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Abstract

The starting point of this dissertation is that biopolitics is widely practiced in occupied Palestine, raising the question of the extent to which resistance takes a biopolitical form. I will analyse how iterations of the body, stationary or in motion, have changed in colonial occupied Palestine and for people living in exile vis-à-vis postcolonial resistance strategies and hope. This will be achieved by examining novellas, poetry, images, film, and prison literature produced by the Palestinian communities from 1948 onwards. The dissertation contributes to the analysis of what I term thin and thick resistance, which can constitute either separate or composite strategies to resistance praxis. While thin resistance instils endurance of hardship, resilience in outlook and behaviour, such as non-violent resistance or Sumud in a Palestinian context, thick resistance takes a violent approach. This dissertation will consider the distinction between violent and the non-violent resistance but will also engage purposefully in elements that constitute thin and thick strategies of anti-colonial and postcolonial resistance.

Both thin and thick resistance are strategic options for those aiming for the survival and emancipation of Palestinians. What I posit here is the notion of hope in the Palestinian cultural output that I examine, and its importance in determining the strategy of resistance Palestinians undertake. Whilst I have drawn on theoretical and sociological accounts of biopolitics, liminality, and resistance, my dissertation will
make a case for the importance of studying biopolitics in the context of literary texts. These have a dual aspect: they represent the specificity of biopolitics in their locally inflected ways. They additionally constitute a non-biopolitical mode of resistance in that they confront the struggles they write of through the imagination. Hope, I will argue, is an imaginative approach, so there is a way in which literature may be aligned with thin resistance. In the postcolonial context, the written or spoken word is often presented as an alternative to violence. Simultaneously, the written or spoken word, for example, when sites of memory and resistance are translated into words have succeeded at mobilising both thin and thick resistance. This suggests that the spoken and written word are not passive but are instigative and mobilising. They become a recourse of resistance.
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Strategies of Resistance and the Significance of Hope in Palestinian Literature and Film

Every native population in the world resists colonists as long as it has the slightest hope of being able to rid itself of the danger of being colonised. That is what the Arabs in Palestine are doing, and what they will persist in doing as long as there remains a solitary spark of hope that they will be able to prevent the transformation of ‘Palestine’ into the ‘Land of Israel’ (quoted in Khalidi 12, emphasis added).

Ze’ev Jabotinsky, Jewish Russian revisionist Zionist leader (1923)
Chapter 1. Introduction.

The purpose of this dissertation is to investigate how resistance is expressed through literary and cultural materials in respect of Palestinian resistance to Israeli settler-occupation of Palestinian lands. In doing this, the dissertation seeks to show that the level of resistance that is expressed is related to the level of hope that Palestinian people have of one day being able to live as full citizens within the Palestine that they consider as their homeland.

Israel has a long history of deploying biopolitics, that is, politics which affects people’s physical lives and bodies. An estimated 800,000 - 900,000 Palestinians were transferred from their towns and villages in 1948, in what is known as the Nakba ('catastrophe'). Israel then built separation walls, checkpoints, and high security prisons to achieve domination over the land, bodies, economy, politics and daily lives of the Palestinians. Since 1948, the Palestinian people have resisted their situation. Palestinian resistance can be viewed as the response to the actions of the Israeli state in the West Bank, Gaza, and inside Israel. Further, resistance is carried out in the Palestinian diaspora, notably the millions of Palestinians living as refugees in neighbouring countries who were displaced during the Nakba.

In this response of resistance, I argue Palestinians have adopted what I term ‘thin’ and ‘thick’ resistance. While thin resistance, exemplified by non-violent resistance, instils resilient outlooks and behaviours enabling people to endure hardship, thick resistance is militaristic and uses violence, including suicide bombing. I further argue that the degree of hope within the colonised Palestinians is necessary if they are to choose a strategy of resistance. The greater the degree of hope for the colonised, the less violent
their bodily resistance will be. It should be noted that bodily resistance is also included in many examples of thin resistance, such as waiting for hours at a checkpoint or having to live with settler colonialism in a liminal place, however such bodily resistance carries little violence if hope diminishes or disappears, then characteristics of thick bodily resistance might take the place of thin resistance, such as physical confrontation with Israeli soldiers when Palestinians are in defence of their land, children, and trees.

It should be noted that the physical body as we know it with its defined boundaries, analogises a defined boundary of conventional occupations and bodily resistance. Both bodies rely on each other’s power for support, advocacy, defence, and mobilisation; biopower. This dissertation uses the term body both as the physical body and as the defined boundary of conventional occupations and bodily resistance.

In Chapter 2, I will provide relevant theoretical and historical frameworks on power and biopower, biopolitics to contextualise Israel’s practices and historical accounts of biopolitics, resistance (including thin, thick, and Sumud) and the effect of liminality, and finally on the relationship between hope and resistance. This sets out the context in which to understand what is meant by these concepts that underpin my investigation of the literary and cultural materials in the following chapters.

In Chapters 3 and 4, I will offer an analysis of postcolonial literature and cultural production in Palestine/Israel and from those in exile from the Nakba onwards. The literature I have chosen includes the poetry of Mahmood Darwish and Tawfik Ziad; \textit{After the Last Sky: Palestinian Lives} (1986), a book by Edward Said; Eran Riklis’s
film, The *Lemon Tree* (2009); two of Ghassan Kanafani’s novellas, *Returning to Haifa* (1969), and *Umm Saa’d* (1969); and *The Story of Saber (Prison literature)* (2012), written by the Jerusalemite prisoner Mahmood Issa. Issa’s prison literature story depicts the ordeal of tens of thousands of Palestinians still behind bars. Most of the works I have chosen were produced by Palestinians; the exception being Israeli Director Eran Rikli’s *The Lemon Tree* which unites both Palestinian and Israeli actors, in a communal and liminal space. *The Lemon Tree* presents the biopolitical barriers planted in a liminal space and explores how both Israelis and Palestinians resist these spatial boundaries. Having both Israelis and Palestinians in Riklis’s film allows for an exploration of the co-existence of Israelis and Palestinians in conditions of fraught liminality.

The chosen literary and cultural material will be analysed to address the issues raised in my introduction and show how hope affects the level of resistance that may be shown by Palestinians and what these levels of resistance may be. The text, poems, and film I examine in this dissertation circulate in both Arabic and English. This dissertation focuses on a representation of national and diasporic narration and national allegories of settler-colonial Palestine.

My selections followed three basic criteria. Firstly, the authors are respected actors, commentators, and academics. Secondly, the texts are representative of different geographic locations where Palestinians are situated: within Palestine and Israel and outside as refugees. Finally, the works studied contain aspects of resistance that are linked to the notion of hope.
The body is an anchor in most of the works examined here. The function of many poems is to mobilise the body, while visual art such as the *Lemon Tree* and *After the Last Sky: Palestinian Lives* shows the liminal space in which both Palestinians (Palestinian bodies) and Israelis (Israeli bodies) exist. I have chosen texts that demonstrate the liminality of Palestinians in relation to Israeli occupiers in ways that further demonstrate how this positioning determines modes of resistance. I will show through the works I have chosen, that these works give insights into the transition between thin and thick resistance.

In regard to the body within the works studied here, there seems to be a certain alignment of visual images. The pictures of bodies in *After the Last Sky* depict the atrocity of daily lives for Palestinians, for example as having to wait at checkpoints. The moving images of the body in the *Lemon Tree* represent pain and suffering of having to live in a liminal space, for example, when bodies on each side of liminal are trapped in their places and, in doing this, reformulate designed forms of perceiving the other (Scherr 20). While this imagery is also a form of language, the most important factor is that, collectively, the examined works facilitate an allegorical reading of Palestine as an imprisoned country and Palestinians as literally dispossessed.

The aims of the dissertation are to investigate the relationship between these Palestinian cultural productions as a growing artistic and literary genre and their position in the context of Palestinian politics, the politics of resistance against the politics of settler colonialism. In order to demonstrate this relationship clearly, this dissertation will look at the historical circumstances in which the productions were created, it will investigate the development of Palestinian resistance through the ability
of the productions to contextualise power and manifest resilience towards Israel’s reliance on biopolitics.

The research questions that the dissertation seeks to answer are:

How does postcolonial literature demonstrate resilience?

To what extent are Palestinian resistance strategies biopolitical?

To what extent does the level of hope affect whether resistance strategies are physical and violent?
Chapter 2. Conceptual framework of power, biopolitics, resistance and hope.

This chapter reviews relevant literature to explain the concepts that underpin the investigation that will be carried out on the literary and cultural materials, namely the theoretical and historical frameworks on power and biopower, Israel’s practices of biopolitics, resistance (including thin and thick resistance – the terms that I have coined) and Sumud. It also reviews the relationship between hope and resistance. Explanations will be given throughout on how the dissertation understands the concepts in relation to its investigations.

Power and biopower.

Power dynamics have manifested in settler colonialism throughout occupied Palestine. Understanding exactly what power is is not straightforward, but in this section we attempt to define our understanding. It should be noted that the notion of power is a complex one and has been defined by different authors in various ways.

From a Foucauldian perspective, the relationship of power is dynamic, has multiple process and relationships (Deleuze and Hand 59). Gilles Deleuze puts forward the notion of power (in relation to Foucault) as follows:

We should not ask: What is power and where does it come from? but, how is it practiced? An exercise of power shows up as an affect since force defines itself by its very power to affect other forces (to which it is related) and to be affected by other forces (Deleuze and Hand 59).
Foucault perceives power relations that “[p]ermeate the whole fabric of our existence.” According to Foucault, power can be violent or non-violent. Non-violent power could be used to inscribe, induce, and seduce. However, Foucault perceives violence as acting on “specific bodies”, beings or objects whose form it changes or destroys (Foucault et al.17).

James Scott, in his book, *Weapons of the Weak* (1985), has an interesting approach to power. He talks about domination, and "everyday resistance" as the daily acts that resist, and react to, domination. I adopt Scott’s approach in which certain acts of resistance are viewed as reflections of, or mechanical responses to, certain forms of domination. Foucault similarly talks about domination, and typifies types of struggles against forms of domination that may be ethnic, social, or religious. He further talks about struggles against forms of exploitation that separate individuals from what they produce; or against that which ties the individual to himself and submits him to others in this way.

Within a Foucauldian theoretical framework of power, distinctions are primarily made between sovereign power, disciplinary power, and biopower (Johansson and Vinthagen, ‘Dimensions of Everyday Resistance’ 420). For Agamben, sovereign power extends to those who have authority over vital aspects of human existence. Agamben asserts that authority figures such as "the jurist, the scientist, the expert, the priest" whose power is borne of entry into the sovereign's realm, become part of Althusser's Ideological State Apparatuses, and therefore, wittingly, or unwittingly, do the sovereign's work (Agamben, Sovereign Power and Bare Life, 122).
Sovereign power may also be used under the auspices of the state of exception to confine those stripped of their rights to certain geographical areas, or to condemn, torture, or kill those with reduced status without legal restrictions (Rabinow and Rose, 195). Therefore, when a state of exception is applied to the juridical-political directive, it contains a noticeable construction of an *inclusion* of what is concurrently pushed outside it. Deleuze and Guattari were therefore able to write, “Sovereignty only rules over what it is capable of interiorizing” quoted in Agamben, *Homo Sacer*. 19). Regarding Foucault’s great confinement described in *Madness and Civilisation*, Maurice Blanchot notes society’s endeavour to “confine the outside”. The exception that defines the structure of sovereignty does so to exert control, i.e. in ‘states of exception’ when a sovereign state declares a time or a place where the rule of law can be suspended in the name of self-defence or national security (Agamben, 1995, 1996). According to Agamben, the exception does not subtract itself from the ruler; rather the rule suspends itself. The latter gives rise to exception and to maintaining itself vis-à-vis to the exception. The force of law expressed in this circumstance maintains itself in relation to exteriority. “We shall give the name *relation of exception* to the extreme form of relation by which something is included solely through its inclusion” (Agamben,18, emphasis in original).

Possibly the most chilling impact of a state of exception is the capability of the oppressor to integrate and ‘normalise’ war, imposing cruelties and displaying indifference to victims. In addition, the state of exception manifests in the “creation of a space in which bare life and juridical rule enter into a zone of indistinction...a space in which the normal order is de facto suspended” (Agamben, *Sovereign Power*)
and Bare Life, 174). Space in settler-colonial Palestine, particularly in the West Bank, allows us to observe how Palestinians live in a liminal space, as discussed below. In his review of State of Exception, Marc Botha notes Agamben's prediction that “[T]o live in a state of exception [will lead] the West toward global civil war” (Botha, 258). Indeed, one might think also of the caged war Israel continues to wage in the West Bank, suspended as it is between civil war and international conflict.

Much of the theoretical predicate for the concept of a state of exception is tackled in Homo Sacer. Agamben specifies an individual or a group without any political rights in terms of zoë, which simply refers to the existence of a being or beings, comparable to the zoological existence of other species. This is in contradistinction to bios or the social and historical existence of those who are in possession of responsibilities and political rights. As pertains to a form or a way of living appropriate to an individual or a group (Agamben, 1). Thus, zoë is defined as bare life, namely, the life of homo sacer, who may be killed and yet not be deemed worthy of sacrifice (Agamben, 7-8). The life of homo sacer and their death are considered the same, in their presumed puniness and worthlessness. Here, Agamben radicalises and de-historicises Foucault’s famous postulate that sovereignty is characterised by the right to take life or to let life continue. Agamben argues that the production of bare lives, that is, of killable bodies, is the original act of sovereign power (Rabinow and Rose, 202).

