



1948 and Its Shadows

BESHARA DOUMANI AND ALEX WINDER

Seventy years after the Nakba, what does it mean to commemorate 1948? This introduction to three articles drawn from the 2018 New Directions in Palestinian Studies workshop at Brown University, “The Shadow Years: Material Histories of Everyday Life,” examines the emergence of 1948 as the primary focus of Palestinian commemorative practices and guiding star of future political possibilities, as well as the promise and limitations of the settler-colonial framework. It argues that widening our lens to include the material histories of everyday life in the context of a generational struggle for survival contextualizes moments of great trauma and violence within the larger dynamics of Palestinian society, and recasts the time/space architecture of narratives about Palestine and the Palestinians.

ON THE SEVENTIETH ANNIVERSARY of 1948, a year that has cast the longest and deepest shadow on the history of modern Palestine and the Palestinians, this special issue considers what is forgotten and elided in the current politics of commemoration among Palestinians and their supporters. There is no denying the power of the 1948 moment as an existential and profoundly transformative rupture that is now at the core of what it means to be Palestinian.¹ At the same time, the erasure of Palestine, the destruction of Palestinian society, and the relentless opposition to the equally relentless attempts by Palestinians to constitute themselves as a cohesive and effective political community have been and continue to be long-term structural processes typical of asymmetrical settler-colonial relationships. In this grinding generational struggle for freedom, equality, and emplacement, what does it mean to commemorate 1948?

The answer, at least for many academics, was obvious. Let us organize a conference on 1948. As Director of Middle East Studies and founder of New Directions in Palestinian Studies (NDPS) at Brown University, Beshara Doumani received a flurry of such proposals by colleagues starting in 2017.² And that was the second such wave. The first had arrived in 2016 and concerned the equally consequential number “seven” in the Palestinian political calendar: the 1917 Balfour Declaration and British seizure of Jerusalem, the November 1947 adoption of the United Nations Partition Plan, the June 1967 war, and the increasingly romanticized 1987 uprising now known as the First Intifada. Commemorating these events may seem self-evident, but as Rochelle Davis has noted, commemorations of 1948 did not become commonplace until the late 1990s; and other

commemorations, such as that of the 1968 Battle of Karameh, faded after the 1982 Israeli invasion of Lebanon effectively ended the “armed struggle” phase—materially and, eventually, rhetorically—of the Palestine Liberation Organization.³

Imbuing a moment with extraordinary significance valorizes a specific bundle of political perspectives, agential actors, and places that, in combination with other bundles, constitutes the time/space architecture of stories about Palestine and the Palestinians. Choosing which moments—hence, which bundles—are most deserving of commemoration reveals a great deal about the state of Palestinian political culture and visions for the future.⁴ The importance of 1948 in the mobilization of memory, for example, has risen in inverse proportion to the degree of faith in the global political formula that shaped much of the twentieth century: partition. Often referred to as “land for peace,” this formula was pursued by Palestinian leaders in earnest beginning with Yasir Arafat’s famous “Gun and Olive Branch” speech at the United Nations in 1974, formalized in 1988 at the Palestine National Council meeting in Algiers, and fully embodied in the 1993 Oslo Accords. The ending of the second phase of the Palestinian national movement, symbolized by the diasporic camp-based guerrilla fighter, combined with the waning days of the third phase, symbolized by the suit-and-tie technocrat in Ramallah, have opened a space for 1948 to emerge as the guiding star of future political possibilities.

