middle East: Approaches and Applications*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, pp. 201–224.
- Kaufman, C. E. (2000). “Reproductive Control in Apartheid South Africa.” *Population Studies* 54(1): 105–114.
- Keinan, H. and Lazaroff, T. (2011). “Netanyahu Condemns Settlers’ ‘Price Tag’ Violence,” *Jerusalem Post*, March 9, www.jpost.com/NationalNews/Article.aspx?id=211353&R=R2.
- Khalidi, W. (ed.) (1987). *From Haven to Conquest: Readings in Zionism and the Palestine Problem until 1948*. Washington, DC: Institute for Palestine Studies.
- Khoury, J. (2012). “Israeli-Palestinian Couples on Citizenship Law: Supreme Court Guided by Israeli Racism,” *Ha’aretz*, January 12, www.haaretz.com/news/national/israeli-palestinian-couples-on-citizenship-law-supreme-court-guided-by-israeli-racism-1.406886.
- Kitzinger, S. (2005). “Letter from Europe: Birth, Military Occupation, and Patriarchy.” *Birth* 32(3): 232–234.
- Klein, N. (2008). *The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism*. New York: Holt.
- Klabbers, J. (2005). “Off Limits.” *Theoretical Inquiries in Law* 7: 59–80.
- Kovovitz, Y. and Huri, J. (2011). “Headstones Defaced in Two Jaffa Cemeteries,” *Ha’aretz*, October 8, www.haaretz.co.il/news/politics/1.1518339 (in Hebrew).
- Kretzmer, D. (1990). *The Legal Status of the Arabs in Israel*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Kristeva, J. (2002). “Approaching Abjection.” In A. Jones (ed.), *The Feminism and Visual Culture Reader*. London: Routledge, pp. 389–391.
- Lawrence, B. (2003). “Gender, Race and the Regulation of Native Identity in Canada and the United States: An Overview.” *Hypatia* 18(2): 3–31.
- Lazreg, M. (2008). *Torture and the Twilight of Empire: From Algiers to Baghdad*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Lefebvre, H. (1987). “The Everyday and Everydayness.” *Yale French Studies* (73): 7–11.
- Lendman, S. (2012). “Racist Israeli Supreme Court Decisions,” *Occupied Palestine*, January 20, <http://occupiedpalestine.wordpress.com/2012/01/21/racist-israeli-supreme-court-decisions-by-stephen-lendman>.
- Lentin, R. (2008). *Thinking Palestine*. London: Zed Books.
- Lentin, R. and Lentin, A. (eds.) (2006). *Race and State*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Levinson, C. (2011). “Shin Bet: Israel’s Extreme Rightists Organizing into Terror Groups,” *Ha’aretz*, September 13, www.haaretz.com/print-edition/news/shin-bet-israel-s-extreme-rightists-organizing-into-terror-groups-1.384099.

- (2012). "Right-Wing Extremists Cite Israeli MK as Source on IDF Movements in West Bank," *Ha'aretz*, January 8, www.haaretz.com/news/national/right-wing-extremists-cite-israeli-mk-as-source-on-idf-movements-in-west-bank-1.406158.
- Levy, G. (2003). "Twilight Zone: Birth and Death at the Checkpoint," *Ha'aretz*, September 10, www.haaretz.com/twilight-zone-birth-and-death-at-the-checkpoint-1.99726.
- (2012). "Israel's High Court Doesn't Deserve to Be Defended," *Ha'aretz*, January 1, www.haaretz.com/print-edition/opinion/israel-s-high-court-doesn-t-deserve-to-be-defended-1.407369.
- Lichtman, R. (2002). "Scenes from a Nightmare: The Imperialist Construction of Israel." *Capitalism Nature Socialism* 13(3): 125–146.
- Light, P. C. (1999). *The True Size of Government*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Linfield, M. (1990). *Freedom under Fire: U.S. Civil Liberties in Times of War*. Boston: South End Press.
- Lingeman, R. R. (1970). *Don't You Know There's a War On?* New York: Putnam.
- Liss, Y. (2012). "Uri Ariel Confessed: I Spent Settlers' Information on IDF Movements," *Ha'aretz*, January 8, www.haaretz.co.il/news/politics/1.1612127 (in Hebrew).
- Lissak, M. (1994). "The Permeable Boundaries between Civilians and Soldiers in Israeli Society." *Contributions in Military Studies* 153: 9–39.
- Lobe, J. (2013). "Israel Ranked World's Most Militarized Nations," *Inter Press Service*, November 11, www.ipsnews.net/2012/11/israel-ranked-as-worlds-most-militarised-nation.
- Long, J. C. (2006). "Border Anxiety in Israel/Palestine." *Antipode* 38(1): 107–127.
- Los, M. (2004). "The Technologies of Total Domination." *Surveillance and Society* 2(1): 15–38.
- Lustick, I. (1980). *Arabs in the Jewish State: Israel's Control of a National Minority*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Machiavelli, N. (1992). *The Prince*. New York: Dover.
- MacKinnon, C. A. (1991). *Toward a Feminist Theory of the State*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- (2000). "Disputing Male Sovereignty: On *United States v. Morrison*." *Harvard Law Review* 114: 135–177.
- Macklin, A. (2004). "Like Oil and Water, with a Match: Militarized Commerce, Armed Conflict, and Human Security in Sudan." In W. Giles and J. Hyndman (eds.), *Sites of Violence: Gender and Conflict Zones*. Berkeley: University of California Press, pp. 75–107.
- Mahmood, D. (2008). *The Butterfly Effect (A Diary)*. Beirut: Riyad El-Rayyes Books S.A.R.L.