Yet is Foucault concerned with bare life? The secret substratum of power is the body of subjects: political power “is not founded – in the last instance – on a political will but rather on bare life, which is kept safe and protected only to the degree to which it submits itself to the sovereign’s (or the law’s) right of life and death” (Agamben, 2000,
Agamben argues that a constant state of emergency or exception enables the state to turn the lives of those under state rule into ‘bare life’, that of ‘homo sacer’ (Agamben, Sovereign Power and Bare Life, 125). Paul Rabinow and Nikolas Rose in their article, “Biopower Today” argue that Homo Sacer, for Agamben, is not a:

[H]istorically marginal phenomenon. It demands our attention as critical thinkers precisely because it is the ordering principle of contemporary societies. Against such ‘growing bio-political nightmare’ the only solution seems equally sacred. No wonder Agamben invokes the figure of a messianic ‘end of time’, taken from Walter Benjamin, as one possible way out (Rabinow and Rose, 202).

In this dissertation, I will read prison as both the literal, physical imprisonment, and the allegorical imprisonment of Palestine with the exercise of disciplinary power and surveillance reinforcing the occupation of the Palestinian bodies; territorial, political, societal, and individual. In Discipline and Punish, The Birth of Prison, Foucault details how, throughout the modern age, disciplinary power has manifested through institutions, punishments, awards, and scientific discourses. These power dynamics have prognerated productive bodies that strengthen economic, political, and military organisations, with these institutions continuously restructured by the bodies they mould (Foucault, 1991, Lilja and Vinthagen, 432). Foucault continues: "[T]he body is . . . directly involved in a political field; power-relations have an immediate hold on it; they invest it, mark it, train it, torture it, force it to carry out tasks, to perform ceremonies, to emit signs" (Foucault, Discipline & Punish: The Birth of the Prison, 25). This strategy, Foucault maintains, has not been implemented to forcefully repress
the prisoners' criminal impulse, but to compel their bodies to signify the prohibitive law as their manifest essence, style, and necessity. That law is not literally internalised but incorporated on bodies (the depravation of some sexual activity for example); there the law is manifested as a sign of the essence of their selves, the meaning of their souls, their consciences, the law of their desires (quoted in Butler, 1989, p. 608). Therefore, through careful observation, the prison complex tames ‘docile bodies’, which Foucault defines as “those bodies that may be subjected, used, transformed, and improved” (Foucault, Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison, 136). Discipline enables bodies to function productively within the forms of economic, political, and military organization that emerged in the modern age and are continuously restructured (Foucault, 1991).

Foucault’s concept of biopower describes the administration and regulation of human life at the level of the individual body and the population. For Foucault, power “traverses and produces things, it induces pleasure, forms knowledge, produces discourse. It needs to be considered as a productive network which runs through the whole social body” (Foucault, Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977. 119).

Firstly, regarding the social body, Judith Butler asserts that freedom can be exercised on the condition that there is enough support for the exercise of freedom. Butler also associates freedom with mobility in the public sphere: “Indeed, when we think about the embodied subjects who exercise speech or move through public space, across borders, it is usually presumed to be one who is already free to speak and move without threat of imprisonment or deportation or loss of life” (Butler, Rethinking Vulnerability
and Resistance, 14). The public sphere is referred to here as the social body. What then is the social body? And how does it come to be? Butler theorises the social body as:

Although we struggle for rights over our own bodies, the very bodies for which we struggle are not quite ever only our own. The body has its invariably public dimension [within the field of politics]. Constituted as a social phenomenon in the public sphere, my body is and is not mine. Given over from the start to the world of others, it bears their imprint, is formed within the crucible of social life; only later with some uncertainty, do I lay claim over my body as my own, if, in fact, I ever do. Indeed, if I deny that prior to the formation of my “will”, my body related me to others whom I did not choose to have in proximity with others, them am I denying the social conditions of my embodiment in the name of autonomy?

(Butler, Precarious Life: The power of Mourning and Violence 26)

The social body of a country is then an amalgamation of individual bodies. Butler theorises the body in terms of being supported by other bodies yet acting apparently individually (Butler, Rethinking Vulnerability and Resistance 15). The body is at work explicitly and implicitly in numerous political gestures: seeking food and shelter, seeking protection from suffering during wars, imprisonment, and violence. Butler asserts that at one level the implicit idea of bodies at work, for political demands and mobilisation, is interrogated. On a different level, it is to find out how: “mobilization presupposes a body that requires support” (ibid). Butler gives the example of public assemblies held in precarious situations. The demand to end or minimize precarity is enacted publicly in a collective performative bodily resistance. Precarity vis-à-vis
political, social, environmental, and economic policies that are destroying livelihoods will cause bodies to resist. Finally, Butler notes that these bodies are simultaneously expressing their precarity and resisting these very powers: “they enact a form of resistance that presupposes vulnerability of a specific kind and opposes precarity” (Butler, Rethinking Right Vulnerability and Resistance, 15). Butler argues that we cannot understand bodily vulnerability outside the conception of social and material relation (ibid, 16). In other words, the physical body as we know it with its defined boundaries, analogises a defined boundary of conventional occupations and bodily resistance. Both bodies rely on each other’s power for support, advocacy, defence, and mobilisation; biopower.

Secondly, one clarifying definition of the concept of biopower is offered in the periodical “Biopower Today” by Rabinow and Rose:

Biopower, we suggest, entails one or more truth discourses about the ‘vital’ character of living human beings; an array of authorities considered competent to speak that truth; strategies for intervention upon collective existence in the name of life and health; and modes of subjectification, in which individuals work on themselves in the name of individual or collective life or health (Rabinow and Rose, 195).
Foucault formulates a theory of biopower that manages and controls populations. His theory complements contemporary postcolonial liberation theory, which synthesises theories of class struggle with inflections of race and racism. Foucault thus puts it: "racism justifies the death-function in the economy of biopower by appealing to the principle that the death of others makes one biologically stronger insofar as one is a member of a race or a population" (Foucault, Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the College de France, 1975–76, 258). In this dissertation, I will analyse how iterations of the body as stagnant or in motion have changed in colonial occupied Palestine and exile vis-à-vis (anticolonial) and/or postcolonial resistance strategies and hope.

Colonial biopolitics is the colonial rationality which administrates the life of the colonised populations as its subject. Biopower thus names the way in which biopolitics operates in society, and involves what Foucault describes as a very profound transformation of the mechanisms of power. In Discipline and Punish, Foucault explores shifts in the biopolitics of governmentality. In this work, Foucault argues that being punished in secret is a more effective exercise of power than being punished in public. To put this in a bodily context, the body is no longer visible, and thus is far from the mind of the public. It is hard to retrieve evidence associated with torture, bodily punishment, or even death. Therefore, ‘governmentality’ has taken a different direction from the transparency of punishment (Foucault, Discipline & Punish: The Birth of the Prison 9). Foucault insists that this transition constitutes a new political...

---

1 As we shall see below in this dissertation, some discussion on Palestinian literature’s relationship to the postcolonial is discussed vis-à-vis concepts of postcolonial liberation theory, such as dealing with rights deprivation, racism, discrimination, reduction in status, and reduced agency because of occupation, to mention just a few.
economy. It relies on an institutional force of production of the body that becomes a useful force “only if it is both a productive body and subjected body” (Foucault, Discipline & Punish: The Birth of the Prison 26). Discipline, as a technology that fundamentally acts on the body, becomes a key factor for the understanding of modern societies (Nilsson and Wallenstein 9). In particular, to understand how the body resists discipline: Is it by mere bodily responses? If the technology of punishment on the body through governmentality has changed, accordingly, examining different and changing occupation apparatuses, their motifs, and intentions in relation to the body will clarify the relationship between governmentality and biopolitics resistance.

The position of the Israeli social scientist Neve Gordon (2008) was brought to my attention while reading Johansson and Vinthagen’s article, “Dimensions Of Everyday Resistance” (Johansson and Vinthagen 2020, 4). In this essay, his position supports my later analysis of how Palestinians respond in strategies of resistance to forms of governing constructed by the Israeli occupation, mainly to exert control, as I argue, the space and the bodies of Palestinians. Gordon combines Foucauldian theory with a taxonomy of different forms of power in the setting of the Israeli occupation. Gordon claims that even the three modes of power tend to be simultaneously deployed, the specific form of governing is shaped by particular configurations between sovereign, disciplinary and biopower (Gordon, 2008). Neve Gordon argues:

The particularity of each configuration (sovereign, disciplinary and biopower) determines how individuals and the population are managed. No configuration is fixed, so that certain processes modify the relation and emphasis among the different modes of power. Consequently, they change the way society is
governed and controlled although almost all of the existing forms of control were employed from the beginning of the occupation, some were used more often when a sovereign mode of power was emphasized. By contrast, others occurred more frequently when biopower was prominent, and still others when a disciplinary mode was accentuated (Gordon, 14–15).

For this dissertation, I assume that all forms of power are implemented through governing or as occupation apparatuses, for instance, strategies of normalisation, surveillance, ethnic cleansing, imprisonment, control of movement, ad infinitum forms of collective punishment that target the bodies of Palestinians. Gordon cites a school that used propaganda to manipulate children into accepting occupation as normal. However, the children's resistance to normalisation was expressed in their throwing of stones at military offices. As a result, the military shut down the school (Gordon, 15). Doing so prohibited students from being (physically) at the school: punishing them collectively. In addition, we find in this example the contrary of what Foucault refers to in *Discipline and Punish*: a shift has occurred from disciplinary societies to ‘societies of control’. Hypothetically, if the resistance did not materialise this would signify a form of disciplinary control. This suggests that the Israeli occupation explores methods of control and governance of Palestinians through trial and error.

A genealogy of Israel’s forms of control and an analysis of how they interacted suggests that the excesses and contradictions engendered by the controlling apparatuses helped shift the emphasis among the modes of power and shape both Israel’s policy choices and Palestinian resistance (Gordon, 15). The occupation's
attempts to establish a blueprint or set government structure and their strategies to combat resistance are undermined by Palestinian innovativeness. In *Discipline and Punish*, Foucault reminds us once more of what Joseph Servan has to say: that the idea of crime and punishment must be vigorously linked and follow one another without interpretation. Foucault quotes Servan:

When you have thus formed the chain of ideas in the heads of your citizens, you will then be able to pride yourself as on guiding them and being their masters. A stupid despot may constrain his slaves with iron chains; but a true politician binds them even more strongly by the chain of their own ideas; it is at the stable point of reason that he secures the end of the chain; this link is all the stronger in that we do not know of what it is made and we believe it to be our own work; despair and time eat away the bonds of iron and steel, but they are powerless against the habitual union of ideas, they can only tighten it still more; and on the soft fibres of the brain is founded the unshakable base of the soundest of Empires (Foucault, *Discipline and Punish* 102–03).

Israeli colonial practices approach the despotic in that Palestinians remain occupied subjects, not citizens. Even Palestinians with citizenship of Israel are often deemed to be untrustworthy by their fellow citizens. The Israeli state is structured in a way that implements colonial apparatus to ensure continuing settler-colonialism in Palestine. However, in my view, such power relations continue to consider the body its utmost target.
Israeli biopolitics.

In this section I highlight Israeli practices of biopolitics before focusing on the postcolonial literature and film under examination. Successive Israeli policies of biopolitical settlement-building, which cantonises Palestine, and the apartheid wall, aim to separate the bodies of Palestinians from the agricultural lands upon which they are economically dependent. In the next chapters, I will focus on how Palestinians express their resistance through literature, film and poetry, and will argue that it is possible to see different levels of resistance within the literature in response to the Israeli practices of biopolitics as mentioned in this section, both anti-colonial and postcolonial resistance. The dissertation states that the relation of Palestinian literature for example is both postcolonial and anticolonial. Thus, there is a tendency to notice that these cultural productions bear similarity to the characteristics of postcolonial literature, while Palestine is still occupied. Colonialism ability to colonise both a space and a time and the consequences of colonialism are the content of studying postcolonial approaches that can be examined retrospectively or in different locations such as diaspora.

The starting point of this dissertation is that biopolitics is widely practiced in occupied Palestine, raising the question of the extent to which resistance takes a biopolitical form. To explore this question, I will offer a definition of biopolitics in the Western and Palestinian contexts. I will then narrate Israel's current and historical biopolitical policies, as well as their rationale.
Israeli manifestation of biopolitics is unique in Palestine as it is the only country in the Levant that is occupied by settler colonialism. In her book, *Rhetorics of Belonging*, Anna Bernard asserts that the coloniality of the Israel-Palestine conflict is rarely disputed among scholars working in postcolonial literary studies (Bernard, 14). This assertion will enable me to analyse the biopolitical apparatus of colonialism and Palestinian responses. I will use influential European key thinkers such as Agamben and Foucault to explain biopolitical colonial systematic relations. While both Agamben and Foucault are key thinkers in the field of biopolitics, their works stand to be built on from the perspectives of liberation theorists and postcolonial theorists such as Frantz Fanon, who complemented biopolitics with liberation theory and postcolonial theory. I will explain how new considerations may be introduced of particular relevance to a Palestinian context through a paradigm of what I term ‘thin’ and ‘thick’ resistance.

