



The place of Israel in Asia: settler colonialism, mobility, memory, and identity among Palestinians in Israel

Magid Shihade

To cite this article: Magid Shihade (2016) The place of Israel in Asia: settler colonialism, mobility, memory, and identity among Palestinians in Israel, *Settler Colonial Studies*, 6:2, 133-141, DOI: [10.1080/2201473X.2015.1024379](https://doi.org/10.1080/2201473X.2015.1024379)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/2201473X.2015.1024379>



Published online: 13 Apr 2015.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 360



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Citing articles: 2 View citing articles [↗](#)

The place of Israel in Asia: settler colonialism, mobility, memory, and identity among Palestinians in Israel

Magid Shihade*

Institute of International Studies, Birzeit University, Birzeit, Palestine

This research is part of an initiative by the Social Science Research Council (SSRC) on ‘transregional inter-Asian connections and contexts that aims at reconceptualizing and rethinking Asia, in order to go beyond the territorial and conceptual fixities of area studies that divide the region into East, West, South, Southeast’, and which moreover exceptionalizes one part of Asia – The Middle East – with a name that has no connection to the geography of the region. This has also led some states to fall in the cracks between these regions and sub-regions, an issue that raises many questions I will explore in this research.

This research explores what it means to think of the place of Israel in Asia, considering that leaders in the Zionist movement marketed their settler colonial project in Palestine to Western political leaders as the West’s front against the barbaric East – civilization and democracy posed against despotic Asia. This self-designation and understanding of Israel’s place and role continue to be used by Israeli leaders despite a softening of their vocabulary, and Israel continues to be seen in this way by western leaders. My research also explores the political and social experiences of Palestinians within the Israeli state as West Asians and in relation to the boundaries of ‘Asia’. By situating Palestinians within Asia, this project radically rethinks the categories of who is conventionally considered Asian, and interrogates forms of ‘Asia-making’ by considering the place of Israel within Asian history as entangled with Western colonial and racial modernity. It also shows how such mythmaking and externally imposed categories that stem from a Western history of racialization, colonization, and domination became quickly incorporated by the dominated group. While the myth of the Middle East was introduced by an American military general in 1946 (before then and due to French and British dominance in the region, The Levant or the Near East were the imposed terms), it soon became for people in the region a myth to think of oneself as something other than Middle Eastern. Once incorporated, myths and categories become hard to rethink, so that countering or even interrogating them comes to seem for many just another form of mythmaking.

My research is an attempt to study these questions through a study of the social and political history of Palestinians who remained within the boundaries of the newly created state of Israel after the war of 1948 and became its citizens (‘48 Palestinians). It examines the impact and legacy of the creation of the Israeli state, and of its early policies of military rule that lasted

*Email: mshihade@gmail.com

officially till 1966, on issues of identity, space, and mobility. During this period, Palestinians in Israel experienced increased spatial confinement that altered their freedom of movement and, in consequence, their regional and national identifications and imagination. There was an increased distance between different Palestinian communities within Israel itself, given the restrictions on travel regulated by permits awarded by the state, and also between '48 Palestinians and the rest of the Palestinian population and the Arab world, or West Asia and North Africa. This resulted in greater disconnection internally as well as the severing of the social, political, and economic links with Lebanon, Syria, and Egypt, among other places, which had existed before 1948. Due to Israel's policies of legal exclusion, repression, and marginalization, there were enormous political risks for '48 Palestinians in maintaining what had previously been their familial, cultural, and economic ties with the larger West Asian hinterland, as well as with North Africa. Thus, the possibility for Palestinian identity to participate in a larger, transregional identity became increasingly fragile and transregional political imaginaries were increasingly tenuous, even risky.

However, and despite state repression and the rupture that took place after 1948, there were moments when an inter-Asian political imaginary was reignited during this period. One was in the political context of pan-Arab nationalism and anti-imperial Third Worldism in the 1950s and 1960s, which prompted Palestinians in Israel to the call for pan-Asian and Third World solidarity, particularly in the context of the Non-Aligned Movement. The second was in the cultural context of Palestinian consumption of Arabic films and literature, together with other Asian, specifically Indian, cinema and literature, and the inter-Asian social and political affinities that this forged in that period. These moments of connection were opportunities to reconnect with the Arab region, Asia, and the Third World in general. On the one hand, this was a response to the rupturing of a larger social and cultural identity that had been connected to the region in the past, and on the other hand, this was inspired by the rise of the Third World movement, which called for a more expansive identity and aspired to a world free of colonial domination, political and economic repression, and racial exclusion.