- Makdisi, S. (2010). *Palestine Inside Out: An Everyday Occupation*. New York: Norton.
- Margalit, M. (2005). "The Trust behind Formal Statistics," Israeli Committee against House Demolitions, www.icahd.org/eng/articles.asp?menu=6&submenu=2&article=198.
- (2007a). "Discrimination and Deprivation in Jerusalem." *Palestine-Israel Journal of Politics, Economics and Culture* 14: 24–28.
- (2007b). "No Place Like Home: House Demolitions in East Jerusalem," Israeli Committee against House Demolitions, <http://icahdusa.org/multimedia/no-place-like-home.pdf>.
- Masalha, N. (1997). *A Land without a People: Israel, Transfer and the Palestinians, 1949–96*. London: Faber & Faber.
- (2007). *The Bible and Zionism: Invented Traditions, Archaeology and Post-colonialism in Palestine-Israel*. London: Zed Books.
- (2008). "Remembering the Palestinian Nakba: Commemoration, Oral History and Narratives of Memory." *Holy Land Studies: A Multidisciplinary Journal* 7(2): 123–156.
- (2009). "Reading the Bible with the Eyes of the Canaanites: Neo-Zionism, Political, Theology and the Land Traditions of the Bible (1967 to Gaza 2009)." *Holy Land Studies* 8: 55–108.
- Mbembe, A. (2000). "At the Edge of the World: Boundaries, Territoriality and Sovereignty in Africa." *Public Culture* 12(1): 259–284.
- (2003). "Necropolitics." *Public Culture* 15(1): 11–40.
- (2010). "Reading Fanon in the 21st Century." W.E.B. Du Bois Lecture Series, Colgate University, www.youtube.com/watch?v=VYXIHReZ9Ao.
- McPherson, L. K. (2005). "Excessive Force in War: A 'Golden Rule' Test." *Theoretical Inquiries in Law* 7: 81–95.
- Mendieta, E. (2004). "Plantations, Ghettos, Prisons: US Racial Geographies." *Philosophy and Geography* 7(1): 43–59.
- Morgan, E. and Attias, O. (1990). "Rabbi Kahane, International Law, and the Courts: Democracy Stands on its Head." *Temple International and Comparative Law Journal* 4: 185–210.
- Morris, B. (1989). *The Birth of the Palestinian Refugee Problem 1947–1949*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (1997). *Israel's Border Wars, 1949–1956: Arab Infiltration, Israeli Retaliation, and the Countdown to the Suez War*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Muhareb, M. (2011). "Book Review: *The King's Torah and the Killing of Palestinians*," Arab Center for Research and Policy Studies, <http://english.dohainstitute.org/bookreviews>.
- (2012). "The Price Tag Organization and the Price Tag Paid by Palestinians," Arab Center for Research and Policy Studies, <http://english.dohainstitute.org/policyanalysis>.

- My Palestine (2009). "Kufr Qasem Massacre, 29 October 1956," <http://avoicefrompalestine.wordpress.com/2009/11/07/kufr-qasem-massacre-29-october-1956>.
- Nana 10 (2012). "Netanyahu on Denigration of Graves: 'We Won't Tolerate Vandalism, and For Sure Not against Religious Sentiments,'" October 9, <http://news.nana10.co.il/Article/?ArticleID-836688> (in Hebrew).
- Nash, J. (2005). "From Lavender to Purple: Privacy, Black Women, and Feminist Legal Theory." *Cardozo Women's Law Journal* 11: 303–330.
- National Council for the Child (NCC) (2012). "Demographics," www.children.org.il/childrens_eng.asp?id=53.
- Neff, D. (1994). "Settlements in U.S. Policy." *Journal of Palestine Studies* 23(3): 53–69.
- Negbi, M. (2004). *We were Like Sodom: On the Slope from a Law-Abiding Country to a Banana Republic*. Jerusalem: Keter (in Hebrew).
- Nesher, T. and Rosenberg, O. (2012). "Words of Hate on Arab-Jewish School and on Jerusalem Convent: 'Death to the Arabs,'" *Ha'aretz*, February 7, www.haaretz.co.il/news/law/1.1635716 (in Hebrew).
- Nettleton, S. and Watson, J. (1998). *The Body in Everyday Life*. London: Routledge.
- Nikfar, B. (2005). "Families Divided: An Analysis of Israel's Citizenship and Entry into Israel Law." *Northwestern University Journal of International Human Rights* 3: 5–25.
- Nobel Women's Initiative (2007). "Mairead Maguire Shot in Leg with Rubber Bullet during Protest at Israeli Separation Wall," <http://nobelwomensinitiative.org/2007/04/mairead-maguire-shot-in-leg-with-rubber-bullet-during-protest-at-israeli-separation-wall>.
- Nock, A. J. (1973). *Our Enemy, the State*. New York: Free Life Editions.
- Nolan, J. L. (1998). *The Therapeutic State: Justifying Government at Century's End*. New York: New York University Press.
- Normand, R. and af Jochnick, C. (1994). "The Legitimation of Violence: A Critical Analysis of the Gulf War." *Harvard Journal of International Law* 35(2): 387–416.
- North, D. C. (1981). *Structure and Change in Economic History*. New York: Norton.
- (1990). *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- North, D. C. and Thomas, R. P. (1973). *The Rise of the Western World: A New Economic History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, Occupied Palestinian Territory, United Nations (OCHA) (2009). "The Planning Crisis in East Jerusalem: Understanding the Phenomenon of 'Illegal' Construction," <http://unispal.un.org/pdfs/EJerSpFocus300409.pdf>.

- (2011a). "Israeli Settler Violence in the West Bank," <http://unispal.un.org/unispal.nsf/udc.htm>.
- (2011b). "The Monthly Humanitarian Monitor: February 2011," www.ochaopt.org/documents/ocha_opt_the_humanitarian_monitor_2011_03_18_english.pdf.
- (2011c). "Seven Years after the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice on the Barrier: The Impact of the Barrier in the Jerusalem Area," www.ochaopt.org/documents/ocha_opt_barrier_update_july_2011_english.pdf.
- Olson, M. (2000). *Power and Prosperity: Outgrowing Communist and Capitalist Dictatorships*. New York: Basic Books.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (2010). "OECD Review of Labour Market and Social Policies: Israel," www.hakoled.org.il/webfiles/fck/OECD_Reviews_of_Labour_Market_and_Social_Policies.pdf.
- Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics (PCBS) (2011). *Annual Health Report Palestine 2010*, www.moh.ps/attach/296.pdf (in Arabic).
- Palmer, F. (1931). *Newton D. Baker: America at War*. New York: Dodd, Mead.
- Pappe, I. (2007). *The Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine*. Oxford: OneWorld.
- (2008). "The Mukhabarat State of Israel: A State of Oppression is Not a State of Exception." In R. Lentin (ed.), *Thinking Palestine*. London: Zed Books, pp. 120–132.
- Physicians for Human Rights–Israel, Adalah and Al-Mezan Center for Human Rights (2010). "Who Gets to Go? In Violation of Medical Ethics and the Law: Israel's Distinction between Gaza Patients in Need of Medical Care," www.phr.org.il/uploaded/Microsoft%20Word%20-%20PP%20-%20English%20_2_.pdf.
- Pugliese, J. (2013). *State Violence and the Execution of Law: Biopolitical Caesurae of Torture, Black Sites, Drones (Law and the Postcolonial)*. New York: Routledge.
- Ravid, B. (2012). "Head of the Shin Bet on Tag Mehir: Yitzhar Settlers Terrorize the Government," *Ha'aretz*, February 3, www.haaretz.co.il/news/politics/1.1632993 (in Hebrew).
- Razack, S. (1998). *Looking White People in the Eye: Gender, Race, and Culture in Courtrooms and Classrooms*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- (ed.) (2002). *Race, Space and the Law: Unmapping a White Settler Society*. Toronto: Between the Lines.
- (2003). "Those Who 'Witness the Evil.'" *Hypathia* 18(1): 204–211.
- (2009a). "Afterword: Race, Desire, and Contemporary Security Discourses." *University of Toronto Quarterly* 78(2): 815–820.
- (2009b). "Racism, Empire and Torture." *Racism Review: Thoughts on Racism, Culture, Society, Politics*, www.racismreview.com/blog/2009/05/22/racism-and-torture.