A generalised discussion of colonialism illuminates the forms of governing or the colonial apparatuses of Israel's occupation. I borrow my understanding of colonial apparatuses from Mark Brown who investigates Partha Chatterjee’s distinction between the modern and colonial states. Chatterjee claims that the colonial state is distinct in the logic that underpins the colonial form of administration. Through his analysis of British rule in India, he identifies what he terms a "rule of colonial difference" (Chatterjee 1993, 19). For Chatterjee, the rule of colonial difference is defined as:

---

2 Both forms of governing (governance) and apparatuses will be used interchangeably.
The colonial state, we must remember, was not just the agency that brought the modular forms of the modern state to the colonies; it was also an agency that was destined never to fulfil the normalizing mission of the modern state because the premise of its power was a rule of colonial difference, namely the preservation of the alienness of the ruling group (Chatterjee 10).

In his article "That Heavy Machine: Reprising the Colonial Apparatus in 21st-century Social Control", Mark Brown perceives (building on Chatterjee’s above distinction) what operates across the colonial sphere to condition, or to determine eligibility for participation across almost every sphere of government and civic life. This rule (manifested by colonial apparatuses in occupied Palestine) could use a variety of signs of difference (that apply to Palestinians and not settlers and vice-versa) including Agamben’s state of exception,’ depending upon the specific context in which it was planned, but by far the most important, most potent, and most widely used, Chatterjee argues, is race (quoted in (Brown 43).

The relevance of considering a generalised account of colonialism is to contextualise the apparatus of Israel’s occupation of Palestine and the ways occupied Palestinians respond to it. Over the centuries, powerful nations have used various pretexts to colonise other countries. While the French empire was established on the Civilising Mission belief, ‘mission civilisatrice’, to civilise the indigenous, the British empire was established on the White Man’s Burden assumption, that is, presuming a divine mandate to allow God's empire to reign on earth, making it a ‘civilising mission’ too. These colonial justifications were sometimes associated with religious conversion but not always. Britain and France further used the 'protection of minorities
scheme' and the 'liberation' of women to justify dominating countries in the east. The early Zionists that colonised Palestine instrumentalised 'protection of minorities' rhetoric to achieve their goals of fortifying settlements in Palestine. They were an enclave against antisemitism. The British and the French used this rhetoric of 'protection of minorities' to manipulate Ottoman policies towards their imperial interests, often through divide and rule.

In the initial stages of Jews coming to Palestine, Palestinians extended hospitality to this new minority, aiming to maintain a peaceful society. With the third, fourth and fifth waves of Jewish immigration after the Balfour Declaration, Palestinians began to object to the influx, culminating in the 1936-1939 revolt. In response to the protests of the Palestinians, the British restricted Jewish Immigration to Palestine.

However, in 1947 the United Nations gave international recognition to Israel as a state. The United Nations' proposed partition plan was immediately accepted by Israel but rejected by the Palestinians and the Arabs. The question then become; How legitimate was the creation of Israel? While settler colonialism in America and Australia entailed genocide, a key difference with Israel was that the Jews had been the victims of genocide in Europe.

The creation of Israel was a violent process. Analysing this violence is important for the argument regarding biopolitics. In order to create an exclusively Jewish state, the Palestinian inhabitants of the land had to be removed. This was one of the first aggressive, biopolitical moves taken against the Palestinians. By 1946, just prior to the United Nations' recognition of Israel, mass migration by Jews had increased by
one third. However, at that time, they held just 5.5% of the land. The United Nations’ partition plans emboldened the Zionist movement. The Ben Gurionists and, in particular, Jabotinskyites launched the resultant 1948 Nakba, which included the uprooting of Palestinians from their homes and lands. People were forced to flee under bombings of their neighbourhoods, and under torture by the Haganah. In her article, “The Exodus of Palestine”, (1987), Simpha Flapen writes about the years around partition, that, "there was a search for Arabs [by the Zionists], they were seized, beaten, and also tortured” (Flapan 14). This was not a one-time event but rather a systematic process. In The Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine, Israeli Professor Ilan Pappe writes that ethnic cleansing was not just a condition of war but a strategic goal for early Israeli military units (Pappe, The 1948 Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine 9). In the 1948 Nakba, Zionist militias began a widespread ethnic cleansing of Palestine, driving more than 750,000 Palestinians from their homes, from a 1.9 million Palestinian population. These Palestinians were made refugees beyond the Israeli borders which have remained undefined up to the present day. The ethnic cleansing was to make way for the new Jewish population, which became a majority, to justify a Jewish state. The Zionist militias violently took more than 78 percent of historic Palestine, ethnically cleansed and destroyed about 530 villages and cities, and killed approximately 15,000 Palestinians in a series of mass atrocities, including more than 70 massacres (Flapan 14-15).

In 1967, there was a further war in which Israel occupied East Jerusalem, the West Bank, and Gaza Strip, expelling hundreds of thousands of Palestinians from their

---

3 An armed group for the Zionist movement.
4 In addition, to Ilan Pappe’s detailed accounts of the ethnic cleansing of Palestine, please see Richard Falk (Aydogan).
homes. The United Nations demanded Israel withdraw from the Occupied Territories in line with resolution 242. Human Rights Watch’s 2020 report, *A threshold crossed: Israeli authorities and the crimes of apartheid and persecution* describes conscious intentionality on the part of Israel to harm the body, a prerequisite of biopolitics: “deportation or forcible transfer,” “persecution,” and “other inhumane acts of a similar character intentionally causing great suffering, or serious injury to the body” (Shakir 2021, 33–34). The past is the present in terms of the targeting of the body of the occupied Palestinian.

The Palestinians’ aspiration to keep their homeland remained just that, an aspiration, whereas the aspiration of the Zionist Jews was realised. Despite internationally brokered talks, Israel accelerated illegal settlement building fivefold. Checkpoints and Jewish-only roads crisscross the land. Palestinians continued to be evicted from their homes. Israel continued to besiege and blockade Gaza, targeting civilians and their means of survival (United Nations, 2011, Al-Jazeera English 1). These realities of military occupation, throughout the second half of the 20th century and continuing into the 21st century, used a biopolitical strategy that directly targeted the Palestinian body in the form of biopolitics. As a consequence, Palestinians, seeking ways to survive and reclaim their bodies, homes, and freedom adopted a variety of forms of resistance to counter the strategies of the occupiers.

As mentioned above, Israel's policies of biopolitical attacks on Palestinians' physical bodies were the main target of settler-colonial and the occupation's apparatus and produced different levels of resistance. This practice of biopolitics is designed not only to separate the bodies of Palestinians form their natural communities but from their
birthplaces. The Israeli occupiers created laws and policies to legalise such apparatus, amongst them the Absentees' Property Law of 1950, first proposed in December 1948. The law deemed any Arabs who were not in their places of residence on 29 November 1947 "absentees" stipulating that their property could be appropriated. As a result, two million dunams were taken and given to the custodian, who later transferred the land to Israeli state development agencies (Flapan 18). This law further denied internally displaced Palestinians (IDPs) and millions of dispossessed refugees citizenship on the premise of their being "present absentees".

In historic Palestine, Palestinians within greenline Israel mainly live in cities with large Arab populations, mixed cities of Arabs and Jews such as Led, and towns and villages, such as the area of 'the triangle' that consists of several Palestinian cities. Palestinians who live in Israel were placed under Israeli military law until 1966. Up to the time of writing, all efforts were made by Israel to separate what they have referred to as Israeli-Arabs, from their extended culture and people, in both the West bank and the Gaza Strip (Adi, Sagy and Srour 203). Moreover, Palestinians who live in Israel and choose to shop in the West Bank, both because it is cheaper, and to express solidarity with West Bank merchants’, are required to queue to re-enter Israel, sometimes for hours. Israeli soldiers subject them to thorough searches and interrogations concerning their movements and plans. Gaza is isolated from the occupied West Bank; millions of Palestinian refugees in Gaza are therefore removed from historic Palestine. After the 1967 Israeli occupation, the ethnic cleansing projects took the form of constructing Jewish-only settlements, built on Palestinian territory. In his article, “Explaining
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5 Dunam: a measure of land area used in parts of the former Turkish empire, including Israel, where it is equal to about 900 square metres. [Citation]
Spacio-cide in the Palestinian Territory: Colonization, Separation, and State of Exception”, Sari Hanafi claims that expropriating lands and separating Palestinians perpetuates the myth of founding Israel: on the basis of a “land without a people to a people without a land” (Hanafi 192).

I adopt the position of Geremy Forman and Alexandre Kedar, who explain in their article: “From Arab Land to ‘Israel Lands’: The Legal Dispossession of the Palestinians Displaced by Israel in the Wake of 1948” that thousands of families were subjected to the Absentee law that legalised the annexation of their lands because, although forced to leave under bombardment, they were ‘absent’ after the Nakba (Forman and Kedar 811). This shows the politics of biopolitics at its height; ethnically cleansing from their homes and countries. Hanafi adds that the enforced invisibility of Palestinians sustains an Israeli system neither interested in assimilating the Palestinians nor in killing them. However, over the years, Israel has killed thousands of Palestinians and Arabs, tens of thousands of acres of Palestinian land have been confiscated, and thousands of trees have been uprooted. More than 40 percent of the Palestinian male population has been imprisoned at least once (Beinin and Hajjar 18-19).

By altering Palestinians’ space, Israel forces the politics of invisibility on Palestinians (Griffiths and Repo 251). Examples include confiscating land, demolishing houses, constructing hundreds of checkpoints in a small space, changing the names of familiar towns and streets, changing the fauna and flora of the land by planting non-indigenous trees.
Israeli law has been deployed to counterbalance the demographic ‘threat’ of Palestinians who live inside the green line. Individual or combined practices of Israeli biopolitics have forced hundreds of thousands of Palestinians to leave the country. According to Hanafi, after the 2nd intifada in 2000, around 180,000 Palestinians left the country, from the West Bank and Gaza, some 5.3% of the entire population (Hanafi 4). Regarding economic strategies, Israel has been using the transfer of taxes to pressurise the Palestinian National Authority (PNA). On biopolitical economic dependency on Israel’s institutionalised practice, Abu Sada writes, in his book, *Cultivating Dependence, Palestinian Agriculture Under Occupation*: “First, [economic dependency on Israel] reduces production capacity, denying access to agricultural inputs such as fertilizers and limiting access to land and water resources. Second, the restriction on movement severely impedes trade within the Palestinian territories and the export of products from Israel to elsewhere” (Abu Sada 427). Economic dependency on Israel pressurises Palestinians, creating difficulties in their lives, so Palestinians rely on Israel for their food thus controlling their diets, nutrition, and health to a large extent. In addition, Israel has tried to control the infrastructure of the Occupied Territories by confiscating more than half the total land area in order to establish illegal Jewish settlements, taking over the water resources, and making the territories dependent upon the Israeli economy.

Israel not only tampers with Palestinians bodies while they are alive but also when they are dead to incite fear and control as part of their occupation strategies. Achille Mbembe, philosopher, and political scientist offered a fresh way to look at the development of the biopolitical approach to managing societies, “adjusting Foucault’s original writing to contemporaneity of muddy geopolitics, the process of postmodern
deconstruction and further inevitable reconstruction of ideologies” (Times 1). Mbembe introduced the term ‘necropower’ and ‘necropolitics’ as its functional apparatus, claiming among other things that “contemporary forms of subjugation of life to the power of death (necropolitics) profoundly reconfigure the relations among resistance, sacrifice, and terror” (Mbembe and Corcoran vii).

The guiding principle of Foucauldian biopolitics can be summarised as ‘live and let live’. We all share the same planet with quite limited resources and fragile ecosystem…” Or as it is often described in obituaries— to be ‘survived’ by someone: children, spouses, etc. As a concept this ‘living and letting someone else live’ went beyond the nuclear family and is currently considered, in an enlightened society, as a definition of a responsible approach to the coexistence of peoples. However, the reality of the challenges in contemporary geopolitics present a ‘new normal’, where a ‘live and let die’ approach comes into play (Adapted and quoted from Times 1)

Mbembe’s theoretical constructs suddenly acquire physical shapes. The Israelis’ mechanisms of controlling Palestinian bodies are preventing Palestinians from living in many cases by hindering their access to a possibility to survive. In her article, “The Politics of Karameh: Palestinian burial rites under the gun”, Randa Wahbe demonstrates how Palestinian families manoeuvre around necroviolence to create a politics of karameh-dignity in cemeteries and burial sites. Wahbe calls this resistance the politics of Karameh-dignity. Wahbe discusses cemeteries and burial rites to illustrate how necropolitics functions within the context of Zionist colonialism, and the ways Palestinians have developed a “politics of dignity” as a response to Israeli violence against the dead. The Palestinian collective memory's decades-old fear of
bodies being confiscated derives from obscured Israeli practices of burying fallen Palestinians in undisclosed military zones without the consent or knowledge of their families. Palestinians refer to these cemeteries as the cemeteries of numbers – for their shared characteristic of replacing each corpse’s identity with a numbered marker as their anonymous identifier. Despite decades of attempts to retrieve the remains, about 300 Palestinian and Arab resistance fighters referred to in Palestine and the Arab world at large as martyrs are still interred in these cemeteries (Wahbe 325). In confiscating Palestinian bodies, the Israeli occupation confirms the centrality of the body to the Palestinian/Israeli conflict, at the forefront of Israeli polices, and the necropolitics of ‘live and let die’. This occupation strategy is countered by Palestinian military groups who attempt to kidnap Israeli soldiers alive or dead knowing that they can be exchanged for living prisoners or Palestinian corpses, to restore the dignity referred to in Wahbe’s article. Palestinians are thus using the strategies of the occupier as they often prove effective as forms of resistance and to regain dignity for their people.