Methodology: thus spoke Ibn Khaldoun¹: *tafhees wa tamhees*

My methodology is informed by ideas from Ibn Khaldoun – the fourteenth century Arab scholar – that caution against, and even ask scholars to avoid, official narratives and archives, and instead make use of critical analytical skills through a process of deduction and critical engagement with material written on the subject. His proposed method also entails the scholar's presence in the place of research, and conversations with people knowledgeable about historical events, and those they witnessed or participated in, and studying local archives, through a systematic *tafhees* and *tamhees* (terms used by Ibn Khaldoun meaning a critical study of material, and checking information against other sources, and a thorough process of deduction to examine what makes sense). My own research is based on interviews with people of different generations in the village, local and personal archives, newspapers from the period, and secondary literature. I have been examining the impact of 1948 on issues of mobility, connections, and rupture that have been experienced and are imagined today by older and younger generations in the village of Kafr-Yassif in Galilee.

I also draw on literary works by 1948 Palestinian authors including novels and poetry, as well as films and documentaries and plays. This cultural production can help in understanding the sentiments of people as they dealt with their predicament after 1948 and the ways in which these pan-Arab and Third Worldist identities were expressed in a range of genres. Literature, theater, and film provide nuanced and deep insights into the effects of confinement, and also into the aspiration of linking with the broader region, and the Third World at large, offering a powerful critique of western modernity and its impact on peoples around the world.

Theoretical framework: the settler, the native, the nomad, and rupture

While having many similarities with other modes of colonialism, settler colonialism is defined by its permanent structure, by its ideology of separation of racialised populations, its policies and structures of trapping and confinement, its mechanism of elimination, and by its projection onto the natives of its own violence.² It is also characterized by its logic of transfer and by forms of non-physical alienation that many scholars of Native American studies have framed as ‘killing the Indian but keeping the man’, a concept related to what Masalha terms an attempt to kill the collective historical memory of natives.³ Significant also is the traveling of the discourse of settler colonialism among different sites.⁴

In the field of Settler Colonial Studies as well as Palestine Studies, the question of inter-Asian connections has not been addressed till now, so my study will fill this gap in the scholarship. Central to this contribution is the work of Fayege Sayegh on the nature of settler colonialism in Palestine, which is the earliest work to frame the question of Israel/Palestine as a settler colonial one and to do so in Asian and African contexts. Sayegh argued that the creation of the Israeli state led to the delinking of Palestine from Asia and Africa, as Palestine historically formed a link between these two continents, and so the settler colonial project goes against the sovereignty and self-determination of *all* the peoples of these continents. According to him, the creation of the Israeli settler colonial state was an imposition on the region by colonial powers against the wishes of the people from Africa and Asia.⁵ My study builds on this work by looking at the impact of this rupture on several generations in the village, and how they attempted to overcome spatial as well as social, political, and cultural constrictions of identity. This rupture, I argue, is a long lasting one that befell not only the Palestinians, but others as well. It is only through the study of this rupture created by the Israeli settler colonial state on Palestinians and others from 1948 to the present that one can understand better Sayegh’s concept of a colonial imposition against both Asians and Africans; wars, displacement, refugees, invasions, air strikes, blockades, and sanctions, among other things, became a structure of rupture that has been impacting peoples from both continents.

In conjunction with Sayegh’s theoretical insight of rupture, I utilize the work of the fourteenth century Arab scholar, Ibn Khaldoun – especially his concept of the Nomad as it pertains to mobility as a central aspect of human life. My work brings them into conversation, as they both deal with a rupture, but from different intellectual backgrounds; Sayegh is thinking through a Third Worldist and settler colonial prism, that saw Israeli settler colonialism in Palestine as a rupture between Africa and Asia, as a Western imposition against the decolonizing wave of the South, while Ibn Khaldoun was thinking through the nature of the human, where mobility, connections and cooperation, labor, and creativity are central to being human.