- (2011a). "The Space of Difference in Law: Inquests into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody." *Somatechnics* 1(1): 87–123.
- (2011b). "Timely Deaths: Medicalizing the Deaths of Aboriginal People in Police Custody." *Law, Culture and the Humanities* 7: 1–23.
- (2012). "Memorializing Colonial Power: The Death of Frank Paul." *Law and Social Inquiry* 37(4): 908–932.
- Regev, M. (2011). *The Intoxication of Redemption*. Tel Aviv: Yediot Ahronot (in Hebrew).
- Reiger, K. and Dempsey, R. (2006). "Performing Birth in a Culture of Fear: An Embodied Crisis in Late Modernity." *Health Sociological Review* 15(4): 364–373.
- Ries, N. (2002). "Anthropology and the Everyday, from Comfort to Terror." *New Literary History* 33(4): 725–742.
- Rifkin, M. (2009). "Indigenizing Agamben: Rethinking Sovereignty in Light of the 'Peculiar' Status of Native Peoples." *Cultural Critique* 73(1): 88–124.
- Robin, C. (2004). *Fear: The History of a Political Idea*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Robinson, S. (2013). *Citizen Strangers: Palestinians and the Birth of Israel's Liberal Settler State*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Rouhana, N. N. (1997). *Palestinian Citizens in an Ethnic Jewish State: Identities in Conflict*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- (2006). "Zionism's Encounter with the Palestinians: The Dynamics of Force, Fear, and Extremism." In R. I. Rotberg (ed.), *Israeli and Palestinian Narratives of Conflict: History's Double Helix*. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, pp. 115–141.
- Rosenberg, O. (2012a). "Israel Police: Hundreds Watched Attempt to Lynch Palestinians in Jerusalem, Did Not Interfere," *Ha'aretz*, August 20, www.haaretz.com/news/national/israel-police-hundreds-watched-attempt-to-lynch-palestinians-in-jerusalem-did-not-interfere.premium-1.459293.
- (2012b). "Suspect Involved in Jerusalem 'Lynch' of Palestinian: 'Let Him Die, He's an Arab,'" *Ha'aretz*, August 20, www.haaretz.com/news/diplomacy-defense/suspect-involved-in-jerusalem-lynch-of-palestinian-let-him-die-he-s-an-arab-1.459490.
- Round Up (2005). "Childbirth in the Palestinian West Bank." *Reproductive Health Matters* 13(26): 193–194.
- Saban, I. (2004). "Minority Rights in Deeply Divided Societies: A Framework for Analysis and the Case of the Arab-Palestinian Minority in Israel." *New York University Journal of International Law and Politics* 34: 885–1003.
- Sabbah, H. (2008). "Lost Palestinian Refugee Camps on UN-Google Earth Map," *Sabbah Report*. <http://sabbah.biz/mt/archives/2008/04/10/lost-palestinian-refugee-camps-on-un-google-earth-map>.

- Sa'di, A. H. (2002). "Catastrophe, Memory and Identity: Al-Nakbah as a Component of Palestinian Identity." *Israel Studies* 7: 175–198.
- (2010). "The Borders of Colonial Encounter: The Case of Israel's Wall." *Asian Journal of Social Science* 38: 46–59.
- (2011). "Ominous Designs: Israel's Strategies and Tactics of Controlling the Palestinians during the First Two Decades." In E. Zureik, D. Lyon and Y. Abu-Laban (eds.), *Surveillance and Population Control in Israel/Palestine*. New York: Routledge, pp. 83–98.
- Sa'di, A. H. and Abu-Lughod, L. (eds.) (2007). *Nakba: Palestine, 1948, and the Claims of Memory*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage.
- (1980). *The Question of Palestine*. New York: Vintage.
- Salzberger, E. (1993). "A Positive Analysis of the Doctrine of Separation of Powers, or: Why Do We Have an Independent Judiciary?" *International Review of Law and Economics* 13: 349–379.
- Sayegh, F. A. (1965). *Zionist Colonialism in Palestine*. Beirut: Research Center, Palestine Liberation Organization.
- Sayigh, R. (2007). "Palestinian Refugee Women's Stories of Home and Homelessness: Towards a New Research Agenda." *Review of Women's Studies* 4, http://home.birzeit.edu/wsi/images/stories/The_review/4th_issue/issue_4_E_1st_article.pdf.
- Schaeffer, E. (2011). "No Home: No Homeland," Israeli Committee against House Demolitions, www.icahd.org/sites/default/files/No%20Home%20No%20Homeland%20V2.0%20%283%29.pdf.
- Schneider, E. (2002). *Battered Women and Feminist Lawmaking*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Scott, J. C. (1985). *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Sedley, S., Scotland, P., Oldham, F., Hildyard, M., Khan, J., Harrill, J., Lanchin, J., Davies, G. and Mason, M. (2012). "Children in Military Custody: A Report Written by a Delegation of British Lawyers on the Treatment of Palestinian Children under Israeli Military Law," www.childreninmilitarycustody.org/report.
- Shalhoub-Kevorkian, N. (2005). "Counter Spaces as Resistance in Conflict Zones: Palestinian Women Recreating a Home." *Journal of Feminist Family Therapy* 17(3–4): 109–141.
- (2007a). *Gender and the Militarization of Education in Palestine*. Jerusalem: Women Studies Center (in Arabic).
- (2007b). "When Laws are Tools of Oppression: The Counter Discourse of Palestinian Women against the Policy of House Demolitions." In D. Barak-Erez, S. Yanisky-Ravid, Y. Bitton and D. Pugach (eds.), *Iyunei Mishpat Migdar V'Feminism*. Kiryat Ono: Navo, pp. 463–500 (in Hebrew).