The post-mortem imprisonment of Palestinian bodies by Israelis has been understood among Palestinians as Palestinians being criminalized beyond death. The majority of Palestinians imprisoned post-mortem were captured during a period of armed resistance in the 1960s to 1970s. Now, I turn to how Palestinians have responded, and are responding, to such biopolitical strategies through various means of resistance.

An important question to consider is to what extent the relationship between the settler colonial and occupied Palestinians shapes the type of resistance deployed? One of the suggested arguments for this question is Fanon’s position that the encounter between the settler colonist and the indigenous was established on violent premise: “Their (the settler and the native) first encounter was marked by violence and their existence
together—that is to say the exploitation of the native by the settler—was carried on by dint of a great array of bayonets and cannons” (Fanon and Sartre 35). The notable involvement of the body here constitutes biopolitics. Fanon further asserts that: “So we see that all parties are aware of the power of such violence and that the question is not always to reply to it by a greater violence, but rather to see how to relax the tension” (Fanon and Sartre 72). Fanon clearly refers to the necessity of adopting different strategies of resistance.

---

1 A terrorist armed group for the Zionist movement from 1920-1948. After the Nakba in 1948, the Haganah was enlisted in the Israeli Defend Force IDF.
2 Measure of land area used in parts of the former Turkish empire, including Israel (where it is equal to about 900 square metres).

**Resistance strategies in respect of Palestinian resistance.**

This dissertation explores the conflicting relationship between the colonial government and anti, and post-colonial politics in occupied Palestine and in exile where the majority of Palestinians still reside, raising the question of the extent to which resistance takes a biopolitical form. I situate my argument that resistance mitigates its use of violence, referred to in this essay as thick resistance. Biopolitics in thick resistance is visible as opposed to being invisible in non-violent resistance. Nonetheless, invisible, thin resistance can use the body, albeit not in a violent way, to respond to settler colonial biopolitics practices in occupied Palestine.
Violent and non-violent resistance strategies and forms have been investigated, explored, and interrogated using interdisciplinary fields such as sociology, psychology, postcolonial studies, and literary criticism. What does resistance mean for the Occupied Palestinian Territories? This dissertation will enter into the distinction between violent and non-violent resistance but will also engage purposefully in elements that constitute thin and thick strategies of anti-colonial and postcolonial resistance.

My point of departure in regard to resistance is Hollander and Einwohner’s position: the concept of resistance is used today in a multitude of ways and without much precision. In addition, “Resistance is defined not only by resisters perception of their own behaviour, but also by targets and/or others’ recognition of and reaction to this behaviour” (Hollander and Einwohner 2004: 548). In this dissertation, the interrogated categories of Palestinians vis-à-vis their resistance are occupied Palestinians and their relation to the agents of visible power that are manifested on the ground physically by the occupying police, soldiers and protected settlers with the fortifying walls, prisons, and check points. In addition, the resistance performed by Palestinians who live outside Palestine but also suffer the consequences of the Nakba are considered.

In the late 1970s and early 80s Gilles Deleuze authored a series of articles in which he reflected on the formation of the state of Israel being “clearly a matter of colonisation” (quoted in Medien 49–50). Israel’s actions were equivalent to “genocide, however, one in which physical extermination remains subordinated to geographical evacuation” (ibid). In order for Palestinians to survive, they must merge with the other
Arabs. This is evident from the numerous biopolitical examples this essay mentioned where the very body of Palestinians was and still is, I argue, the primary target.

From before the Great Palestinian Revolt 1936-39 and the occupation of Palestine from 1948 onward, Palestinians have employed diverse resistance strategies. Forms of resistance have never stagnated; they are in constant negotiation with the occupiers, the resisters, and the observers.

Resistance is always related to power. Power is plural and negotiable. As power, resistance is a multi-faceted process and forms dynamic relationships. The definition of resistance has been subject to much confusion (Jocelyn A. Hollander and Einwohner 534). In many works, resistance seems to be viewed as a symbol of the writer's political stance as much as an analytical concept. In order for this dissertation to facilitate better understanding of how resistance is used in literary contexts, I will discuss sociological conceptualisations of resistance and their literary and artistic expression.

Resistance is defined variously as, for example, “[A]cting autonomously, in [one's] own interests” (Gregg 173), “[E]ngaging in behaviours despite opposition” (Carr 543); “[A]ctive efforts to oppose, fight, and refuse to cooperate with or submit to... abusive behaviour and…control” (Profitt 25). Weitz (2001:669) writes, “[T]he term resistance remains loosely defined, allowing some scholars to see it almost everywhere and others almost nowhere” (quoted in Jocelyn A. Hollander and Einwohner 534). A critical mass of the sociological literature seems to perceive resistance as an
oppositional act. It is an activity – a social action that involves agency; and that act is carried out in some kind of oppositional relationship to power.

Since James Scott wrote *Weapons of the Weak* (1985), a significant part of resistance studies have investigated the area of ‘everyday resistance’; the informal and non-organised resistance that Scott also calls ‘infra politics’ (Johansson and Vinthagen 2020, 4). That is being “disguised and hidden” (Johansson and Vinthagen, ‘Dimensions of Everyday Resistance’ 419). *Sumud* is its Palestinian equivalent with some contextual specifics such as living in a settler colonial environment, with multiple sources of power: the violations of settlers burning trees, invading homes, and violating places of worship such as *Al-Haram Al Sharif, Al Aqsa Mosque*, and churches, besides the power that comes from the supporting Israeli army. The majority of response/resistance to the above mentioned violations and violence is conducted through thin resistance, which *Sumud* views as central. Before turning to thin resistance and *Sumud*, I would like to emphasise some characteristics of everyday resistance.

Resistance may fit into Scott's theoretical framework concerning 'transcripts' (hidden and public), in which behaviours and modes of speech come to befit specific actors in particular social settings, whether dominant or oppressed. Resistance is a subtle form of contesting ‘public transcripts’ by making use of prescribed roles and language to resist the abuse of power – including things like “rumour, gossip, disguises, linguistic tricks, metaphors, euphemisms, folktales, ritual gestures, anonymity” (Scott, 137). These methods are particularly functional in situations where violence is used to maintain the status quo, allowing “[A] veiled discourse of dignity and self-assertion
within the public transcript… in which ideological resistance is disguised, muted, and veiled for safety’s sake’ (Ibid). These forms of resistance require little coordination or planning, and are used by both individuals and groups to resist without directly confronting or challenging elite norms (Powercube 1).

Hollander and Einwohner, in their article “Conceptualising Resistance” (2004) conclude that resistance must be both intentional and recognisable by others. They use these two dimensions to develop a typology of resistance by target, agent, and observer (Jocelyn A. Hollander and Einwohner 533). Johansson and Vinthagen observe that Hollander and Einwohner's conclusion contradicts their idea of resistance as a complex and ongoing process of social construction (Johansson and Vinthagen, ‘Dimensions of Everyday Resistance’ 418). This dissertation supports the view that the recognition of resistance as a fully conscious act is problematic, in particular for the everyday resistance referred to as Sumud in Palestine. By contrast, unconscious resistance in occupied nations such as Palestine derives from living within a multifaceted ‘negotiative’ space/liminality, where indigenous Palestinians and settlers try to live, ‘co-exist’, or eliminate one another. Sumud for Palestinians is natural.

Resistance can be the many unconscious and spontaneous actions taken in opposition to a single power. In settler colonial occupied Palestine, Palestinians resist a system that functions (and segregates) in an apartheid land. Power is leveraged by various occupation groups, for instance by settlers, the occupying army and laws to enforce the domination of the occupier and the control of the Palestinians. In addition, Palestinian resistance responds to combined forms of governance that manifest from the aforementioned powers.
Gordon's analysis shows that the three modes of power (sovereign, disciplinary and biopower) tend to be deployed simultaneously. Responding to this complex relationship makes resistance both a declared and undeclared social construction. Further, since the actions of resistance derive from both conscious and unconscious thoughts, it can be difficult to classify these acts as resistance since it is difficult for conscious resistance to emerge from undeclared negotiations or mitigation of power. Fanon writes to illustrate the mutual knowledge of the settler and the colonised that can mean the negotiation I mentioned is unconscious:

The settler and the native are old acquaintances. In fact, the settler is right when he speaks of knowing "them" well. For it is the settler who has brought the native into existence and who perpetuates his existence. The settler owes the fact of his very existence, that is to say, his property, to the colonial system (Fanon and Sartre 35).

Natives, who position themselves as fighting for freedom, start to reimagine themselves, their image and status, and to utilise these in incremental and conducive praxis, for instance, for the survival and freedom of Palestinians.

As a control system, the Israeli occupation is not interested in incorporating the occupied population into Israeli society. It simply wants to control the land without the people. This is why Israeli state authorities do not tolerate conventional politics among the Palestinians. Therefore, the only form of politics open to Palestinians is resistance on all fronts and at all levels, for instance, collective action, that aims to subvert the system, change it, or make it possible to escape its effects (Moughrabi 50-51). Marie et al conclude that Sumud, which can be perceived as reinventing resistance strategies - linked and rooted within a cultural context - promotes resilience. However,
Marie et al demonstrate that “resilience is a prerequisite to ‘Sumud’” (Jones, Hannigan and Mohammad 20). In his book: The Social Bases of Obedience and Revolt, Moore identifies three distinguished capacities that develop what he calls "iron in the soul" - a vital ingredient for resistance. The first is moral courage, which is the ability to resist powerful and intimidating pressures to obey oppressive rules. The second is the intellectual ability to recognise that the pressure and rules are indeed oppressive. The last is "moral inventiveness," which means the ability to “fashion from existing cultural traditions historically new standards of condemnation of what exists” (Moore 91).

Palestinians resist in order to seek freedom, respect for their human rights and an inclusion in which they will not feel minoritised by the machinations of Israeli colonialism. A hunger strike is a powerful means of prison resistance. Prisons and detention centres are places of power and resistance, and Palestinian hunger strikers seek to use the authorities’ apparent strength against them (Shwaikh 78). Israel considers that many of the hunger strikers were convicted of attacks or planning attacks against Israel, and that this was politically motivated (Al-Mughrabi and Sawafta 1). However, Palestinian hunger strikers have felt obliged to continue their fight for freedom and equality despite the imminent hazard of losing their lives in the process. The hunger strike is a major theme within Palestinian prison literature, such as in The Curtains of Darkness by Waleed Al Hodaly, whose work reflects his 12 years detention in Israeli prisons. Prison literature created inside Israel and British mandatory Palestine is considered an armament of will and a challenge to authority. As well as creating suffering, the Zionist prisons are also catalysts for self-reflection and thus self-discovery that might not occur outside the prisons.
**Sumud**

Understanding strategies of *Sumud* provides functional codes, in terms of which method of resistance to use, ‘thin or thick’ to counter Israeli practices of occupation. However, in order to do that, some of the characteristics of *Sumud’s* practices should be underpinned; to identify the degree of hope in such occupation practices and propositions. Since the *Nakba*, Israelis have attempted to prune Palestinians' lives within both Israel and Palestine. By ‘prune’, I mean that Israeli biopolitics stops short of genocide while still lessening the survival odds of Palestinians.

Zionist myths of Palestine, such as the slogan "a land without a people for a people without a land" are countered by the Palestinian documentary record. Therefore, Palestinians remain unified in diaspora by remaining nationalistic and united in the face of suffering and alienation. Somdeep Sen argues that even suffering for the Palestinians has become a symbol of resistance in which they seek to find meaning. Therefore, to the extent they find Palestine in their wounds, suffering may in fact be a result of their daily reactions to the Israeli occupation (Sen 212). Israeli myth-building depends on the knowledge of the occupier. This explains the constant negotiation, often unspoken, between the coloniser and the colonised - on resistance strategies. Salam Mir argues in her article, “Palestinian literature: Occupation and Exile” that understanding the forces that informed Palestinian writers is necessary in order to appreciate Palestinian literature. Mir’s article looks at the grand themes that authors search for,
Imaginative forms to reconstruct their history and voice their identity. Going beyond the imposed legacy of history, Palestinian writers reclaim their loss and dispossession in miraculous words. The emergence of “Poetry of Resistance” in the 1950s and thereafter is a witness to the resilience of Palestinians inside Israel. Moreover, as Palestinian writing continues to flourish, it builds on early writing, rejecting the “nightmare of history” (Occupation of Palestine). Palestinian literature is at the heart of the Palestinian struggle (Salam Mir 110).