My project is also informed by the Latin American School of modernity/(de)coloniality, and the school of intercontinental philosophy, both of which challenge the official history, anthropology, and genealogy of knowledge, principally the work of C.K. Raju, which details how knowledge from different parts of the world was appropriated by the West without reference to its original sources and how Western regimes of knowledge production often developed from these ideas and concepts without accurately understanding them, leading to their misrepresentation.⁶ These traditions of decolonizing knowledge inform this work. Thus, in conjunction with the work on settler colonialism, my project here critically uses the concept of the *nomad* and the way mobility shapes identity and politics, as discussed by Ibn Khaldoun and as later developed in theories of nomadology by Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, as well as other works that study the linkages between space, mobility, and identity.⁷ Specifically, I will look at the impact of confinement on people’s identity and the way they respond to such confinement.

While Deleuze and Guattari borrow the concept of the nomad from Ibn Khaldoun, with one tiny reference, they restrict the meaning of the nomad to one aspect, central as it is, that focuses on the relationship between the individual and the state, specifically in the context of violence and war-making. Accordingly, their analysis is confined to the modern European state, in line with the work of Charles Tilly that also looks at the individual through the prism of the modern state, a specifically Eurocentric approach.⁸ On the other end of the spectrum of the school of nomadology that developed out of this work, the nomad is presented as the human without roots, without connections, having no place of origin, continually roaming the earth unbound by political structures or places of origin. This romanticized version of the nomad has been criticized, and correctly so. Alex Young, building on the work of critical Native American scholarship such as that of Jodi Byrd, argues that this romanticization of nomadology serves to erase both the Natives, who are excluded from such narratives, and the history and experience they underwent as a result of violent Western/European mobility. Young terms such a framing of nomadology as ‘a settler colonial fantasy’.⁹ Hence my exposition of the issue of nomadology/mobility as articulated originally by Ibn Khaldoun and misappropriated by Deleuze and Guattari can contribute to the discussion on different fronts of the ongoing critique of settler colonialism, and can contribute to the discussion in different fields including border studies, and migration, among others.

Both of these ways of presenting and exceptionalizing the nomad either as a violent conqueror or as world traveler are misconceptions of the original idea offered by Ibn Khaldoun. The nomad is part of Ibn Khaldoun’s theorizing of social organizations that took place in the context of pre-‘modern’ nation states. While mobile humans or nomads, in Ibn Khaldoun’s understanding, often do challenge the rule/government of each territory during and through their mobility, and can engage in violence against that rule, there are other aspects of mobility that for Ibn Khaldoun are central to being human. Rather than this restricted analysis of nomadology/mobility, which is also part of westerners’ privilege, rootedness, and mobility are dialectically related in Ibn Khaldoun’s understanding. It is neither about the invading Mongols nor about the romantic Orientalism of Bedouin sheiks. Nomad or in Ibn Khaldoun’s Arabic term, *badawi/badiw* (Bedouin/Bedouins), is primarily an economic term. It is about a mode of economic production or what he terms it as the way one or a group makes a living. Nomads’ way of making a living is through animals raising and farming. Both need rootedness as well as mobility. In the time of Ibn Khaldoun, a quite different historical context, rootedness was not seen in opposition to or as a negation of mobility/nomadology, but rather each connected with and constituted the other. Mobility is something that people do, not simply because of some lack of rootedness or a desire to roam the earth, but also out of necessity. So, the fact that the original concept is not acknowledged, but only incompletely appropriated, leads to further misrepresentation of that concept, and little is learned from it.

Nomadology for Ibn Khaldoun is the norm, not the exception, and not the trait of the few. It is not confined to violent movement, and in fact violence is not central to nomadism. Nomadology for Ibn Khaldoun is more about labor and sustenance, which is central to any human social organization. For Ibn Khaldoun, all people, by nature, seek sustenance and so move, to different degrees and in different ways, from one place to another in order to labor and live or survive. They move when there is a lack of resources in the areas they live in, or when their labor is not treated justly.