- (2008). "The Gendered Nature of Education under Siege: A Palestinian Feminist Perspective." *International Journal of Lifelong Education* 27(2): 179–200.
- (2009). *Militarization and Violence against Women in Conflict Zones in the Middle East: A Palestinian Case-Study*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (2010a). "Education and the Israeli Industry of Fear." In A. E. Mazawi and R. G. Sultana (eds.), *Education in the Arab Region: Global Dynamics, Local Resonances*. New York: Routledge, pp. 335–349.
- (2010b). "Palestinian Women and the Politics of Invisibility: Towards a Feminist Methodology." *Peace Prints: South Asian Journal of Peacebuilding* 3(1): 1–21.
- (2010c). *Trapped Bodies and Lives: Military Occupation, Trauma and the Violence of Exclusion*. Jerusalem: YWCA.
- (2011). "E-resistance among Palestinian Women: Coping in Conflict-Ridden Areas." *Social Service Review* 85(2): 179–204.
- (2012a). *Birthing in Occupied East Jerusalem: Palestinian Women's Experiences of Pregnancy and Delivery*. Jerusalem: YWCA.
- (2012b). "E-resistance and Technological In/security in Everyday Life: The Palestinian Case." *British Journal of Criminology* 52(1): 55–72.
- Shalhoub-Kevorkian, N. and Khsheiboun, S. (2009). "Palestinian Women's Voices Challenging Human Rights Activism." *Women's Studies International Forum* 32(5): 354–362.
- Shalom, Z. (1991). "Security Policy, 1948–1956: The Main Dilemmas." In *Iyunim Bitkomat Israel*. Sede-Boker: Ben-Gurion Research Institute for the Study of Israel and Zionism, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, pp. 141–169 (in Hebrew).
- Shapira, Y. and Elitzur, Y. (2009). *Torat ha-melekh [The King's Torah]*. Yitzhar: Biblical Institute of Yeshiva Od Yosef Chai.
- Shepherd, L. J. (2004). "Visualizing Violence: Legitimacy and Authority in the 'War on Terror.'" *Critical Studies on Terrorism* 1(2): 213–226.
- Shnayderman, R. (2004). "Through No Fault of their Own: Punitive House Demolitions during the al-Aqsa Intifada," B'Tselem, www.btselem.org/english/publications/Index.asp?TF=06.
- Shragai, N. (2008). "The Settlers' New Policy: Price Tag on Every Evacuation by the Army," *Ha'aretz*, October 3, www.haaretz.co.il/misc/1.1352560 (in Hebrew).
- (2010). "Demography, Geopolitics, and the Future of Israel's Capital: Jerusalem's Proposed Master Plan," Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs, <http://jcpa.org/text/jerusalem-master-plan.pdf>.
- Simon, D. (1994). "The Demolition of Homes in the Israeli Occupied Territories." *Yale Journal of International Law* 19: 1–79.

- Smith, A. (2006). "Heteropatriarchy and the Three Pillars of White Supremacy: Rethinking Women of Color Organizing." In INCITE! Women of Color against Violence (ed.), *Color of Violence: The INCITE! Anthology*. Boston: South End Press, pp. 66–73.
- (2010). "Indigeneity, Settler Colonialism, White Supremacy." *Global Dialogue* 12(2), www.worlddialogue.org/content.php?id=488.
- Smith, R., Markusen, E. and Lifton, R. J. (1995). "Professional Ethics and the Denial of the Armenian Genocide." *Holocaust and Genocide Studies* 9: 1–22.
- Soffer, A. (2003). *Israel, Demography: Dangers and Opportunities: 2003–2020*. Haifa: Center for National Security Studies, University of Haifa.
- Soffer, A. and Shalev, G. (2004). "The Mere Actualization of the Palestinian 'Claim to Return.'" In "Ansambel": *The Identification and Examination of Central Themes in National Security*. Haifa: National Security Studies Centre, Haifa University (in Hebrew).
- Sprinzak, E. (1998). "Extremism and Violence in Israel: The Crisis of Messianic Politics." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 555: 114–126.
- Sternhell, Z. (2011). "Israeli Society is Standing by as Settlers Take the Reins," *Ha'aretz*, October 14, www.haaretz.com/print-edition/opinion/israeli-society-is-standing-by-as-settlers-take-the-reins-1.389841.
- Stoler, A. (1985). "Perceptions of Protest: Defining the Dangerous in Colonial Sumatra." *American Ethnologist* 12(4): 642–658.
- (1995). *Race and the Education of Desire: Foucault's History of Sexuality and the Colonial Order of Things*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- (2002). *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power: Race and the Intimate in Colonial Rule*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- (2008). "Imperial Debris: Reflections on Ruins and Ruination." *Cultural Anthropology* 23(2): 191–219.
- (2011). "Colonial Aphasia: Race and Disabled Histories in France." *Public Culture* 23: 121–156.
- Szasz, T. S. (2001). "The Therapeutic State: The Tyranny of Pharmacracry." *Independent Review* 5(4): 485–521.
- Tan, S. K. (1996). "Making Space for Heterologies: De Certeau's Links with Post-colonial Criticism." *Social Semiotics* 6(1): 27–44.
- Tawil-Souri, H. (2011). "Orange, Green and Blue: Color-coded Paperwork for Palestinian Population Control." In E. Zureik, D. Lyon and Y. Abu-Laban (eds.), *Surveillance and Population Control in Israel/Palestine*. New York: Routledge, pp. 219–238.
- Tessler, Y. (2010). "Shas Emergency Debate: 'We Won't Let the Conversion Law Be Passed,'" *Ma'ariv*, December 14, www.nrg.co.il/online/1/ART2/189/285.html (in Hebrew).