In Chapter 3, I will examine how poetry chanting through protests mobilises Palestinian resistance. I document how poetry amplifies the collective voice of the Palestinian body politic.

This essay contributes to the analysis of, what I term, thin and thick resistance, which can constitute either separate or composite strategies to resistance praxis. While thin resistance instils endurance of hardship, resilience in outlook and behaviour, such as the non-violent resistance or *Sumud* in a Palestinian context, thick resistance takes a violent approach.

Both thin and thick resistance are strategic imperatives for the survival and emancipation of Palestinians. However, both forms are spontaneous, retrieving one memory and the attendant unconscious behaviours of how they should act in that given moment and situation after placing the result of acting in a holistic environment. My definition of thick resistance is the bodily acts that are taken by the occupied with the intention to harm the occupier. Prime examples include participating in militant resistance such as firing rockets. My definition of thin resistance is the endurance that
millions of Palestinians undertake in their daily battles against occupation, the resilience that is required to prolong their stay on the land. Prime examples include crossing checkpoints, non-violent and non-physical resistance such as doing nothing if insulted by a Jewish settler or clearing the rubbish thrown at their homes by settlers, and extinguishing fires set alight in their olive trees by settlers with the support of the Israeli army. The distinction between the two is called into question by showing how and why practices of thin resistance are taken and at what point they make the transition.

The political term, *Sumud* connotes the Palestinian physical presence in everyday battles. Its etymology derives from PLO campaigns in the 1970s and 1980s to maintaining a physical presence on the land in the face of Israeli policies that can be understood as a kind of “silent ethnic cleansing” (Johansson and Vinthagen 110). In his article, “Lifestyle of resistance: Palestinian Sumud in Israel as a form of transformative resistance”, Ali Nijmeh describes Sumud as:

The concept most frequently employed to describe the daily reality experienced by Palestinians in Israel, translates as steadfastness, and refers to a form of infrapolitics or everyday resistance. It describes a stubborn insistence on continuing with life despite all obstacles, but it can also suggest that resistance involves reactive actions carried out by weak people. “Everyday resistance” can also encompass a lifestyle in which resistance is understood as both a “value” and a “behaviour”, one in which opposition is focused, not just on Israeli power structures, but also on the internal Palestinian power structures (Nijmeh 143).
This view of *Sumud* is comparable to criticism of everyday resistance as a form of passive resistance. In their article, “To Exist Is To Resist: Sumud, Heroism, and the Everyday”, Alexandra Rijke and Toine van Teeffelen question the uneasy distinction of *Sumud* being “active” or “resisting” (Rijke and Van Teeffelen 88). However, the formulation of *Sumud* differs due to the geopolitical environments, and other economic, legal, and social lived realities that Palestinians experience. *Sumud* is a Palestinian term that has its manifestation in how Palestinians feel they must respond according to their best interests in a given situation. Thus, Palestinians will search for reasons to feel optimistic concerning which *Sumud* tactic to undertake. In their article, “Dimension of everyday resistance: An Analytical Framework”, Johansson and Vinthagen assert that everyday resistance can be understood as an attitude, a cultural trait, or an introspective stance. In addition, as suggested by the typography of resistances, everyday resistance is done routinely yet is neither publicly articulated with political aims or formally organised (Johansson and Vinthagen, ‘Dimensions of Everyday Resistance’ 417). *Sumud*, in other words, represents an ability to live in the shadow of loss and calamity (Nijmeh 146). Richter-Devroe, in her article, “Palestinian Women’s Everyday Resistance: Between Normality and Normalisation”, conceptualises *Sumud* as a “more covert, often individual and non-organised everyday non-violent resistance” (Richter-Devroe 33). Raja Shehadeh adds the dimension of political strategy when he describes *Sumud* as representing a “third way” that takes the form of neither armed struggle nor passive acceptance. In *Occupation Diaries*, Shehadeh reflects on a day he met with Mustafa Barghouti, a Palestinian politician, and Eyad Sarraj, a psychiatrist who lives in Gaza and founded the Gaza Community Mental Health Programme. Speaking to Shehadeh and Barghouti, Sarraj illustrated his *Sumud* decision:
I was under a lot of pressure to leave before the war. We have British passports, and the embassy was urging us to leave. My wife wanted to leave. I said, we will stay, even if the house is destroyed over our heads. I am so glad I stayed (Shehadeh 100).

Perhaps the above decision to resist by staying illustrates Shehadeh’s third way by neither participating in armed struggle nor passively relocating to a safer abode. His decision to stay was calculated on the worst that could happen, “if the house is destroyed over our heads”, death or injury. Nevertheless, his satisfaction later with his decision shows that _Sumud_ actions are often used to describe Palestinians’ inner strength particularly in the Occupied Palestinian Territories, and in refugee camps. My own analytical research concerning _Sumud_ resistance strategies centre on hope as conceptualised in the strength of the individual and collective Palestinian psyches. Such Palestinian resisters often select their strategies under immense pressure and/or during life-threatening situations.

Raja Shehadeh defines _Sumud_ as the firmness of the mind. _Sumud_ is watching your home turned into a prison. You, _Samid_ [who practice the virtue], choose to stay in that prison, because it is your home, and because you fear that if you leave, your jailer will not allow you to return (Shehadeh viii). _Sumud_ is the other choice of what I term thick resistance, a militaristic approach to resistance, involving aggression vehicular by Israeli settlers or soldiers. In the occupied West Bank and Gaza, venting anger can still go directly to the settler or the colonial authorities represented by soldiers or police forces. The manifestation of thick resistance comes at a hefty price exemplified in the collective punishment of the family and sometimes of the neighbourhood of the
perpetrators. Not every Palestinian will tolerate the consequences of their acts of thick resistance. Israel will almost certainly demolish the family home of the perpetrator and persecute and imprison family members (Simon 6). One can witness the collective punishment against the Palestinian collective/political body here. Therefore, the notion of hope can be seen as a standard feature of these dynamics; Palestinian freedom fighters choose their resistance strategies according to it.

Before the performance of thick resistance, native Palestinians will have dreamt thousands of times about desired forms of liberation that they consider adequate, using non-violence, such as their ability to access their land and be sovereign in their country. The native Palestinian dreams of crossing the liminal space that he lives in. An exiled Palestinian dreams of the fulfilment of the right of return. When an opportunity for thick resistance arises, Palestinians would have contemplated it many times before it seemed like a natural next step. Therefore, many of the militant operations performed by native Palestinians against settlers and the occupation body that protect settler-colonialism come as a surprise. Fanon asserts:

The native is a being hemmed in; apartheid is simply one form of the division into compartments of the colonial world. The first thing which the native learns is to stay in his place, and not to go beyond certain limits. This is why the dreams of the native are always of muscular prowess; his dreams are of action and of aggression. I dream I am jumping, swimming, running, climbing; I dream that I burst out laughing, that I span a river in one stride, or that I am followed by a flood of motorcars which never catch up with me. During the
period of colonization, the native never stops achieving his freedom from nine
in the evening until six in the morning (Fanon and Sartre 51).

To speak of thin and thick resistance in diaspora is to consider another manifestation.
Each act of *Sumud* is specific to its location, such that *Sumud* becomes the ability to
endure the hardship of the refugee camp. However, as shown in Kanafani’s novella,
*Um Saa’d*, their thick resistance practices are manifested in military spectacles and
training. Thus, a desired form of liberation reveals itself through dreams and
imaginings, mostly of a bodily nature. Take a Palestinian writer who lives in London
or New York; his method of bodily resistance could be activism through physical
protest to voice their concerns about the injustice practiced in their native land. Or
when their pens that write postcolonial accounts of cultural productions become a
liberating tool. For Palestinians in Israel, when it comes to practicing thick resistance,
they often find themselves in the conflicted situation of holding Israeli citizenship.
Palestinians in Israel tend also to practice the two concepts of resistance I termed: thin
and thick. Thin resistance is practiced by the mentioned *Sumud* to survive their daily
lives living in Israel. However, Israeli colonial policies intensified pre-existing
tribalism among Palestinians who live in Israel. According to Eyad El Sarraj, in his
article, “Defiant, Helpless and Demoralised” the tribal structure, “[G]ives you a sense
of belonging and a sense of security. But it has no impact on this culture (of non-
violent resistance), because this culture is physical and tribal means revenge. And
revenge, if it is physical, has to be an eye for an eye” (El-Sarraj 3–4). Thick resistance
practices tested across settler colonial regions tend to share many similar
characteristics such as internal violence. This perhaps confirms the settler-colonial
nature of occupied Palestine. As Fanon puts it: “The colonised subject will first train
this aggressiveness sedimented in his muscles against his own people” (Fanon and Philcox 15). Thick resistance therefore is an all-time mechanism to vent the demoralised spirits of the colonised.

By contrast, thick resistance has militaristic characteristics such as various forms of lethal bombing, including suicide bombing. Since the chances of surviving participation in any bombing campaign are slim, survival becomes one mode of thin Palestinian resistance. I argue that the level of psychosocial optimism becomes embedded in the mind and many times acted upon by the body of the colonial Palestinian subject. In turn, this determines the strategy of resistance that she/he is going to undertake. Within thick resistance, the body itself becomes weaponised chiefly as a biopolitical target, culprit, and an active agent, so that the body is drawn into politics, philosophy and the arts. The Palestinian body is culturised to resist.

*Sumud* is a resistance that is perceived in terms of the spiritual, psychological, and moral (rather than physical). In refusing the Israeli attempt to break the spiritual resolve of the Palestinians, for example, thin resistance can be referred to as reactive while thick as proactive. In thin resistance, bodies have another destination beyond the practice or the event that triggered the thin resistance in the first place. In thin resistance, some people/bodies enter into a dialectical praxis in which their individual thoughts and subsequent actions respond and react to subjugation. Using past experience, they rethink their resistance strategies to become more effective in the future.
Bearing witness to thin and thick resistance of the same individuals or group of people would help one understand the mechanism of resistance at moments of acute social, psychological, and political pressure. I argue that linking these two phases, while not necessarily moving in sequence, would facilitate a deeper examination of whether resistance is itself bio-political or whether resistance concerns a people's attempts to extricate from bio-political/bio-power structures. For example, in the case of a Palestinian who endures humiliation at a checkpoint (thin resistance), for him, accessing his occupied village is a higher dream (beyond his current circumstances) that is considered worthy of undergoing Israel's bodily tactics of humiliation which are targeted at reducing the dignity of the occupied Palestinian, by asking him for instance to undress for the purposes of a bodily search; Palestinians detainees are routinely completely striped of their clothes (Weishut 2015, 71–72). Many Palestinians cannot tolerate such indignities. Transcending this humiliation extends their threshold of resistance and gives them additional practice in resisting the occupier. The occupier has perhaps intended to reduce the coloniser’s humanity. However, the humanity of the occupied subject is restored when anti or postcolonial resistance aims are realised. The occupied feels that he is doing what is within his means. The different perceptions of the colonised and the coloniser on the same matter triggers bodily resistance by the occupied mainly to rebel against the biopolitics strategies of the occupier. This is intrinsic to understanding thin and thick resistance, demonstrating the objectives of occupier and occupied and the strategies each uses to achieve their goals. What is discussed here are strategies and tactics that the colonised use to mitigate against the acute severity of the conflict, perpetuated by the coloniser.
I argue that perpetuating the existence of the native depends on the notion of hope they find amidst this complex power dominated environment. Hope, and the degree of hope, is what defines resistance for Palestinians. This inclines with resistance as a complex and ongoing process of social construction. Resistance is a stance on circumstances. I argue that this stance generates what I term thin and thick resistance. These are two strategies, tactics, forms, modes, or actions of resistance which I will attempt to explain before introducing how such resistance can take place in a liminal space.

The dimension of space is fundamental to understanding resistance. In the era of settler colonialism such as that currently experienced in Palestine, this space is liminal. Two people are trying to coexist together. Although one, the Zionist occupier, is powerful, with all the rights to settle its desired population, while the occupied, indigenous Palestinian population must resist in order to exist, let alone to live in a dignified way. Israelis establish forms of governance over all aspects of life, such as controlling the space using checkpoints, surveillance to control places of liminality, mainly in the occupied West Bank and Jerusalem. It is evident that the Zionists thought they could sustain Palestine as a settler colony to accommodate the dream of a Jewish homeland at the expense of the indigenous population who lived there for centuries. Those Palestinians and their descendants now constitute millions who lived, are living, and will probably live for the forcible future, in diaspora. Any means, including the assassination of Palestinians, is considered permissible by Israel to sustain this space and the population of the settler-colony. Racism defines this liminal space and its population. Site is an important spatial category. Resistance in Palestine is situated in a location: at a checkpoint, in prison, on Jews-only roads, at the entry to one’s village,
and the list goes on. In the settler colony of Palestine, this site/space/location is structured politically-legally, socio-economically, and socio-culturally. As I will explain, this liminal space is both physical, targeting the body, for example with the creation of checkpoints to restrict the movement of Palestinians. And existing in such places means resisting oppression by physical means, bringing the body into the settler colonial politics, as well as by other non-bodily means.