A structure of commemorative politics solely constructed around events of massive destruction, loss, and colonial machinations—such as 1917, 1948, and 1967—can imprint the time/space architecture of colonial narratives onto Palestinian ones, constituting, effectively, a discursive “iron cage.”⁵ Such a commemorative structure hides more than it reveals, and it elides the agency and responsibility of “ordinary” Palestinians at crucial moments of their history. This is especially true for the shadow years just before and after 1948. For example, one can think of the fluid period of mobility between expulsion and eventual settlement in currently existing refugee camps by the mid-1950s as akin to the bouncing of a ball dropped from the roof of a house. Thousands of journeys by groups, large and small, forced to leave villages and neighborhoods, bouncing their way from one place to the other, making thousands of fateful decisions along the way. Where shall we go? With whom and for how long can we stay? Shall some of us return while others move on? Like an x-ray or an MRI, each of these decisions exposes, in unprecedented detail, the bones, tissues, and arteries of the pre-1948 Palestinian social body as it was dislocated and dispersed.

These decisions were formative of so much more than simply the demographic and spatial structure of diasporic communities (both within and outside of Palestine). They generated a dizzyingly diverse array of subjectivities, social practices (in the broad sense of the word), and life trajectories that shared, at the same time, the searing memories, conscious and unconscious, of a people dispossessed. Seeing, understanding, and remembering these experiences and practices can critically teach us about ourselves, inspire us to expand our political imagination, and help us to mobilize for potential histories. They can, in other words, provide the raw materials for constructing a new backbone for an overarching Palestinian narrative that can engage more fully with the three fundamental questions that still bedevil Palestinian politics: What does it mean to be Palestinian? What do Palestinians want? And how do they intend to get there?

The rising influence of a settler-colonial framework within Palestinian studies, an old/new approach that emphasizes dispossession as “a structure, not an event,” has produced a widespread rethinking of the Nakba as an ongoing process rather than a singular moment.⁶ This conceptualization posits the displacement and dispossession of Palestinians in 1948 as only the most visible substantiation of a structure of settler invasion and indigenous elimination prior to and after 1948. Commemorating 1948 thus repudiates the Oslo Accords’ prioritization of 1967 as the starting point for “land for peace” negotiations, and potentially decenters statehood as the end goal for all three major components of the Palestinian body politic: refugees in the diaspora; residents of the West Bank, Gaza, and East Jerusalem; and Palestinian citizens of Israel. Reference to a continuous Nakba thus serves as a reminder of persistent Palestinian struggles against enclosure and erasure and refuses the confinement of the Palestinians’ right to political self-determination to the so-called occupied territories. A commemorative structure centered on 1948 can also lend itself to a kind of lachrymose school of Palestinian history marked by a series of tragedies, each a permutation of “a catastrophe without borders in space or limits in time.”⁷ As Rana Barakat provocatively argues, employing a settler-colonial studies analytic, “regardless of intentions, . . . can and has led to a Zionist-centered reading” of Palestinian history. Instead, she proposes a framework of indigeneity, “which involves a reading of settler colonialism *within* a Palestinian narrative” in order to recognize “Palestinians as the makers of Palestinian history as opposed to Palestinians as a part of a Zionist narrative.”⁸

If we accept that a century-long purposeful (in the sense of both collective and individual agency) process of “being and becoming Palestinian” in a settler-colonial context is the fundamental dynamic that molds present realities and generates future political possibilities, it follows that the meanings and practices of commemoration need to be expanded and democratized to include the politics of everyday life among the majority of Palestinians whose voices, hitherto, have been only faintly heard in conventional political histories.⁹ Stretching the concept of politics to include such experiences and actions is important despite, or perhaps precisely because of, the astounding range and internal frictions of such politics. These frictions include, among other things, the pervasive microcompromises of daily existence that turn the shield of nationalist rhetoric into a sieve, the hierarchical power relations within Palestinian communities that consume vast amounts of political energy, and the internal contradictions of a fragmented Palestinian body politic, which undermine the emergence of unified goals and means.