- Thobani, S. (2007). *Exalted Subjects: Studies in the Making of Race and Nation in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Turner, D. (1998). "From Valladolid to Ottawa: The Illusion of Listening to Aboriginal People." In J. E. Oakes (ed.), *Sacred Lands: Aboriginal World Views, Claims, and Conflicts*. Winnipeg: Canadian Circumpolar Institute, University of Manitoba, pp. 53–73.
- United Nations Fact Finding Mission on the Gaza Conflict (UNFFMGC) (2009). "Human Rights in Palestine and Other Occupied Arab Territories." General Assembly, Human Rights Council, A/HRC/12/48, www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/hrcouncil/docs/12session/A-HRC-12-48.pdf.
- United Nations General Assembly (1966). "International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights," www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/CESCR.aspx.
- (2009). "Annual Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and Reports of the Office of the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General." Human Rights Council, Tenth Session, A/HRC/10/35, <http://unispal.un.org/UNISPAL.NSF/0/C7067BCF833833D8E85257571006853D3>.
- Veracini, L. (2010). *Settler Colonialism: A Theoretical Overview*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Vision of Humanity (2012). "2012 Global Peace Index," www.visionofhumanity.org/gpi-data/#/2007/OVER.
- Waked, A. (2008). "Mother of 4 Went to Study in London and Can't Return," YNet, March 19, www.ynet.co.il/articles/0,7340,L-3520819,00.html (in Hebrew).
- Walla! (2012). "Suspicion of Jewish Terror: Vehicles were Put on Fire in an Arab Village in Jerusalem," January 4, <http://news.walla.co.il/?w=/1891074> (in Hebrew).
- Walsh, D. J. (2010). "Childbirth Embodiment: Problematic Aspects of Current Understandings." *Sociology of Health and Illness* 32(3): 486–501.
- Weizman, E. (2006). "Walking through Walls: Soldiers as Architects in the Israeli–Palestinian Conflict." *Radical Philosophy* 136: 8–22.
- (2007). *Hollow Land: Israel's Architecture of Occupation*. London: Verso.
- Wolfe, P. (1999). *Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology*. London: A&C Black.
- (2001). "Land, Labor and Difference: Elementary Structures of Race." *American Historical Review* 106: 866–905.
- (2006). "Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native." *Journal of Genocide Research* 8(4): 387–409.
- (2008). *Structure and Event: Settler Colonialism, Time, and the Question of Genocide*. New York: Berghahn.
- Yeğenoğlu, M. (1998). *Colonial Fantasies: Towards a Feminist Reading of Orientalism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Yemini, B. D. (2011). "The Jihadi Rights: Terrorism Protected by the State," *Ma'ariv*, December 14, www.nrg.co.il/online/1/ART2/316/108.html (in Hebrew).
- Yiftachel, O. (2006). *Ethnocracy: Land and Identity Politics in Israel/Palestine*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- YNet (2008). "Israeli Minister Warns Palestinians of 'Holocaust,'" February 29, www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-3512978,00.html.
- (2011). "46 Percent Supporting Tag Mehir, 68 Percent Rabbis Could Prevent it," March 21, www.ynet.co.il/articles/0,7340,L-4045372,00.html (in Hebrew).
- Young, I. M. (2003). "The Logic of Masculinist Protection: Reflections on the Current Security State." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 29(1): 1–25.
- Yuval-Davis, N. (1996). "Women and the Biological Reproduction of the 'Nation.'" *Women's Studies International Forum* 19(1–2): 17–24.
- Zarchin, T. (2012a). "Israel's Supreme Court President Criticized for Handling of Appeals against Citizenship Law," *Ha'arezt*, January 13, www.haaretz.com/print-edition/news/israel-s-supreme-court-president-criticized-for-handling-of-appeals-against-citizenship-law-1.407029.
- (2012b). "Cabinet Expected to Extend Law Withholding Citizenship from Palestinians Who Marry Israelis," *Ha'arezt*, January 22, www.haaretz.com/print-edition/news/cabinet-expected-to-extend-law-withholding-citizenship-from-palestinians-who-marry-israelis-1.408525.
- Zureik, E. (1979). *Palestinians in Israel: A Study in Internal Colonialism*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Zureik, E., Lyon, D. and Abu-Laban, Y. (eds.) (2011). *Surveillance and Population Control in Israel/Palestine: Population, Territory and Power*. New York: Routledge.

INDEX

- academics, responses to settler colonialism, 69
African-Americans, home as site of resistance, 106
Agamben, Giorgio, necropolitics, 68
Amir, Yigal, 30
aphasia, condition of, 70
appropriation of land *see* [land](#)
- Bab Alsat, Muslim Cemetery court case, 125
Balfour Declaration of 1917, 15
Barak, Ehud, 29
Basic Laws, effectiveness, 59
Ben Gurion, David, 12, 16
biblical narratives and settler colonialism, 15
biopolitics
 concept of, 3, 8, 116
 everydayness and, 19, 179
 legalized biopolitical violence, 7
 necropolitics and, 8, 116
 race and, 8
birth
 as act of defiance, 157
 breath, actual and metaphorical fight for, 164–169
 calculatedness of control, mother's perception of, 155–159
 control over, 144–149, 169–171
 mother's isolation in space and time, 149–155
 mother's loss of control, 159–164
 population growth, statistical data, 153([table](#))
 refusal to abort dead baby as act of defiance, 172–174
bodies, movement of *see* [death](#)
body control
 death and burial *see* [death](#)
 pregnancy *see* [birth](#)
 surveillance as method, 24–28
 Tag Mehir, 28
breath, actual and metaphorical fight for, 164–169
B'Tselem (Israeli human rights organization), 30
burial *see* [death](#)
cemetery desecrations, court decisions on, 121–127
children
 Citizenship and Entry into Israel Law, 61–64
 double death (natural and bureaucratic), 131–133
Citizenship and Entry into Israel Law of 2003
 children, 61–64
 as control instrument, 47–50, 64–69, 71
 effect of provisions, 50
 fear of otherness, 64, 66, 69
 human rights and, 50–53
 intellectual responses, 69
 necropolitics, 68
 population control, 56–57
 racial control, 53
 security concerns regarding family reunification, 53–56
 shifting forms of governance, 71
 Supreme Court of Israel ruling, 52, 57–60
 UN concerns, 51
 women, 51, 64–69
colonialism *see* [settler colonialism](#)
conspiracy culture, growth of, 45
court decisions on cemetery desecrations, 121–127
covert institutional discrimination, 59
cultural dispossession, policing of death as, 120–121
death
 bringing the dead home, denial, 136–137
 burial in secret, 128–131
 children, 131–133
 control over, 116–118
 court decisions on cemetery desecrations, 121–127
 deceased's loss of identity, 128–131
 double death (natural and bureaucratic), 131–133
 effect of surveillance and securitization, 137–139
 enlivening the dead, 118–120
 movement of bodies, control over, 133–136