Frantz Fanon describes the spatialisation of colonial occupation in vivid terms. For him, colonial occupation implies, first and foremost, a division of space into compartments. It includes the setting of boundaries and internal frontiers epitomised by barracks and police stations; it is administered by the language of blunt force, immediate presence, and frequent and direct action; and it is premised on the principle of reciprocal exclusivity (Fanon, The Wretched of the Earth 39). In the context of Palestine/Israel, liminality is given physical manifestations through boundaries. More importantly, whoever controls this liminal space claims sovereignty, in this long-contested quest for claiming superior love and belonging between settlers and Palestinians for the land. Therefore, one of Israel’s many forms of governing and colonial apparatus, according to Rafi Grosgilk et al, in their article “Soil, territory, land: The spatial politics of settler organic farming in the West Bank, Israel/Palestine” is using agriculture as a means of reclaiming territorial sovereignty and indigenous identity (Grosglik et al. 906). The authors write that political space is generated by multiple state apparatuses. They claim: “territory is long considered the central concept in scholarly debates on the Occupied Territories”. The conflict is always over land (and space) as part of a continuous attempt to achieve the highest degree of control and sovereignty. “In this case, territoriality is not only formally exercised by
the state, but also by the settler farmers, who function as private entrepreneurs claiming sovereignty over the disputed territory” (Grosglik et al. 910). With limited or no sovereignty over their land, what choices remain for Palestinians but to exist with a colonialism that invades their every space?

Liminal space develops where two people must coexist together. Liminality can be understood as threshold; a limit; and a reduced agency within the space that people live in due to a change of circumstances, such as settler-colonialism and occupation. Victor Turner’s application of Van Gennep’s use of ‘limen’ (from the Latin for ‘threshold’) in his study The Rites of Passage (1960) provides a pathway into the concept of liminality. Van Gennep observes ‘Rites of Passage’ operating in phases, including a transitional phase, where the ritual subjects often pass through a period of dismay and area of ambiguity, a type of social limbo phase which has few of the attributes of either the preceding, or subsequent profane social statuses or cultural states (Turner 24). This liminality is shaped by a transitional phase between voice and body of the Palestinian.

Analysing the relationship between body and voice more concretely shows liminality between the body and the voice of the Palestinians as I will show in the literary analysis. The liminality of the body depends on denying it a voice. When the Palestinian occupied subject has little or no voice in the politics that decide his own present and future, his body will seem to correspond to that deprived voice. In other words, the deprived voice will give the Palestinian a choice: for example, this body will become docile (passive resistance) or activate it in resistance. Not all Palestinians will tolerate the results of the Israeli occupation's forms of governance equally. For
instance, many Palestinians adhere to crossing instructions given by the occupation authority at a checkpoint. Others refuse those instructions and choose alternatives routes to cross such as penetrating the separation wall. Psychosocially, Palestinians live in the reality that voicing their freedom and aspiration cannot overcome the current life-threatening restrictions that define their liminality. However, they look for glimpses of hope within this liminal space to expand their resistance strategies.

In Palestine/Israel, this colonial shift from classic imperialism to geo and body-politics is changing the colonised relation to their borders, bodies, and liminality. In light of this shift, resistance strategies affected by this shift ought to change to respond to the fragmentation of space, the targeting of the body, fear, fear of death, and death referred to by Mbembe as necropower. The most accomplished form of necropower is the contemporary colonial occupation of Palestine (Mbembe, Necropolitics 27), Mbembe writes:

To return to Fanon’s spatial reading of colonial occupation, the late-modern colonial occupation in Gaza and the West Bank presents three major characteristics in relation to the working of the specific terror formation I have called necropower. First is the dynamics of territorial fragmentation, the sealing off and expansion of settlements. The objective of this process is twofold: to render any movement impossible and to implement separation along the model of the apartheid state. The occupied territories are therefore divided into a web of intricate internal borders and various isolated cells (Mbembe, Necropolitics 27-28).
Mbembe asserts that the death of the colonised goes hand in hand with the death of the Other. Homicide and suicide are accomplished in the same act. And to a large extent, resistance and self-destruction are synonymous (Mbembe, Necropolitics 36). Fanon's formulation of death is especially striking as it highlights his conviction in life itself. Therefore, although colonisation certainly targets, in part, the life of the colonized, life itself remains generative, active, and future-oriented. It remains cherished by those who hold it, and it is future oriented, stimulating the accumulation of glimpses of hope what can make living into the future possible and desirable.

For Fanon, life, not death, is what makes the news. It makes the news in the sense of expressing resistance from the oppressed viewpoint. Frantz Fanon opened up the possibility and need for a double consciousness and broader thinking of and from the experience of Les damnés de la terre (Mignolo and Tlostanova 219). In The Wretched of Earth, Fanon writes: “To live simply means not to die. To exist means staying alive. Every date grown is a victory. Not the result of hard work, but a victory celebrating a triumph over death” (Fanon, 1963, p. 232).

*Sumud* is an indigenous Palestinian mode of existential presence. Being alive provides hope that circumstances may change, that dignity and liberation can be achieved. Stephanie Clare, in her essay, “The Politics of Life and Land in Frantz Fanon’s Writing”, illustrates how Fanon can be employed to intervene in the rendering of life: that we find between Michel Foucault and Gilles Deleuze. The latter’s powerful reading of Foucault’s *The History of Sexuality* reaches the point of vitalism in which life is formed of the “capacity to resist force”. When power takes life as its object, then, “resistance to power already puts itself on the side of life and turns life against power” (qtd in Clare, 2013, p. 62). Life itself, the object of biopower, becomes the
source of resistance. Fanon argues that colonisation occupies both a territory (space) and a population and it is only in the transformation of each that a new humanism can emerge (Clare, 2013, p. 63). The power relations that Fanon describes are intrinsically biopolitical, and indeed, they involve the issues of space and land⁶. The object of power as far as the focus of this essay is concerned is life under occupation and its associated practices of biopolitics from the sides of coloniser and colonised.

For Fanon, the deployment of psychology in resisting colonialism has two main aims: to highlight the embedded psyche of the colonised and to equip her/him with a resistance tool in the pursuit of strengthening themselves. The path for dismantling colonialism begins “with a positive change of mind, self-consciousness…listening in postcolonial theory has to work at the conscious level of those engaged in and bring them to a level of responsibility and accountability” (cited in Rukundwa and Van Aarde 1185). As for the positive change in the mind of the colonised, this dissertation further uses the notion of hope which will be detailed further. Hope is the positive criterion many of the colonised in Palestine use to determine their resistance strategies. Specifically, this paper will be concerned with addressing the relationship between hope and resistance through literature.

---

⁶ See (Clare, 2013) for Fanon anticolonial approach in relation to land.
Resistance in relation to hope in respect of Palestinian resistance.

I wish to introduce how hope is crucial to understanding forms of resistance and the differences between ‘thin’ and ‘thick’ resistance. The greater is the degree of hope for the colonised, the less violent the bodily resistance will be. With greater hope, resistance can remain within thin resistance. Those who turn their bodies into explosive weapons, like suicide bombers, have seen little or no hope during the thin resistance phase. They may choose martyrdom or a lifetime imprisonment believing that freedom will be found in the next life, since it is not possible in this one. Mbembe contends:

The power and value of the body result from a process of abstraction based on the desire for eternity. In that sense, the martyr, having established a moment of supremacy in which the subject overcomes his own mortality, can be seen as labouring under the sign of the future. In other words, in death the future is collapsed into the present (Mbembe, Necropolitics 37).

Thick resisters may believe that their actions might at least trigger other revolutionaries who are inspired by them to continue the next stage of the fight against occupation. In Dale Jacobs’ article, “What’s Hope Got To Do With It? Toward A Theory Of Hope And Pedagogy”, Kate Ronald and Hephzibah Roskelly argue how Jacobs examines the pragmatic possibilities that depict the relationship between the notion of hope and an advanced education pedagogy:
Untested feasibility involves mediating between what is and what might be, looking simultaneously at the present and toward the future. Untested feasibility allows us to undertake this temporal mediation and to balance our attention between present circumstances and future possibilities; it involves fostering a critical belief in what is possible in order to overcome the obstacle or limit-situation or circumstances before us.” (Quoted in Jacobs, 2005, p. 709).

The majority of occupied people are aware of both the present moment and the anticipated future, choosing to employ survival tactics in the status-quo until the means to liberate their country increases. To survive, they use thin resistance. Nevertheless, there exist a minority who want their resistance to hurt the occupier on a reciprocal stand. Thick resistance conveyors do not tolerate the occupation's killing of loved ones. That said, they tend to conduct thin resistance until a saturation point at which they assess that such actions are no longer effective. Both strategies of resistance almost always come unconsciously, the choice is instinctive and emotive. And the coloniser does not want to witness the prevalence of this instinct, especially in thick resistance. Fanon writes:

When we consider the resources deployed to achieve the cultural alienation so typical of the colonial period, we realize that nothing was left to chance and that the final aim of colonization was to conceive the indigenous population it would save them from darkness...At the level of the unconscious, therefore, colonialism was not seeking to be perceived by the indigenous population as a sweet, kind-hearted mother who protects her
child from a hostile environment, but rather a mother who constantly prevents her basically perverse child from committing suicide or giving free rein to its malevolent instincts (Fanon, The Wretched of the Earth 149).

There are many ways in which the occupier attempts to prevent the colonised from acting upon his “malevolent instincts” that are originally caused by occupation’s cruel governing apparatus, such as surveillance and imprisonment, but here I argue that the coloniser uses hope to stretch the immediacy of action upon this pure instinct. Israel has always embedded spies within Palestinian communities. For Israel’s own intelligence, it has not been hard to understand or imagine what the hopes of the Palestinian community they occupy are. Israel therefore studies the psychological contemporaries of the occupied Palestinians to understand when Palestinians are likely to turn to thick resistance, in Fanon’s term to control power. Israel thus measures the degree of hope Palestinians need and provides a fraction of it. Because both the colonised and the coloniser live together, often in a liminal space, the coloniser’s safety depends on the response of the colonised.

Yet to quote another aphorism on hope, “Just as man cannot live without dreams, he cannot live without hope. If dreams reflect the past, hope summons the future” (Wiesel, 2019, p. 1). There is no real sense of what hope actually is or how it is fully developed. Hope is future-oriented. The theorisation of hope in Jacobs Dale proved useful for my attempt to conceptualise hope in a postcolonial (bodily) context in his article, “What's Hope Got to Do With It? Theorizing Hope in Education”.
I first look at Hooks, whose work anticipates the ideas of Dale. In her 2003 book, *Teaching Community: A Pedagogy of Hope*, Bell Hooks argues that hope helps move us beyond critique and cynicism. “[H]ope empowers us to continue our work for justice even as the forces of injustice may gain greater power for a time” (Hooks, 2003, p. xiv). While Dale cites Gabriel Marcel’s book, *In Homo Viator: Introduction to a Metaphysic of Hope*, originally published in 1951, Marcel writes: “Hope is only possible on the level of the us, or we might say of the agape, and that it does not exist on the level of the solitary ego, self-hypnotised and concentrating exclusively on individual aims. Thus, it also implies that we must not confuse hope and ambition, for they are not of the same” (Marcel, 1965, p. 10) (quoted in Jacobs, 2005, p. 785). Hope is social, rather than individual, in nature, and is clothed in the fabric of social relations where we reside. Hope is decidedly not about desires, individual aims, or ambitions; it is what Marcel refers to as a communion (ibid). In a liberation postcolonial context, the hope of the colonised is a hope of the collective society as if nationalism equals the collective hope. To quote Marcel’s reflections on the existence of collective society: “[B]y the presence of its members: For Marcel, it is at the level of communion that hope first becomes possible because hope requires a relationship of presence, i.e., an actualization of communion… hope is engaging the weaving of experience now in process ” (Marcel, 1965, p. 272). We may find hope in the physical sense of togetherness, but hope is also possible for those in exile and thus across extensive distance.

The occupier is also aware that what prolongs his existence is the provision of hope for the colonised. More clearly, the coloniser, realising that hopelessness stands to increase violence born of despair, negotiates with managed degrees of hope to maintain power. And for this perhaps there are fundamental differences between war,
colonialism, settler colonialism, massacre, and genocide. Colonialism tries to ameliorate its image nationally and internationally and colonialism will seek to distance its image from association with a massacre or act of genocide. Although as mentioned Deleuze considers the formation of the state of Israel as “clearly a matter of colonisation”, in which Israel’s actions were equivalent to "genocide, however, one in which physical extermination remains subordinated to geographical evacuation” (Deleuze, quoted in Medien, 49–50).