If with agency comes responsibility, then commemorating everyday politics—to the extent that is possible in the first place—does not only recognize the significance of the ordinary; it also provides a self-critical and inward-looking dimension to commemorative practices. In other words, it thrusts internal contradictions onto the political stage. Hanging dirty laundry in public is a risky move. Since Palestinians are in the midst of a struggle for survival, should not academics focus instead on constructing a clear, simple, and cohesive story line that can unify and mobilize? In fact, much of the writing on the Palestinian condition does take that route in one of two ways: demonstrating injustice and celebrating resistance through an often exclusive focus on the actions of the Other and the various responses to it, and demonstrating the indigeneity of Palestinians through an often exclusive focus on the seamless Arab/Muslim

unity of land and people.¹⁰ Thus far, neither has succeeded in laying the foundations for a new political language, and neither pays sufficient attention to the practices of everyday life that produce and transform the meanings of being Palestinian across time and space.

A more capacious approach to commemorative practices draws power from internal complexities, expands the political imagination, and builds stronger foundations for international solidarity. This is why the response to proposals to devote the 2018 New Directions in Palestinian Studies workshop to a commemoration of 1948 was to organize it, instead, on the theme “The Shadow Years: Material Histories of Everyday Life.” The workshop sought to address both the production of “shadows” and to probe their depths so as to provide a fuller understanding of the continuities and gradual changes across landmark events that transcend a linear narrative of a series of ruptures. The goal was not to avoid the political, but to recast and contextualize moments of great trauma and violence within the larger dynamics of Palestinian society. The advantage of making everyday politics available for commemoration is that they constitute an incredibly rich but seldom tapped archive that reveals, among other things, strategies of struggle and survival relevant to the challenges facing Palestinians today.

One way of excavating such strategies is by asking: how might material histories offer new insights about the diversity of Palestinian experiences, as well as the contradictions and uneven impact of transformative events? How are the political and affective reverberations of these events related to or understood through individuals’ and communities’ relationships with material objects and the built environment? The dozen papers presented at the NDPS workshop in March 2018 focused on a wide range of material objects ranging from textbooks, tobacco, and cement to camps, urban renovation, and the politics of water and electricity infrastructures. Three papers from the workshop appear in this special issue, with three more to follow in future issues. Other papers from the workshop will also appear in forthcoming special issues of the *Jerusalem Quarterly*, this journal’s sister publication.

The articles here, by Mezna Qato, Nasser Abourahme, and Dotan Halevy, are examples of a growing scholarly field of critical and engaged Palestinian studies that goes beyond asserting the existence of a Palestinian people with a legitimate claim to Palestine—though such assertions, in the face of the sustained denial of Palestinian existence and claims, remain prevalent¹¹—and seeks to unpack the complex, variegated, and dynamic character of Palestinian experiences.¹² In this special issue, the articles address the “shadow years” on either side of 1948, which had for decades remained unexplored, existing as dead zones in Palestinian history, stretching roughly from the end of the Arab Revolt in 1939 to the Partition Resolution of 1947, and from the 1949 Armistice Agreements to the emergence of Palestinian resistance organizations in the late 1950s. Moreover, they engage the everyday material dimensions of Palestinian struggles as something more than effects of colonial power.¹³

Palestinian experiences in the immediate wake of 1948 were shaped by multiple factors, not the least of which were legal and other forms of regulation imposed by the regimes under whose authority they found themselves. But the closer we get to the everyday, the clearer it becomes that these experiences were shaped not only from the top down, but also from the bottom up—that is, by the strategies and struggles of Palestinians themselves.¹⁴ In “A Primer for a New Terrain,” Qato