- death (*cont.*)
 necropolitics, 139–143
 personal experiences, 127–128
 policing of, as cultural dispossession, 120–121
 right to kill as absolute articulation of sovereignty, 140
 spaces of difference, 140
 defence system and politics of fear, 10, 13
 demographic policy *see* population control
 demolitions *see* house demolitions
 Derrida, Jacques, politics of death, 117
 discrimination *see* race
 dispossession from land *see* land
- East Jerusalem
 as dying city, 77
 urban zoning as population control, 82–86, 150
- Elitzur, Josef, 32
 Elitzur, Yosef, 34
 Eliyahu, Mordechai, 34
 Elkin, Ze'ev, 31
- everydayness
 biopolitics and, 19, 179
 definition, 1
 feminism and, 2
 politics of, 19
- family life, control over *see* Citizenship and Entry into Israel Law of 2003
 family reunification, security concerns over, 53–56
- Fanon, Frantz
 colonizers and colonized as different species, 120
 colonizer's "right to oppress," 26
 fear of otherness, 8
 legislation as appropriation of power, 80
 objectification of colonized, 66
 quoted, 1, 12
 rhetoric as political tool, 22
 surveillance and control, 24
- fear
 colonialism and, 5
 historical context, 11–16
 homelessness, 109–110
 industry of fear, 10
 of otherness, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9
 politics of fear, 7–11
 security and, 3, 7, 9, 13, 174–176
 sociocide and, 10
 truth and, 11
 violence and, 10, 13
- feminism and everydayness, 2
 Foucault, Michel, biopolitics, 3, 8, 116, 179
 Fourth Geneva Convention of 1949, 18, 89
- Gavriely-Nuri, Dalia, violence as "rational transaction," 34
- Gaza
 Israeli military attack of 2008–2009, 2, 16, 17
 Israeli military attack of 2012, 17
 Israeli military attack of 2014, 16, 17
 Qassam rocket attacks, 17
- gender *see* women
- Goldstone Report *see* United Nations Fact Finding Mission on the Gaza Conflict
- governance *see* security; settler colonialism; surveillance
- graffiti, surveillance power of, 21, 22, 41–44
- Habayit HaYehudi (New National Religious Party), 31
- Haehud HaLeumi (National Union Party), 31
- Hague Convention and Regulations of 1907, 18, 89
- Hajaj, Majda, death of, 2, 8
 Hajaj, Raya, death of, 2, 8
- Harper, David, conspiracy culture, 45
- Herzl, Theodore, 5, 11
- home
 erasure, 82–86
see also house demolitions
 fear of homelessness, 109–110
 meaning of, 108–109
 Nakba, memories of, 73
 politics of home and homeland, 74
 as source of memory and identity, 73–74
 violence against
 as control instrument, 110–115
 meaning of, 77
 memories of, 74–78
see also house demolitions
 as war zone, 90–91
- hooks, bell, home as site of resistance, 106
- house demolitions
 avoidance, 92
 historical continuity since Nakba, 82
 as human rights violation, 82
 international humanitarian law, and, 89
 judicial review, 88
 process, 96–101
 security justifications, 87–90
 self-demolition, 92–96
 statistical data, 83(table), 87
 use of urban warfare tactics, 90–91
 women's experiences, 102–108
- housing policy as demographic engineering, 84
- human rights
 citizenship and residence law, 50–53
 effectiveness of Basic Laws, 59

- identity cards, introduction and issuing, 48
 images *see graffiti, surveillance power of*
 industry of fear *see fear*
 intellectuals, responses to settler colonialism, 69
 intelligence services, maintenance of fear, 9
 international alliances, maintenance of fear, 9
 international humanitarian law
 house demolitions, 89
 settler colonialism and, 18
 invisibility of power, 26, 43, 177
- Jabotinsky, Vladimir, 11
 Jerusalem *see East Jerusalem*
 Judaization through population control, 86
 judicial review *see Supreme Court of Israel*
- Kach (political party), 29
 Kahane, Meir, 29
The King's Torah see Torat ha-melekh
 Knesset proceedings
 Basic Laws amendment, 56, 59
 Citizenship and Entry into Israel Law, 50, 53, 56, 61
 demographic policy, 152
 Nakba Law, 78
 Supreme Court and, 60
 Kretzmer, David, covert institutional discrimination, 59
- land
 amalgamation, 6
 appropriation/dispossession, 9, 10, 12
 biblical claims, 15
 control, 28
 settler claim, 5, 6
 Zionist map of Palestine, 16
 see also home
- language
 Citizenship and Entry into Israel Law as cognitive redirection tool, 70, 72
 surveillance power of, 21, 22
- law
 legalized violence, 7, 9
 legislation as appropriation of power, 80
 Lebanon, war of 2006, 34
 life and death *see necropolitics*
- Maguire, Mairead Corrigan, 17
 Mbembe, Achille
 colonizer's denial of racism, 72
 control of space, 142
 necropolitics, 43, 68, 116, 140
 power of life and death, 142, 187
 military forces, politics of fear, 10, 13
- mind control
 surveillance as method, 24–28
 Tag Mehir, 28
 movement, justifications for restrictions, 3
 Muammar brothers, 17
 Muhareb, Mahmoud, Tag Mehir philosophy, 35
 Museum of Tolerance and Human Dignity
 court case, 123
- Nakba
 commemoration, 78
 “demographic problem,” 18
 house demolitions, 82
 law against commemoration *see Nakba Law of 2011*
 memories of, 73
 “refugee problem,” 11
 Nakba Law of 2011
 erasure of memory as aim of, 77
 as memory surveillance, 78–82
 narrative accounts *see personal experiences*
 National Union Party *see Haehud HaLeumi*
 necropolitics
 biopolitics and, 8, 116
 Citizenship and Entry into Israel Law, 68
 colonialism and, 8
 concept, 43
 everydayness and, 19
 race and, 8
 right to kill as absolute articulation of sovereignty, 140
 surveillance and, 41–44
 see also birth death
 New National Religious Party *see Habayit HaYehudi*
- Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, 30
 Olmert, Ehud, 34
 otherness
 control under citizenship laws, 64, 66, 69
 fear of, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9
 rationalization of fear of, 179–181
 women, 27
- Palestinian exodus (Nakba) of 1948 *see Nakba*
 Palestinian refugees, fear of, 12
 Parliament *see Knesset proceedings*
 permits, introduction and issuing, 48
 personal experiences
 childbirth, 144, 149, 155–164, 165
 Citizenship and Entry into Israel Law, 47–50, 64–69
 death and burial, 118–120, 133–137
 death of baby, 131–133
 fear of homelessness, 108