The important point here is that nomadology is not strictly about conquest or violence as Deleuze and Guattari see it. Nomadology is about seeking refuge as well, as well as about creativity, and its core is about being a free person/human. After all, we are told again and again by ‘western’ thought, that it is only natural to be free as a human. Yet freedom and mobility have, since the rise and dominance of western modernity, represented the privilege of one-way movement for some. In the case of Palestine, it is the settler who has the privilege of free mobility,

taking over the natural habitat of the native, while disrupting not only the natives' lives, but also the natural flow and interconnectedness of the region. So, what has disrupted this human nature – nomadology – is precisely western modernity, racism, nation states, colonialism, and, acutely so, settler colonialism. So, it is the settler that has been the practitioner of violence, not the nomad.

It would have been more useful and original if Deleuze and Guattari had engaged the work of Ibn Khaldoun by taking into account this larger understanding of his concept of nomadology, and thinking of its application to the modern state, especially the settler colonial state, and the implications of his concept of the human nature of mobility, which for the modern state is an anomaly. In other words, if we follow Ibn Khaldoun's theorization of human nature, the nation state form of modern times goes against the grain of human nature in restricting a central constitution of human mobility. The settler colonial state in particular has its own specific dynamic of rupture, which, in conjunction with Ibn Khaldoun's work, highlights the value of the theoretical insight offered by Fayeze Sayegh as it pertains to Zionism and the colonization of Palestine. In the case of Palestine, the Israeli settler colonial state has led to a shattering of the Palestinian community and its social organization as these existed prior to 1948, for it dismembered and detached pre-1948 Palestinian society from its Arab surroundings. Furthermore, by being at war against Arab states, Israel disarticulated the whole region that had been for thousands of years a meeting point and a key node in the circulation of goods, humans, labor, and ideas that extended from Asia and Africa to the Mediterranean. Hence, the implications of the creation of the Israeli settler colonial states go beyond Palestine, the Palestinians and (in the academy) Palestine Studies to other regions, contexts, and areas of study.

My study of Palestinians in Israel accordingly contributes to work on inter-Asian contexts and connections in several ways. First, it problematizes the borders of Middle Eastern Studies as an area studies field by considering Palestinians within the category of 'Asians', and by building on existing literature that critiques the imperial and colonial divisions of the world, including Asia, into continents and regions.¹⁰ The project challenges conventional boundaries of locally and regionally produced identities that were framed by historical events and state structures and shaped by a colonial modernity that categorized Palestinians and Arabs as 'Near/Middle Easterners', rather than as West Asians, for example. The excising of Palestine from West Asia was thus, in many ways, a colonial project of imposing identities and spatial designations, such as the 'Middle East' or the 'Levant'. Looking at the question of regional identities and political and cultural connections between Palestinians in Israel and the Arab world, Asia, and the Third World, in general, can provide insights into how people themselves responded to the colonial rupture of identities after 1948. In other words, it shows how, contrary to imperial, colonial, and state-imposed processes of delinking, people worked to create their own linkages regionally, across the continent at large, and globally. In some sense, this work also contributes to de-exceptionalizing Israel, as well as the Palestine Studies that mirrored Israeli colonial exceptionalism, and puts the Palestinian question into conversation with similar sites of colonization in Asia and the Third World and with the legacy and lessons of Western colonialism.

Local knowledge/local history

This research grew out of my earlier work on political events in the Palestinian village of Kafr-Yassif in northern Israel (Galilee) during the 1980s and 1990s, and is part of my new research on political and social histories in that community. During my fieldwork in the village, which was the basis of my first book, several issues struck me as under-researched in the scholarship on the Palestinian community in Israel. For example, one issue that emerged from interviewing several older residents in the village was their sense of confinement, isolation, and alienation after 1948. Many in the older generation expressed the feeling of being confined within new

borders and trapped by laws that did not allow them to cross to other states in the region that they had often visited before 1948, and where they had many social, political, and economic links that had shaped their sense of identity. Some in the younger generations had heard from their parents and grandparents about this history of movement/mobility, exchange, and affiliation, and expressed nostalgia about places like Lebanon and Syria, without themselves having traveled there before. Many in the village felt isolated from the rest of the Palestinian community living outside Israeli state borders and from the Arab world in general. Others spoke of how the period of military rule (that officially lasted until 1966 although travel restrictions continued after it officially ended) and its restrictions on movement led to their alienation from a previously familiar geography and reshaped their social life and cultural cartography.