explores the particulars of the “imaginative geography” produced by the Hashemite state’s third-grade geography primer—authored by Jordanian and Palestinian educators—in which a group of fictional students engage in a series of road trips within and beyond the borders of Jordan, borders that the primer expands to include “all of Palestine and Transjordan, previously.”¹⁵ This primer reflects a particular effort to de-Palestinianize space, in keeping with but distinct from Israeli efforts in this regard.¹⁶ Qato reminds us, however, that texts have a life beyond the page and that control over their reception is never fully in the hands of those who write, publish, or distribute them. Palestinian students may have memorized the texts to pass exams, but doing so did not supplant memories of the places from which they were expelled, nor their experiences of refugee camps conspicuously absent from the primer. The primer as a material object thereby took on a particular social life, one shaped both by its significance in the lives of Palestinian schoolchildren and by their resistance to its discursive erasure of their Palestinian-ness. It was an object of reverence, its words memorized by the light of candles and kerosene lamps, its passages chanted on the way to school, and its pages handled with utmost care to ensure that a single copy could be handed down from one sibling to the next. At the same time, students defaced photographs of the king within it and drew themselves into images of their homeland.

The passage of time and the transformation of refugee camps from sites of survival into spaces of everyday life did not resolve this tension between survival and resistance, between life and politics. The camp, in particular, became a space that, intellectually and materially, manifested both Palestinians’ adaptation to a post-1948 reality and their refusal of its meaning. In “Nothing to Lose but Our Tents,” Abourahme analyzes the camp in some of the literature of the Palestinian revolution—an experience that he locates roughly between 1960 and 1982—and notes that the revolution “didn’t just emerge as a mass, popular movement *from* the refugee camps; in many respects, it emerged *against* the camps.” The Palestinian revolution was thus engaged in an effort that strained simultaneously toward “making and unmaking of the camp”: *unmaking* it as a humanitarian space of life and nothing more, and *making* it as a launching base for militancy.¹⁷ Yet the camp life that Palestinians made could not be encapsulated in this dichotomy—it was always a space of everyday struggles for survival and dignity, internal politics, and localized power.¹⁸ Examining the entanglement of camp and novel in works by Ghassan Kanafani, Rashad Abu Shawir, and Yahya Yakhliif, Abourahme shows how the camp, “even at a symbolic level, cannot be kept on one side of the life/politics divide; it spills over constantly, appearing as an ambivalent and indeterminate space between place and non-place.”

The spillage between place and non-place is also a theme found in Halevy’s exploration of the tensions between different “essential modalities of urban change in Palestine,” and the transformation of these modalities during the late Ottoman and Mandate periods. At the heart of this transformation, Halevy argues in “Toward a Palestinian History of Ruins,” are the ways in which “practices of spatial *evolution*—material reuse and the ulema-guided waqf system—were replaced with the state-centric institutions of spatial *revolution*—the modern waqf administration, municipal redevelopment, and antiquities protection.” Halevy traces how in Gaza different actors mobilized these logics in contests over “residual spaces and derelict structures,”¹⁹ namely the Great Mosque and Khan al-Zayt. The urban fabric of Gaza was shaped and reshaped during the Mandate period through local residents’ negotiation with colonial power (manifested here in

the Department of Antiquities and the municipality) and with Palestinian elites (embodied by the Supreme Muslim Council).

Halevy's attention to these contests over space serves as a response to a question posed by Munir Fakhr Eldin: "How can we discuss struggles over land in a colonial context both within and outside the law, in the court and in a legal framework, as well as in lived realities, ideas, and social relations?"²⁰ Struggle over land is at the core of modern Palestinian history, and of the events of 1948 in particular, but framing this struggle as a national or even a settler-colonial struggle has had a tendency to flatten or erase the particular dynamics of the relationship between people and space within Palestinian society.²¹ These dynamics include geographic variation, stratification of land ownership, and conflicting logics and practices of land usage, including those inconsistent with capitalist concepts of private property.²² Land is, of course, only one lens through which to view the complexity of Palestinian society, whether before or after 1948. The rapidly expanding body of work on 1948 and Palestinian collective memory has increasingly attended to the ways in which class, gender, location, and other factors shape memory work.²³