Apart from allowing the Palestinians hope, Israel, while having the power to ethnically cleanse the Palestinians to ‘solve’ the problem from their point of view, cannot take things to such extremes without positioning themselves as committing undeniable crimes against humanity. What I propose that is new in this dissertation is, while drawing on theoretical and sociological accounts of biopolitics and resistance, a case for the importance of studying biopolitics through literary texts. These texts have a dual aspect: they represent the specificity of biopolitics in their locally inflected ways. Additionally, they also constitute a non-biopolitical mode of resistance in that they confront the struggles they write of through the imagination. Hope as I shall argue is an imaginative approach, so there is a way in which literature may be aligned with thin resistance. In the postcolonial context, the written or spoken word is often presented as an alternative to violence, simultaneously words have succeeded at mobilising both thin and thick resistance. This suggests that the spoken and written word are not passive, but instigative and mobilising. They become a recourse for resistance, as shown when postcolonial poems and songs were chanted during the Intifadas.
Having provided evidence of Israel’s biopolitical policies in the introduction, I will now explain how these are adopted in the different cultural production. This chapter focuses on Palestinian resistance, and argues that Palestinian resistance practices and strategies can be categorised as ‘thin resistance’ and ‘thick resistance’. What makes the difference between thin and thick resistance is the question of hope. My argument is that ‘thin resistance’ is based on Sumud, which is bodily and non-bodily endurance as seen through the small battles of survival performed in the firmness of the mind or resolve of the occupied Palestinian, and that thin resistance is practised through depending on the Palestinians having hope of regaining their properties and being equal citizens in their land. My position that the final position to settle the conflict in Palestine can only be a human solution. It should not require the extermination of one group by the other. As in South Africa, the end of the conflict can be reached by accommodating all citizens with equal rights. In The Question of Palestine, Edward Said concludes: “Two things are certain: the Jews of Israel will remain; the Palestinians will also remain. To say much more than that with assurance is a foolish risk” (E. W. Said 235). For many, the existence of Zionists and/or Palestinians is a zero-sum game. As the land is constantly being occupied, achieving egalitarianism proves increasingly more difficult.

In contrast, it is often the lack of such hope that leads to forceful physical resistance, for example, armed resistance and suicide bombings, amongst other things. Thick resistance is the term that I give to such forceful physical resistance. Palestinians have resorted to practices of violent biopolitics (as non-violent bodily practices can be performed in thin resistance) when their hope is extinct. Some Palestinians have come to believe in armed struggle as the only form of hope left in response to the occupation
army's practices of biopolitics (physical force) performed by the Israeli occupiers. The Palestinian body has no choice but to enter the daily political battle whether performing thin or thick resistance.

For non-violent bodily practices in thin resistance, Palestinians have developed postcolonial strategies that are manifested mainly in bodily thin resistance to try to escape Israeli control. The biopolitical acts of the body, performed by Palestinians, aim to secure the agency (rational, deliberative) to act on their own bodies in ways that thwart control. Oppressed and occupied subjects have altered aspects of their bodies and appearance to confuse authorities. They do so by adopting (unvoiced) strategies of bodily, and non-bodily resistance. This kind of resistance is not unique to Palestine and has been used in past settler-colonial settings such as in Algeria and in other non-colonial settings, to counter controlling authorities. For example, in his essay “Algeria Unveiled”, Fanon’s line “the flesh of Algeria laid bare” referenced what the French imagined would happen when they occupied Algeria. Veils falling would have a domino effect as the Algerian women would support the French penetration of their native country. Fanon’s conviction was that, with socialist equality, Algerian women would soon reclaim their public spaces, and care less about the liberation of their country (F. Fanon, Algeria Unveiled 42). This suggests that the majority of Algerian women were held by other powers such as patriarchy and colonialism to prevent their entry into the public sphere and to fully participate in the making of the history of their country. But many veiled Algerian women mobilised their private sphere to the public. In other words, being veiled in the public sphere; women can see without being seen. The mujahidat, female freedom fighters, were veiling and unveiling in order to customize their role in the resistance and to confuse the occupier using their very
bodies in resistance (Perego 355). Another example is, the film *Welcome to Calais: Sylvain George and the Aesthetics of Resistance* which shows the methods of resistance in journeys suffered by innumerable migrants on their way to more stable countries.

The most powerful—and disturbing—illustration of bodily resistance is the erasure of fingerprints. For migrants within the Euro-zone, fingerprint mutilation by means of razors, fire, or acid is an attempt to escape the reach of Eurodac, the database that collects and manages the biometric data of asylum seekers and illegal entrants into the European Union....Destroying their skin, as they would their papers, the subjects of these passages in George’s film, paradoxically reveal themselves becoming unclassifiable, illegible, even invisible (Sanyal 14-15).

Palestinians also have their ways of expressing ineligibility using their bodies in this resistance. Over tens of visits to Palestine-Israel, I noticed that the majority of Palestinians youth who live in historic Palestine, or in mixed cities, wear their hair short. Probably, they use hair clippers themselves at home, perhaps number two on the clippers that corresponds to ¼ inch length. At first, I questioned this collective haircut and speculated on reasons for it: it was cheaper, a trend, and so on. The more I looked at those youth, the more I found they look alike. I followed my curiosity to contextualise some of the environments they live in; and I even befriended a few Palestinians who live in Yaffa, Lod, and Jerusalem and asked them about the reasons behind the haircut. By collecting their different answers, I found the logic: to confuse the Israeli police when they are searching for a Palestinian youth activist, since the
majority have the same haircut. This is an example of a thin resistance strategy using the body. Its appearance is visible, but its essence is not. And when it becomes known to the occupier, the occupied will innovate another strategy. In recent visits, I ask about the collective black T-shirt that is worn by the majority of youth, I was given similar answers.

The coming sections concentrate on examples of why Palestinians resist, and how those resistances are represented through different cultural genres: fiction, non-fiction, academic writing, films, and poems. Scholars, as this dissertation shows, disagree on how resistance strategies are formulated, and hence what the different manifestations of resistance are, such as, bodily, non-bodily, Sumud, everyday resistance, actionable, and re-actionable forms of resistance. In the work under scrutiny in this dissertation, I perceive hope as a main motive for Palestinians' resistance. I discuss why the notion of hope is at the core of determining the adopted strategy of resistance that Palestinians embark on, at the core of how Palestinians respond to Israeli occupation practices of biopolitics, and at the core of when they refrain from it. I will now turn to how Palestinians resist in exile.

Being refugees will always give the sentiment that the Palestinians' freedom is still incomplete. This sense of completeness vis-à-vis other émigré, who can return to their countries of origin if they wish to will always haunt Palestinians until they can return. Most refugees or diasporic Palestinians tend to nostalgically refer to their occupied

7 To learn more on hairstyles resistance, see (Kuumba and Ajanaku, 1998; Weitz, 2001) (Kuumba and Ajanaku).
homeland as Palestine, even though many have never seen it. Schulz and Hammer (2003), write in their book *The Palestinian diaspora: formation of identities and politics of homeland*: “[The] attachment to glorified homeland (Palestine) remains exceedingly strong” (Schulz and Hammer 227). This could be attributed to the fact that Palestinians will never fully belong wherever they are outside Palestine (Schulz and Hammer 52). It is difficult to be an immigrant, especially if it is not voluntary and it may be difficult for Palestinians to fully belong to another country. According to Avi Plascov (1981), in Jordan, Palestinians are constantly reminded of various ways they do not belong there (cited in Schulz and Hammer 52). This is even though Jordan is considered the best country in the region at hosting Palestinian refugees as most Palestinian refugees there have citizenship, an option that is not available in Lebanon or Syria, for example. Therefore, Palestinians have a psychological need to belong to the homeland of Palestine. The loss of a homeland (Palestine), in the mind of the Palestinians has led to dualism: that Palestine is their homeland, but it is occupied. On the one hand, Palestinians manifest their homeland in cultural and artistic productions, as drawings of one’s city of origin or a map of historic Palestine that are hung on the wall. On the other hand, the longing for a homeland is encourages the glimpses of hope that keep the cause of Palestine alive. In other words, the dualism of belonging to a homeland and yet also failing to because the homeland is occupied concerns both physical reminders that manifest the existence of Palestine, although occupied, and an emotional longing that preserves a deep search for hope and the creation of hope even when none seems to be there. Thus, the belief is that Palestine, as it was, can be regained and relived. In this respect, Palestinians have invented niche strategies of resistance, such as *Sumud*. 
Many articles refer to *Sumud* as only performed in specific areas in Palestine, for example, in the Occupied Palestinian Territories (oPT), and they neglect the *Sumud* performed by Palestinians in cities and villages annexed in 1948 by Israel and now known as Israel\(^8\). Palestinians who live in Israel form a quarter of the overall Israeli and Palestinian population; to continue living on the land, they too perform *Sumud*, and other means of resistance. This chapter refers to *Sumud* as a special characteristic of Palestinians wherever they are, unless otherwise specified, including those in Israel\(^9\), those in the oPT, and those in exile in other countries.

Indeed, Palestinians operate their resistance strategies with variations, for example, someone who is in a refugee camp in Qalqilia, a city in oPT, who faces existential threats, will not perform the same resistance strategies as a Palestinian living comfortably in Amman. The strategies of the latter are again different from a Palestinian who is living in a refugee camp in Jordan. In the next section, I will proffer analysis of hope within the scope of the Palestinian context, in order to illustrate how hope is different for different Palestinians. Hope is often of an emotional, political, economic, and socio-cultural mixture, whether the hope of some Palestinians is to go back home to a liberated Palestine free of Israelis, or to return to their occupied homes in Palestine, or to survive under occupation, or to accommodate settler colonialism with equal rights varies. For some, it is to cohabit with the other under equal responsibilities and duties in a civil state free of religious dogmas, such as the religious dogmas of the ‘Jewish State’. Abd Al Wahab Elmessiri wrote: "The functional nature
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\(^8\) For example, Hammad and Tribe’s article, “Culturally informed resilience in conflict settings: a literature review of Sumud in the occupied Palestinian territories”

\(^9\) Such resistance is often referred to as post-colonial resistance as Israel is considered as ex-colonial and now ‘have independence’. However, the term postcolonial is applied in this dissertation to the wider context as a literary critic approach that analyse cultural productions and how they represent resistance as in this dissertation in anti-colonial, post-colonial, and de-colonial contexts.
of Israel means that it was created by the colonialism for a specific purpose. It is thus a colonial project that has nothing to do with Judaism” (Elmessiri 1). To this extent, this chapter will use a relative working definition of hope.

Hope is one of the few resources left for Palestinians to depend upon in a state of surviving. To survive, Palestinians must resist dynamic forms of governing enforced by the occupiers. I argue that resistance strategies, thin and thick, examined against the degree of hope show hope as an active process. I argue that the notion of hope can be read in the examined literature and cultural productions as a catalyst to formulate strategies of resistance. The notion of hope derives from an individual’s wishful thinking to a collective political notion that is manifested through strategies of postcolonial and anti-colonial resistance. This section engages with what constitutes the politics of hope for Palestinians. Secondly, this section investigates how the politics of hope affect the mind and the body of Palestinians. The body and mind are key to determining which strategies of resistance (thin or thick) Palestinians adopt. Understanding the interrelationship between postcolonial hope, postcolonial resistance strategies, and the Palestinian postcolonial body enables us to read the aspirations of Palestinians fighting oppression and justice for Palestine as a cause at large, I argue.

According to the Oxford Dictionary Of English, hope is a feeling of expectation and a desire for a particular thing to happen, and being hopeful is a feeling of optimism about a future event (Soanes and Stevenson 836). In this definition, hope is privatised or can be perceived from the use of positing ‘desire’ as wishful thinking. Hope, in this respect, is individual rather than collective, a process Thompson and Zizek have
referred to in their book *The Privatization of Hope: Ernst Bloch and the Future of Utopia*. That is, to posit the privatization of hope is to interpret hope only in individual terms, such as hope for oneself or one’s family. In his review of Ernst Bloch’s book, Sigel asserts that Bloch teaches us to see the contingent processes by which the future is already immanent in the present, and, from this perspective, so too is hope, collectively (Sigler 306). In order to understand hope as a collective endeavour, it is important to adapt the concept of hope to a postcolonial condition, such as the mobilisation of Palestinians’ collective hope manifested in *Sumud*, as the determination to survive. This is to interpret hope within ‘the politics of hope’. It implies that hope becomes political, that it can be mobilised, and that hope goes beyond individual desires. Dales refers to hope as being, at its core, thoroughly intersubjective, a horizontal relationship of mutuality that looks towards a shared future. Working together towards the future in a relationship constitutes hope (Dale 786). The necessity of the collective aspect is important since Palestinians are not fighting just for their individual survival but also for their survival as a nation.

What hinders or slows *Sumud* sometimes is not the shared future of Palestinians but the shared past. The shared future remains to be seen. With difficulty, it can be imagined that Palestinians will have more freedom and rights, or the return of the refugees. However, what often deters the Palestinian collective hope and thus their *Sumud* is that millions of Palestinians do not have shared memory of Palestine as a result of being exiled in different places. Forming a Palestinian community in the UK is difficult as efforts to encourage Palestinians in the UK to work together have been unfruitful, let alone trying to do this in Palestine. One of the slim options that Palestinians can use to formulate a community is the cause itself, as opposed to the
nostalgia for one’s homeland that shares cultural aspects such as certain places in Palestine, songs, food, and art. Evidently, writing about the cause, in particular about hope and resistance, by different Palestinians who reside in different places proves different. Many Palestinians end up working or trying to work in small groups. This fragments the hope and resistance.