There were also those in the village who spoke of a different period where they felt connected to the larger Arab world, during the rise of the pan-Arab nationalist movement in the region. They spoke passionately about how they connected with this movement through Arab newspapers, radio, and television; were inspired by Arab leaders such as Jamal Abdel-Nasser; and found hope in reconnecting with the rest of the Arab world again. Others recalled the impact of decolonizing movements in Asia, Africa, and Latin America in the 1950s and 1960s, particularly the Non-Aligned Movement and the Bandung conference in Indonesia, and the hope that this new Third World Movement would ease their sense of political isolation and connect them to movements in Asia, Africa, and the Third World in general.

With regard to cultural flows, many in the older generation spoke of how during this period they were glued to films from the Arab world and from India, which they watched in cinemas and on Arab television, and felt a greater cultural affinity with these films than with Israeli or Western cinema in general. Some spoke of reading Arabic literature and also Third World literature that included Indian nationalist/anti-colonial authors, such as Rabindranath Tagore. They emphasized how important these literary sources were for their political maturation, and how they helped them imagine a less constricted and repressive world.

People theorized the cause of the rupture through their own ways of understanding how the Zionist Movement managed to colonize Palestine. (M) talked about how people, even when they were allowed to travel more freely after military rule ended, felt a strange sense of alienation in previously familiar places. He spoke of a trip to Jericho with relatives and friends. While viewing the topography of the place, (A) wondered how the Jews/the Zionists could have managed to take over all this land. (N) argued that this was due to Western support to the Zionist Movement and to Israel, while (R) argued that the Jewish religious claims to the land played a role in normalizing the place of Israel in Asia. (A) responded that the Zionist Movement had had several plans, one of which had been to establish Israel in Africa (the so-called Uganda plan/option). He argued that if the Uganda option had materialized, the Jews would have found the Wailing Wall in Africa as well. While (A) had not read Steven Salaita's work, his insight into the use and manipulation of Biblical myth is worth considering, and it is part of what I mean here by memory and local knowledge.¹¹

People resisted the rupture of 1948 in different ways, and not always in 'political' forms. Smuggling consumer products, for example, that people had used for decades before 1948 from Syria or Lebanon (such as cotton, silk, or tobacco rolling paper) was not only a criminal offense in the eyes of the Israeli state, but also a political offense. (T), who was used to the tobacco rolling paper and traditional clothes made of silk or cotton from Damascus, continued to purchase these products from smugglers. Though he always feared that information would reach Israeli government officials, he was unable to change his tastes and habits and was willing to take the risk. Not that these people had any other options, as Israel did not produce these products that they were used to. These individual economic acts, as well as individuals' efforts to connect with relatives and friends beyond the Israeli borders, were attempts at

maintaining some normalcy and continuity amidst the violent rupture created by the Israel settler colonial state. But they were seen by Israeli authorities as politically motivated and a security risk, and were often presented by Israeli officials in the typical Orientalist expressions: ‘these Arabs do not understand the concept of the “rule of law”’. This concept of ‘rule of law’ required that these people discontinue thinking of or imagining themselves as Arabs, as Asians, as Africans, or as trans-regionally connected individuals and communities. According to the Israeli ‘rule of law’, these people are best understood as ‘present-absent’: they exist physically, until time and opportunity allows for their removal from this imposed western body/structure – the State of Israel, yet legally and politically they are absent and denied many rights enjoyed by Israeli Jewish settlers, and even by Jews who do not reside within the Israeli state.