A focus on the material culture of everyday life in the shadow years of modern Palestinian history questions the identity/territory/sovereignty matrix and the state-centric projects that characterize successive phases of the Palestinian national movement. This does not mean that Palestinians do not have a moral imperative and a legal right to live in and/or return to their homeland, nor that they should give up the struggle for statehood. Rather, the point is to de-exceptionalize the Palestinian condition by placing it in a global historical context, and to challenge the colonial genealogy of nationalist identity narratives by attending to the ironic and contingent historical pathways carved by discrete and internally differentiated Palestinian communities. This carving takes place in the everyday struggles for survival, for dignity, and for political rights. Choosing to foreground these overshadowed aspects of Palestinians' experiences through a critical analysis of the politics of commemoration on the occasion of the seventieth anniversary of 1948 is not to deny the catastrophic rupture of that year or to diminish the structural grip of settler colonialism. Rather, it is to propose that Palestinian history has a rich but hitherto underappreciated archive of political possibilities that can only be revealed by making the effort to imagine Palestinian lives before, beyond, and after settler colonialism.

About the Authors

Beshara Doumani is a professor of history at Brown University and founder of New Directions in Palestinian Studies. His most recent book is *Family Life in the Ottoman Mediterranean: A Social History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017).

Alex Winder is a visiting assistant professor of Middle East Studies at Brown University and associate editor of the *Jerusalem Quarterly*.

The 2018 New Directions in Palestinian Studies (NDPS) workshop, from which the articles in this special issue derive, was planned collaboratively by the authors.

ENDNOTES

- 1 Of course, 1948 does not fully account for modern Palestinian identity, which is multilayered, has deep historical roots, and is fluid across time and space.

- 2 An initiative of the Middle East Studies program at Brown University, NDPS was founded in 2012 to promote the integration of Palestinian studies into larger streams of critical intellectual inquiry, especially by supporting the work of emerging scholars through an annual thematic workshop, a book series, and an endowed post-doctoral position. The workshop provides a platform for rigorous theoretical and methodological discussion of new research agendas that seek to decolonize, de-exceptionalize, and globalize Palestinian studies. The first five workshops focused on the following themes: "Political Economy and the Economy of Politics" (2014), "Political Culture and the Culture of Politics" (2015), "Approaches to Research on Palestinian and the Palestinians" (2016), and "The Politics of Archives and the Practices of Memory" (2017). More information can be found at palestinianstudies.org.
- 3 Rochelle Davis, "The Politics of Commemoration among Palestinians," *JPS* 47, no. 1 (Autumn 2017): pp. 69–85.
- 4 This is even more true for Palestinians who could not concretize memory through the built environment in any systematic way given the absence of a state and, more crucially, of meaningful territorial control. See Davis, "Politics of Commemoration."