- personal experiences (*cont.*)
 home, violence against, 74–78
 house demolitions, 92, 96–101, 102–104, 105
 self-demolition of homes, 92–96
 Tag Mehir, 21, 36–41
 personal integrity, violation of, 21
 politics of fear *see* [fear](#)
 population control
 Citizenship and Entry into Israel Law, 56–57
 “demographic problem” post-Nakba, 18
 housing policy as demographic engineering, 84
 Judaization policy, 86
 population growth, statistical data, 153
 revoking of residency rights, 85
 poverty, race and, 23
 power relations, topography of, 177–179
 pregnancy *see* [birth](#)
 Price Tag activists *see* [Tag Mehir](#)
 propaganda and maintenance of fear, 9
 psychological effects of surveillance, 36–41
 public policy and racial discrimination, 23
- Qadoom (village), 42
 Qassam rocket attacks from Gaza, 17
- Rabin, Yitzhak, 30
 race
 biopolitics and, 8
 Citizenship and Entry into Israel Law, 53
 colonialists’ denial of racism, 72
 covert institutional discrimination, 59
 discriminatory public policies, 23
 effect of discrimination, 28
 necropolitics and, 8
 poverty and, 23
 racial epistemic of governance, 71
 Razack, Sherene, colonizer’s “right to oppress,” 26
 “refugee problem,” fear of, 12
 Regev, Micha, 32
 residence permits, introduction and issuing, 48
 rhetoric *see* [language](#)
 right to kill as absolute articulation of sovereignty, 140
 right to return, Palestinians’
 denial, 14
 as “security risk,” 112
 rocket attacks from Gaza, 17
- Sayegh, Faye
 effect of racial discrimination, 28
 Zionist racial identification, 25
- Schijveschuurder, Shvuel, 30
 security
 fear and, 3, 7, 9, 13, 174–176
 theology of *see* [security theology](#)
 security theology
 aggressive practices, 18
 biblical justifications, 14
 elements, 26
 global racial politics, and, 16–18
 rationalization, 179–181
 self-demolition *see* [house demolitions](#)
 Separation Wall, West Bank, racial justification, 11
 settlements, illegality, 17
 settler colonialism
 aphasia, condition of, 70
 biblical justifications, 15
 biopolitics, concept of, 3
 call to challenge, 184–187
 claim to land, 5, 6
 “colonial order of things,” 68
 colonizers and colonized as different species, 120
 definition by details, 181–184
 democratic status, 17
 fear and, 5
 framework, 5–7
 gender and colonialism, 2
 intellectual responses, 69
 international humanitarian law, and, 18
 invisibility of power, 26, 43, 177
 necropolitics and, 8
 objectification of colonized, 66
 race and, 8
 racism, denial of, 72
 rationalization, 179–181
 “right to oppress,” 26
 shifting forms of governance, 71
 sociocide of colonized as aim, 10
 topography of power relations, 177–179
 varieties, 27
 Shajaeyeh, massacre of 2014, 16
 Shalhoub-Kevorkian, Nadera, invisibility of power, 43
 Shalit, Gilad, 17
 Shapira, Yitzhak, 32
 Shin Bet (Israeli secret security agency), 31
 “sociocide” as aim of settler colonialism, 10
 Sofer, Amnon, 54
 space
 death and spaces of difference, 140
 invasion of private space, 21
 politicization of, 22
 surveillance power of vandalism, 22
see also [home](#)

- Stoler, Ann Laura
 aphasia, 70
 “colonial order of things,” 68
 racial epistemic of governance, 71
- Supreme Court of Israel
 Citizenship and Entry into Israel Law
 ruling, 52, 57–60
 independence, 58, 60
 judicial review of house demolitions,
 88(footnote)
- surveillance
 control of body and mind, 24–28
 emotional effects, 21, 24
 invisibility, 26
 necropolitics and, 41–44
 official non-acknowledgement, 70
 political economy of, 33–36
 psychological impact, 36–41
 Tag Mehir *see* Tag Mehir
- Tag Mehir
 activities, 29–33
 graffiti, 41–44
 impact assessed, 44–46
 as instrument of control, 28
 politicization of space, 22
 “price tag” concept, 33
 psychological impact, 36–41
 surveillance power, 22
 violence, 33–36
- Tel Aviv University, Muslim cemetery court
 case, 122
- topography of power relations, 177–179
Torat ha-melekh (The King’s Torah), 32, 34
- Truman, Harry, 16
- truth and fear, 11
- Tuba Zangariyya (village), 30
- unemployment *see* poverty
- United Kingdom, Balfour Declaration of
 1917, 15
- United Nations concerns over Citizenship
 and Entry into Israel Law, 51
- United Nations Fact Finding Mission on the
 Gaza Conflict (UNFFMGC), 2
- United States
 support for Israel, 16–18
 Zionist map of Palestine, and, 16
- urban zoning as population control, 82–86,
 150
- vandalism, surveillance power of, 22
- violence
 biblical justifications, 15
 fear and, 10, 13
 legalized, 7, 9
 racial justification, 8
 as “rational transaction,” 34
- war and politics of fear, 13
- Wiesenthal, Simon, 123
- women
 Citizenship and Entry into Israel Law and,
 51, 64–69
 colonialism and, 2
 experiences *see* personal experiences
 house demolitions, 102–108
 otherness, 27
 pregnancy *see* birth
 psychological impact of surveillance,
 36–41
- words *see* language
- Yeğenoğlu, Meyda
 otherness of women, 27
- Zionism
 biblical claims, 14
 fear and security in relation, 7, 11
 map of Palestine, 16
 racial identification, 25
 settler colonialism and, 5

CAMBRIDGE STUDIES IN LAW AND SOCIETY

Books in the series

Diseases of the Will
Mariana Valverde

The Politics of Truth and Reconciliation in South Africa:
Legitimizing the Post-Apartheid State
Richard A. Wilson

Modernism and the Grounds of Law
Peter Fitzpatrick

Unemployment and Government:
Genealogies of the Social
William Walters

Autonomy and Ethnicity:
Negotiating Competing Claims in Multi-Ethnic States
Yash Ghai