It is interesting to note here that the concept of the ‘present-absentee’ is an actual Israeli legal term, produced soon after the creation of the state to categorize about a third of the remaining Palestinians, those who were unable to present evidence of having been present in their localities in 1948, in a sense designating them ‘nomads’. In fact these individuals left their villages, towns, and cities in flight from Zionist troops’ heavy bombardment. They were thus considered physically present, yet legally and so also politically absent. As I argue elsewhere, this framing of the present-absent has been the norm through which the Israeli state has treated all of the Palestinians, both in areas colonized in 1948 and elsewhere. Furthermore, I argue that it is a conceptual framework that, without being named as such, has framed the relationship and the treatment of less valued peoples around the world since the rise of the West to global hegemony.¹² Thus, the Israeli act/law is not a sheer invention, but rather a creative rewording of this aspect of the Western concept of ‘rule of law’. In what follows, I will share a story from local memory and knowledge through conversations with inhabitants of the village that exemplifies how rupturing and disposing of native Palestinians is justified by Israeli legalized theft of native lands, and how individual Jewish settlers play into the transformation of archeology

(M) talked about an incident he remembers well while working on a settlement near Mi’ilia (a Palestinian village in Galilee), on land that was confiscated by force from the Arab residents of the village, even though the village was known for being ‘cooperative’ with the Israeli authorities. After confiscating the land by force from its native Palestinian owners, the Israeli government, following its usual practice, transfers the ownership of the land to the Jewish National Fund (JNF), which is an international organization. The JNF laws and regulations stipulate that the lands under its ownership are for the purpose of developing the Jewish community in Palestine/Israel, and it prohibits the sale of the land to non-Jews. (M) and other Arabs were working on construction on that new Jewish settlement in Galilee. They worked for Philip, a recent Jewish settler from France, who bought the land cheaply from the JNF and hired (M) and other Arabs to build his house there. As they prepared to pour the cement for the foundation of the house, Philip called the manager of the Palestinian construction team and asked him not to pour the cement in the foundation before he had put something deep in the ground. Philip came with a bottle in his hand that was sealed with a paper inside it and after putting it down in the ground, he asked for the cement to be poured on top of it. When (M) asked Philip what was this all about and what was that paper in the bottle, Philip replied that it contained a paper on which he had written his information and family history, so that when in the future, after hundreds or thousands of years, people dig under the ground in that area, they would find out who had been the owner of the land! (M) thought what a strange thing this was to do! Why would Philip think about the future in this way? Nadia Abu El-Haj has written about Israeli archeological policies that aim at negating Palestinian heritage in the land and creating a fabricated Israeli past.¹³ Here, in the case of Philip, we have a case of a citizen actively pursuing an archeological fabrication on land that was taken by force from its Palestinian inhabitants and given to a French Jew, who with his French passport, as he told (M), travels often through the Arab world, and was many

times in Beirut. Philip's case, like many others, is a case of a settler who displaces the native Palestinians, and enjoys their pre-1948 space, including their Arab surroundings.

Conclusion

After living and working in the West Bank for a few years, and talking to Palestinians about their experiences of identity, confinement, and cultural, social, and geographic alienation, I heard from many about the impact of Israeli state policies, especially since the so-called post-Oslo 'peace process', and the checkpoints, permits to travel, and travel restrictions that have shrunk their social and cultural worlds and political life. It became clear that a similar development is taking place in Palestinian areas colonized in 1967 as has been the case within the 1948 borders. What is clear from this parallel is that in a settler colonial context both war and 'peace' produce similar developments when it comes to the native population: more confinement, less mobility, greater estrangement and alienation from their own geography and from one another. Thus, this study brings back the importance of settler colonialism to Palestine Studies as an analytic to understand the Israeli state and its impact on the Palestinians wherever they live and no matter what legal status they have (citizens, residents, and refugees). It calls into question studies that ignore 1948 as a spatial and temporal rupture but also as a structure that continues to implicate the predicaments of Palestinians, Arabs, and peoples in Asia, Africa, and elsewhere.