- 5 The phrase is taken from Rashid Khalidi's *The Iron Cage: The Story of the Palestinian Struggle for Statehood* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2006).
- 6 The oft-quoted "structure, not event" phrasing was popularized by Patrick Wolfe. See Patrick Wolfe, *Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology* (London: Cassell, 1999), p. 2. For an overview of the application of the settler-colonial framework to Palestine, see Brenna Bhandar and Rafeef Ziadah, "Acts and Omissions: Framing Settler Colonialism in Palestine Studies," *Jadaliyya*, 14 January 2016, <http://www.jadaliyya.com/Details/32857/Acts-and-Omissions>. Recent articulations of the necessity of understanding the Nakba as a process include: Lila Abu-Lughod and Ahmad H. Sa'di's introduction, "The Claims of Memory," in *Nakba: Palestine, 1948, and the Claims of Memory*, ed. Ahmad H. Sa'di and Lila Abu-Lughod (New York: Columbia University Press, 2007), p. 18; Elias Khoury, "Rethinking the Nakba," *Critical Inquiry* 38, no. 2 (Winter 2012): p. 263; Adel Manna', "The Palestinian Nakba and Its Continuous Repercussions," *Israel Studies* 18, no. 2 (Summer 2013): p. 87; and Nahla Abdo and Nur Masalha, eds., *An Oral History of the Palestinian Nakba* (London: Zed Books, 2018).
- 7 Khoury, "Rethinking the Nakba," p. 263.
- 8 Rana Barakat, "Writing/Righting Palestine Studies: Settler Colonialism, Indigenous Sovereignty, and Resisting the Ghost(s) of History," *Settler Colonial Studies* 8, no. 3 (2018): pp. 349–63 (quote at p. 350). This is not to say that there is a single or unified Palestinian narrative. See n. 10 below.
- 9 Of the scholarly emphasis on commemoration in Palestinian refugee camps in Lebanon, Diana Allan writes: "While oral narratives of the expulsion, the politics of memory, the right-of-return movement, and deracinated nationalism continue to figure prominently in ethnographies, the material conditions of refugee existence have tended to be occluded." She continues: "Everyday matters such as work, health, and homemaking have received very little scholarly attention; even politically valenced issues such as power dynamics, grassroots action, and notions of futurity are recognized only when the frame of reference is large-scale, national, and symbolic." Diana Allan, *Refugees of the Revolution: Experiences of Palestinian Exile* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2014), pp. 4–6.
- 10 For a detailed analysis of the "call to battle" and "affirmation of identity" themes in Palestinian historical writing, see Beshara Doumani, "Rediscovering Ottoman Palestine: Writing Palestinians into History," *JPS* 21, no. 2 (Winter 1992): pp. 5–28.
- 11 For example, in the introduction to their landmark volume on the Nakba and memory, Abu-Lughod and Sa'di write: "The cumulative effect of the memories we have collected and analyzed in this book is to affirm that something terrible happened to the Palestinians as a direct result of the military and political will to create the state of Israel." This is a surprisingly modest "cumulative effect" for a collection of such significance, and seems to indicate the continued sense that there is a need to reaffirm Palestinians' existence and to document the violence behind their dispersal in 1948, thereby legitimizing their claim to Palestine (which Zionist propaganda sought to undermine