Constituting Democracy:
Law, Globalism and South Africa's Political Reconstruction
Heinz Klug

The Ritual of Rights in Japan:
Law, Society, and Health Policy
Eric A. Feldman

The Invention of the Passport:
Surveillance, Citizenship and the State
John Torpey

Governing Morals:
A Social History of Moral Regulation
Alan Hunt

The Colonies of Law:
Colonialism, Zionism and Law in Early Mandate Palestine
Ronen Shamir

Law and Nature
David Delaney

Social Citizenship and Workfare in the United States and Western
Europe:
The Paradox of Inclusion
Joel F. Handler

Law, Anthropology and the Constitution of the Social:

Making Persons and Things

Edited by Alain Pottage and Martha Mundy

Judicial Review and Bureaucratic Impact:

International and Interdisciplinary Perspectives

Edited by Marc Hertogh and Simon Halliday

Immigrants at the Margins:

Law, Race, and Exclusion in Southern Europe

Kitty Calavita

Lawyers and Regulation:

The Politics of the Administrative Process

Patrick Schmidt

Law and Globalization from Below:

Toward a Cosmopolitan Legality

Edited by Boaventura de Sousa Santos and

Cesar A. Rodriguez-Garavito

Public Accountability:

Designs, Dilemmas and Experiences

Edited by Michael W. Dowdle

Law, Violence and Sovereignty among West Bank Palestinians

Tobias Kelly

Legal Reform and Administrative Detention Powers in China

Sarah Biddulph

The Practice of Human Rights:

Tracking Law Between the Global and the Local

Edited by Mark Goodale and Sally Engle Merry

Judges Beyond Politics in Democracy and Dictatorship:

Lessons from Chile

Lisa Hilbink

Paths to International Justice:

Social and Legal Perspectives

Edited by Marie-Bénédicte Dembour and Tobias Kelly

Law and Society in Vietnam:

The Transition from Socialism in Comparative Perspective

Mark Sidel

Constitutionalizing Economic Globalization:

Investment Rules and Democracy's Promise

David Schneiderman

The New World Trade Organization Knowledge Agreements:
2nd Edition
Christopher Arup

Justice and Reconciliation in Post-Apartheid South Africa
Edited by François du Bois and Antje du Bois-Pedain

Militarization and Violence against Women in Conflict Zones in the
Middle East:
A Palestinian Case-Study
Nadera Shalhoub-Kevorkian

Child Pornography and Sexual Grooming:
Legal and Societal Responses
Suzanne Ost

Darfur and the Crime of Genocide
John Hagan and Wenona Rymond-Richmond

Fictions of Justice:
*The International Criminal Court and the Challenge of Legal Pluralism in
Sub-Saharan Africa*
Kamari Maxine Clarke

Conducting Law and Society Research:
Reflections on Methods and Practices
Simon Halliday and Patrick Schmidt

Planted Flags:
Trees, Land, and Law in Israel/Palestine
Irus Braverman

Culture under Cross-Examination:
International Justice and the Special Court for Sierra Leone
Tim Kelsall

Cultures of Legality:
Judicialization and Political Activism in Latin America
Javier Couso, Alexandra Huneeus and Rachel Sieder

Courting Democracy in Bosnia and Herzegovina:
The Hague Tribunal's Impact in a Postwar State
Lara J. Nettelfield

The Gacaca Courts and Post-Genocide Justice and Reconciliation in
Rwanda:
Justice without Lawyers
Phil Clark

Law, Society, and History:

Themes in the Legal Sociology and Legal History of Lawrence M. Friedman
Robert W. Gordon and Morton J. Horwitz

After Abu Ghraib:

Exploring Human Rights in America and the Middle East
Shadi Mokhtari

Adjudication in Religious Family Laws:

Cultural Accommodation: Legal Pluralism, and Gender Equality in India
Gopika Solanki

Water On Tap:

Rights and Regulation in the Transnational Governance of Urban Water Services
Bronwen Morgan

Elements of Moral Cognition:

Rawls' Linguistic Analogy and the Cognitive Science of Moral and Legal Judgment
John Mikhail

A Sociology of Constitutions:

Constitutions and State Legitimacy in Historical-Sociological Perspective
Chris Thornhill

Mitigation and Aggravation at Sentencing

Edited by Julian Roberts

Institutional Inequality and the Mobilization of the Family and
Medical Leave Act:

Rights on Leave
Catherine R. Albiston

Authoritarian Rule of Law:

Legislation, Discourse and Legitimacy in Singapore
Jothie Rajah

Law and Development and the Global Discourses of Legal Transfers

Edited by John Gillespie and Pip Nicholson

Law against the State:

Ethnographic Forays into Law's Transformations
Edited by Julia Eckert, Brian Donahoe, Christian Strümpell and Zerrin
Özlem Biner

Transnational Legal Process and State Change

Edited by Gregory C. Shaffer

Legal Mobilization under Authoritarianism:

The Case of Post-Colonial Hong Kong

Edited by Waikeung Tam

Complementarity in the Line of Fire:

The Catalysing Effect of the International Criminal Court in Uganda and Sudan

Sarah M. H. Nouwen

Political and Legal Transformations of an Indonesian Polity:

The Nagari from Colonisation to Decentralisation

Franz von Benda-Beckmann and Keebet von Benda-Beckmann

Pakistan's Experience with Formal Law:

An Alien Justice

Osama Siddique

Human Rights under State-Enforced Religious Family Laws in Israel,
Egypt, and India

Yüksel Sezgin

Why Prison?

Edited by David Scott

Law's Fragile State:

Colonial, Authoritarian, and Humanitarian Legacies in Sudan

Mark Fathi Massoud

Rights for Others:

The Slow Home-Coming of Human Rights in the Netherlands

Barbara Oomen

European States and their Muslim Citizens:

The Impact of Institutions on Perceptions and Boundaries

Edited by John R. Bowen, Christophe Bertossi, Jan Willem Duyvendak
and Mona Lena Krook

Religion, Law and Society

Russell Sandberg

The Experiences of Face Veil Wearers in Europe and the Law

Edited by Eva Brems

The Contentious History of the International Bill of Human Rights

Christopher N. J. Roberts

Transnational Legal Orders

Edited by Terence C. Halliday and Gregory Shaffer

Lost in China? Law, Culture and Society in Post-1997 Hong Kong
Carol A. G. Jones

Security Theology, Surveillance and the Politics of Fear
Nadera Shalhoub-Kevorkian