Studying Israel/Palestine through 1948 Palestinians brings back the issue to its core, settler colonialism, which is an analytic that can best explain the nature of the Israeli state, and the policy approach of the state towards the indigenous population, whether they live in 1948 areas or elsewhere. Conflict with a settler colonial state is not with a state that has disputed borders, as settler colonial states have no borders, but have open frontiers. This framework allows us to go back to the core question; the future for Palestinians as well as Israelis is only possible by ending the settler colonial structure that by its very nature does not allow for co-existence, peace, justice and equality with natives, and has since 1948 created a rupture locally and regionally. It has disconnected Asia and Africa as Sayegh suggests, but also it has led to severing mobility that is central to the economic, social, and cultural needs of any human social organization as explained by Ibn Khaldoun. The settler colonial state, which encourages the in-movement of Jewish settlers, and seeks both to 'indigenize' and 'settle' them, ends its own mythical diaspora by creating an immense diaspora of the actual indigenous people while interrupting the circulation of movement that characterized the region. It is too often assumed that modernity is about movement, but in reality regulation and segregation of movement is actually the core aim of the modern state, acutely so in the case of the settler colonial type.

Notes on contributor

Magid Shihade is a faculty member at the Institute of International Studies at Birzeit University, Palestine.

Notes

1. Ibn Khaldoun's *Al-Muqaddimah* (An Introduction) is a six volume manuscript that believed to a collection of his lectures on the history of social human organizations. The best so far readable translated and abridged version is 465 pages long, yet remains hostage to Ibn Khaldoun's circular way of writing and repetition: *The Muqaddimah: An Introduction to History*. Translated and introduced by Franz Rosenthal, Abridged and Edited by N.J. Dawood with an Introduction by Bruce L. Lawrence (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2005).

2. See Lorenzo Veracini, *Settler Colonialism: A Theoretical Overview* (New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010); Ahmad Sa'di, *Thorough Surveillance: The Genesis of Israeli Policies of Population Management, Surveillance and Political Control Towards the Palestinian Minority* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013); Nadera Shalhoub-Kevorkian, *Trapped Bodies and Lives: Military Occupation, Trauma and the Violence of Exclusion* (Jerusalem: YWCA, 2010); Patrick Wolfe, 'Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native', *Journal of Genocide Research* 8, no. 4 (December 2006): 387–409; and Munir Akash, *The Right to Sacrifice the Other: The American Genocide* (Beirut: Dar Al-Rayes Books, 2002).
3. Nur Masalha, *The Nakba: Decolonizing History, Narrating the Subaltern, Reclaiming Memory* (London: Zed Books, 2012).
4. Steven Salaita, *Holy Land in Transit: Colonialism and the Quest of Canaan* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2010).
5. See Fayez Sayegh, *The Zionist Colonization of Palestine* (Beirut: Palestine Liberation Organization Research Center, 1965).
6. See C. K. Raju, *Ending Academic Imperialism: A Beginning* (Penang: Multiversity and Citizen's International, 2011) and *Is Science Western in Origin?* (Penang: Multiversity and Citizen's International, 2009).
7. Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Nomadology: The War Machine*, trans. Brian Massumi (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1986).
8. Charles Tilly, 'War Making and State Making as Organized Crime', in *Bringing the State Back In*, ed. Peter Evans, Dietrich Rueschemeyer, and Theda Skocpol (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 169–87.
9. Alex Young, 'The Settler Unchained: Constituent Power and Settler Violence,' forthcoming in *Social Text*.
10. See Melani Budianta, 'Shifting the Geopolitics of Knowledge: The Unfinished Project of Inter-Asian Cultural Studies,' *Inter-Asian Cultural Studies* 11, no. 2 (2010): 174–7; Kuan-Hsing Chen, *Asia as Method: Toward Deimperialization* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010); Timothy Mitchell and Bashir El-Siba'i, 'The Subaltern Studies School and the Question of Modernity', *Alif: A Journal of Comparative Poetics* 18 (1998): 100–21; and Ronald Robinson, 'Imperial Theory and the Question of Imperialism after Empire', *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 12, no. 2 (1984): 42–54.
11. Salaita, *Holy Land in Transit* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2010).
12. Sunaina Maira and Magid Shihade, 'Meeting Asian/Arab American Studies: Thinking Race, Empire, and Zionism in the U.S.', *Journal of Asian American Studies* 9, no. 2 (2006): 117–40.
13. Nadia Abu El-Haj, *Facts on the Ground: Archaeological Practice and Territorial Self-Fashioning in Israeli Society* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2001).