- through narratives that stressed Palestinians' flight according to Arab orders or personal choice). Abu-Lughod and Sa'di, "The Claims of Memory" in *Nakba*, ed. Sa'di and Abu-Lughod, p. 23.
- 12 A far from complete list includes: Ilana Feldman, *Governing Gaza: Bureaucracy, Authority, and the Work of Rule, 1917–1967* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2008) and *Police Encounters: Security and Surveillance in Gaza under Egyptian Rule* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2015); Adel Manna', *Nakba wa baqa': Hikayat Filastiniyyin dhallu fi Hayfa wa al-Jalil (1948–1956)* (Beirut: Institute for Palestine Studies, 2016); Shira Robinson, *Citizen Strangers: Palestinians and the Birth of Israel's Liberal Settler State* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2013); and Sherene Seikaly, *Men of Capital: Scarcity and Economy in Mandate Palestine* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2015).
 - 13 As Shira Robinson writes with regard to the experiences of Palestinians within Israel's borders post-1948, a "myopic treatment of colonialism has perpetuated our inability to make sense of the coexistence of liberal citizenship and colonial rule in post-1948 Israel and to wrestle historically with the complexity of Palestinian experiences within it." Robinson, *Citizen Strangers*, p. 6.
 - 14 See, for example, Ilana Feldman's work on policing in Gaza under Egyptian control, which takes into consideration the "formation of new relationships and intimacies in an altered community and governing structure . . . and the reconfiguration of borders, both spatial and social, as key features of governing and community relations." Feldman, *Police Encounters*, p. 24. A number of other recent efforts to examine Palestinian experiences in the immediate wake of 1948 include: Manna', *Nakba wa baqa'*; Robinson, *Citizen Strangers*; and Alex Winder, "Muqaddima," in *Bayna manshiyyat Yafa wa Jabal al-Khalil: Yawmiyyat Muhammad 'Abd al-Hadi al-Shrouf (1943–1962)*, ed. Alex Winder (Beirut: Institute for Palestine Studies, 2016).
 - 15 On imaginative geography, see Edward W. Said, "Invention, Memory, and Place," *Critical Inquiry* 26, no. 2 (Winter 2000): pp. 175–92.
 - 16 On the de-Palestinianization of space, see Sari Hanafi, "Spacio-cide and Bio-politics: The Israeli Colonial Project from 1947 to the Wall," in *Against the Wall: Israel's Barrier to Peace*, ed. Michael Sorkin (New York: New Press, 2005); and "Explaining Spacio-cide in the Palestinian Territory: Colonization, Separation, and State of Exception," *Current Sociology* 61, no. 2 (2013); and Gary Fields, *Enclosure: Palestinian Landscapes in a Historical Mirror* (Oakland: University of California Press, 2017).
 - 17 Khaldun Bshara describes the urbanization of refugee camps through "lingering processes of making and unmaking of the camp." He continues: "I use the terms making and unmaking of the camp because the process of making (establishing, constructing, developing, and urbanizing) involves the unmaking of the camp as humanitarian temporary space as well as the unmaking of refugees as humanitarian subjects." Khaldun Bshara, "Spatial Memories: The Palestinian Refugee Camps as Time Machine," *Jerusalem Quarterly* 60 (Autumn 2014): pp. 14–15.
 - 18 See, for example, Allan, *Refugees of the Revolution*; Nell Gabiam, *The Politics of Suffering: Syria's Palestinian Refugee Camps* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2016); Muhammad Ali Khalidi, ed., *Manifestations of Identity: The Lived Reality of Palestinian Refugees in Lebanon* (Beirut: Institute for Palestine Studies and Institut français du Proche-Orient, 2010); Are Knudsen and Sari Hanafi, eds., *Palestinian Refugees: Identity, Space, and Place in the Levant* (London: Routledge, 2011); and Julie Peteet, *Landscape of Hope and Despair: Palestinian Refugee Camps* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005).
 - 19 This phrasing is borrowed from Yazid Anani, "Al-Atlal: Ruins & Recollections," *Jerusalem Quarterly* 69 (Spring 2017): p. 10.
 - 20 Munir Fakher Eldin, "British Framing of the Frontier in Palestine, 1918–1923: Revisiting Colonial Sources on Tribal Insurrection, Land Tenure, and the Arab Intelligentsia," *Jerusalem Quarterly* 60 (Autumn 2014): p. 55.
 - 21 As Fakhr Eldin writes, a "simple story of colonial land acquisition and loss of sovereignty" in Palestine fails to account for "the inhabitants of Palestine whose history and rights cannot be told in terms of bourgeois property rights and who are often omitted or antagonized in the national narrative." Fakher Eldin, "British Framing of the Frontier," p. 55–56.

- 22 See, for example, Fakher Eldin, "British Framing of the Frontier"; Fields, *Enclosure*; and Alexandre Kedar, Ahmad Amara, and Oren Yiftachel, *Emptied Lands: A Legal Geography of Bedouin Rights in the Negev* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University, 2018).
- 23 See, for example, Anaheed Al-Hardan, *Palestinians in Syria: Nakba Memories of Shattered Communities* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2016); Rochelle A. Davis, *Palestinian Village Histories: Geographies of the Displaced* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2010); Sari Hanafi, "Haifa and Its Refugees: The Remembered, the Forgotten, and the Repressed," *Kyoto Bulletin of Islamic Area Studies* 3, no. 1 (July 2009): pp. 176–91; Sa'di and Abu-Lughod, *Nakba*; Salim Tamari, *Mountain against the Sea: Essays on Palestinian Society and Culture* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2009); and Abbad Yahya, "Oral History and Dual Marginalization: Palestinian Peasant Women and Nakba Narratives," *Jerusalem Quarterly* 70 (Summer 2017): pp. 96–109.