Working together on a mutual hope to achieve a goal in the future makes people part of the politics of hope. The question is then what constitutes this politics of hope. The working together in hope for a shared future must be collective, as stated, and must include endeavour, whether, legal, political, economic, social, or ecological. Therefore, together Palestinians (and on occasions Israelis) can mobilise this hope into strategies of taking actions, or not taking actions. If doing nothing is in Palestinians’ and/or Israelis’ best interests, taking no action is often considered a strategy of thin resistance, I argue. If deciding to not resist prolongs hope, then non resisting becomes a strategy of hope. In his article, “An Anatomy of Hope”, Fredrick Torisson (2015) illustrates that the most contemporary popular version of the ‘politics of hope’ in the West derives from the 2008 US presidential campaign for Barack Obama. The tagline for the campaign, was ironically changed from ‘Progress’ to 'Hope’, with Obama’s slogan being ‘Yes, we can’. Hope then, according to Torisson, is required to define collective projects rather than individualised desires (Torisson 33). The significance of using Obama’s motto to aid my argument is to show how hope enters into politics. Palestinian politics of hope are complex, as Palestinians struggle to have a unified function. That it is difficult for Palestinians to have a completely unified function is attributed to Palestinians having a disjointed vision (Peteet 198). Some reasons for this disjointed vision are attributed to the changing Israeli colonial forms of colonial
governing that impose the segregation between the West bank and Gaza, the geographic dispersal of Palestinians, and the diverse ideologies that Palestinians have that manifest in resistance strategies.

By colonial apparatus or forms of governance, I mean the strategies that stem from colonialisation. In particular, three colonial apparatus that the Israelis employ using the mentioned forms of power are: sovereign power, disciplinary power, and biopower (Johansson and Vinthagen, ‘Dimensions of Everyday Resistance’ 420). Such powers create colonial apparatus or forms of governing as separation, reduction, and imprisonment. The separation apparatus is about a bodily separation for people from familiar places or places of significance, such as Jerusalem and the sea, and the systematic destruction of spiritual and cultural essences necessary to the survival of Palestinians as a people. A further example of separation is that Israel segregates Jerusalemites from West Bankers, and both from Gazans. This separation makes reconciliation between Palestinians parties such as Fateh and Hamas difficult because geographically, they are disconnected. As an example of reduction, Israel continues to reduce its Arab citizens' status to second class citizens (Frisch 69). It practices apartheid in areas that have Jewish settlers present, for instance it allows Jewish settlers to perform their violations against Palestinians under the army's protection, such as the invasion of Al Aqsa Mosque in Jerusalem. Moreover, Israeli apartheid in some cases affects the natural space Palestinians exist in. For example, there are certain roads that are to be used by Israelis only, and there is the apartheid wall (Rogers and Ben-David 203). This segregates the OPT and encroaches on Palestinians' rights to move freely. Throughout, Israel has treated Palestinians with suspicion (Frisch 23). The deployment of different colonial apparatus means that the nature of resistance and
thus hope differ for Palestinians in line with the occupational strategies that they have been subjected to.

The ‘principle of colonisation’ is a form used by governments in which the coloniser attempts to manage the body of the colonised and destroy his/her spirit. Therefore, resistance undertaken to counter this principle of colonisation takes both physical and psychological forms through both thin and thick resistance. The response, however, to this colonial apparatus has been felt when Palestinians have joined one another in the many facets of occupation. However, since Palestinians have been disjointed in their vision for the future of Palestine, it is important to examine the differing strategies of resistance of individual Palestinian bodies and how these depend on the restrictions that Israel attempts to impose on them.

The selected cultural work in this dissertation is representative of given geographic places, for example, Riklis’s film is set in the West Bank. Nevertheless, the work I examine is either representative of, or symbolic of, wider groups. Palestinians in the West Bank, for instance, share one space within the physical barriers of the apartheid wall. The lemon grove in Riklis’s film is a symbol of the cultivated or inhabited land. Key to this chapter is to read the amalgamations of the representative individual postcolonial Palestinian bodies and symbols as allegorical of the wider society. As seen in the 2021 war on Gaza, those bodies converge to represent one single body in the face of occupation, despite the fact that Israel invested in and created occupational apparatus such as forms of separation.
In the British Journal of Nursing, Ferreira and Prista’s (2014) article titled, “The Meaning of hope for individuals with spinal cord injury in Brazil”, is an ethnographical qualitative study that was used to understand individuals’ perceptions of hope, in cases of spinal cord injury, through interviews. The data was analysed using Ernst Bloch’s theory of hope (anticipatory consciousness). For Bloch, hope is anticipatory and active: it is “[A] directing act of cognitive kind” (Bloch 12). The findings of the study confirm that the majority of the 18 interlocutors considered their hopes for their future to be based on their life before their injury. Ferreira and Pristas found that:

Using a sense of hope to establish goals for the future helped participants overcome obstacles… Hope in people with spinal cord injury helped them cope with the fundamental changes to their daily lives. Hope played an important role in articulating coping strategies and setting and achieving goals. These findings may help nurses understand the limits and potentialities of hope as an instigator of goals in the daily life of individuals with spinal cord injury (Ferreira and Guerra 380-81).

This dissertation considers the above quote relevant as it is part of the Health Humanities discipline. In this field, “the arts and humanities are used to provide insight into the human condition, and issues such as suffering” (Crawford et al. 2015, 18). This chapter chooses to engage with a definition of hope from a medical/health humanities field because the spinal cord injury resonates with the collective Palestinian situation: the physical and psychological injuries that Palestinians are exposed to in literal and figurative ways, and the hope they have, as the spinal injury
sufferers had, of returning to a life without injury. Thousands of Palestinians have been physically disabled by the Israelis, and millions are psychologically injured from the consequences of colonialism, amongst other things from the wars, the killing of children, women, and the elderly, imprisonments, living under an apartheid system, sieges, living in exile, being deprived of a return to their homes.

In the Palestinian context of biopower, many youths have been shot dead by Israeli bullets to the upper torso or the head. Israeli snipers have “intentionally shot” Palestinians (UN Commission: Committee to Protect Journalists 2), a prime example is the assassination of Shireen Abu Akleh who was intentionally killed early on May 1, 2022 in the West Bank city of Jenin by an Israeli soldier. It is not infrequent for those who impose great power over others, or for those who critique it, to imagine that power to be incapable of being successfully resisted (Moughrabi 46). Edward Said is of the opinion that this is Foucault's greatest failing. He asserts that, very often, an alternative consciousness that allies itself to various subaltern groups may successfully challenge absolute power (Foucault and Hoy, Foucault: A Critical Reader 151). However, few fundamental norms are established within settler colonial theory; principally, that the settler colonial state’s “dominant feature is not exploitation but replacement” (Wolfe 164). In her journal, “Radical Hope: Transforming Sustainability”, Laila Strazds quotes Raymond Williams: “To be truly radical is to make hope possible rather than despair convincing” (Strazds, Radical Hope: Transforming Sustainability 1). Palestinians understand the settler colonialists' ultimate goal: to replace them. Palestinians counter this domination by staying on their land. Zionists do whatever it takes to sustain their nation, and Palestinians counter this narrative by using their bodies to resist in order to stay on the land. The
ins and outs of this dialectic, at its different categorical levels show that Israel has created an instance of a wider reality of what the occupiers and the occupied of this land do to reach their goals, how bodies are administered and accordingly mobilised, and how the land itself is changing. For example, to occupy more Waqf land in Jerusalem, Israel has filled a mountain in Jerusalem linking Bab Al Rahmeh to Ras Al Amood with 5000 fake Jewish graves (Haramalaqsa.com 1). Therefore, Palestinians find it extremely hard to do anything with this Waqf land on the auspices that there are graves there and should be respected.

To Ernst Bloch, hope is not merely contrary to fear, but hope is anticipatory and active; as quoted earlier, it is “[A] directing act of a cognitive kind” (Bloch 12). In Bloch’s view, the “Something’s missing”, feeling, is a departing point for utilising hope as a cognitive instrument (Bloch 14). Said differently, hope is a cognitive process in which the abstract becomes concrete in the mind. There are diverse forms or levels of hope, the simplest and most common of which are daydreams of compensation and personal success, often in the form of memory and nostalgia.

In her PhD thesis (2020), Sites of (Post)colonial Becoming: Body, Land and Text in the Writings of Wilson Harris, Derek Walcott, Mahmoud Darwish and Ghassan Kanafani, Dania Meryan writes on what postcolonial narratives attempt to represent.

These narratives attempt to represent violence and pain resulting from violation of body and land in text. These endeavours prove the impossibility of reducing historical, physical, and psychological pain into text and that representation is not possible. However, this impossibility causes a new type
of writing—disruptive, myth, historic writing—to occur and occupy its own space or literary territory. This mirrors the reflexive relation between the three physical sites of becoming: Land, body and text, and the protean nature of all three in literary writing. Moreover, these texts introduce a new type of memory—a performative memory—that is different from nostalgia, by locating memory in the present (body, land, and text) and through creating affinities amongst characters also in the present, these texts construct a biopolitical memory that is rooted in wounded histories of colonisation and occupation, yet moving forward to the future of becoming (P53)

Memories can transform into actions, to both Sumud and bodily resistance. Memories can be dormant, but they may be like the atomic bomb. A good example can be recalled from the 2021 Israeli war on Gaza, when many Arabs and Palestinians who live in mixed cities with Jews revolted against tyranny and stood by to defend Al Aqsa Mosque from the aggression of Zionist settlers’ who were protected by the Israeli army, and to condemn the planned ethnic cleansing by the Israeli occupation in the neighbourhood of Al-Sheish Jarah and Silwan in Jerusalem. Palestinians who live in Israel mobilise their memories and understand that what is being planned for the residents of Al-Sheish Jarah is symbolic of the Nakba, and will happen again as Israelis are already threatening Palestinians who live in Jaffa, Led, and other cities with confiscating their homes. Trauma has somatic effects though the memories in question are also cognitive recollections and thus conscious.

Unconsciously, during the performance of Sumud, somatic memories draw on how to shift to postcolonial/anti-colonial/decolonial bodily resistance which is distinct from
the deliberations of the mind. Yet there is a discrepancy between this and Bloch’s emphasis on the cognitive. When the notion of hope is jeopardised, not only does the change of the form of resistance signal a change of the emancipatory direction, but it makes the subjugated express themselves actively as opposed to contemplating silence and memories to fuel steadfastness. There are other causes that help transform thin resistance to thick resistance other than dormant memories. Karl Mannheim (1952) in Moghrabi’s article, “Israeli Control and Palestinian Resistance” argues that a biological generation, undergoing the impact of rapid social change, may create "new collective impulses and formative principles original to itself" (Moughrabi 54). When this happens, Mannheim writes of the realization of potentialities embedded in the location and the development of a new generation style, or entelechy. On occasions, however, a new biological generation will opt to identify with the previous generation and fail to develop its own entelechy. When this happens, we may speak of an abortive generation. The link with social change is significant. The quicker its tempo, the greater is the likelihood that particular generational groups will produce their own entelechy. The new generation may encounter the accumulated heritage in a fresh manner. Mannheim also suggests that different generation units within the larger generation may generate different intellectual and social responses to a historical stimulus experienced by all in common (ibid). As entelechy is the realisation of a potential, some of the new Palestinian generation, for example, the second and third generations of Palestinians whose parents were forced to leave in 1948 still identify with the establishment of Israel as being paid for at the expense of the Palestinians’ suffering, dispossession, and oppression. However, the recent collective stand in 2021 against the multiple facets of Israeli violations showed that the new generation was ready to stand with the older ones to face settlers, who are protected by the Israeli
police, from invading the Al-Aqsa Mosque. The youth stood in solidarity with the residents of Sheikh Jarah, attacked the Israeli army near check points in the West Bank, and participated in the armed resistance, firing rockets at mainly Israeli military targets, renewing the Palestinian cause at the forefront of the agenda of many countries. Some of the youth’s memories have been studied or narrated by their teachers or parents. Yet still, they invented other routes to Sumud, underpinning thin resistance as described in the introduction and now even underpinning the shift from thin to thick resistance. Such identification must include knowledge of Israel’s massacres, such as Deir Yassin in 1948 and Sabra and Shatila in 1982. The young generation is developing its own fingerprint by innovating resistance strategies, such as the Boycott, Divestment, and Sanction movement, BDS, that works to end international support for Israel's oppression of Palestinians and pressure Israel to comply with international law. BDS is considered thin resistance, but it is an effective and strategic resistance strategy.

Steaks writes that for Bloch, reality is mediation. This is the interrelationship between the subject and the object. Occupied Palestinians and Israeli occupiers in
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10 “The BDS movement considers three strategies: boycott, divestment, and sanction. The first process of placing pressure on Israel to restore Palestinian rights in accordance with international law is through boycott. That includes “withdrawing support for Israeli and international companies that are involved in the violation of Palestinian human rights, as well as complicit Israeli sporting, cultural, and academic institutions” (Essayali 2).
this chapter reunite the subject and the object to create new realities. This reunion in this context would be for the occupied and the occupier to be together in a kind of utopia; in which the subject-object distinction disappears (Skeats 115). Bloch argues that hope is necessary to enable the possibility of the utopian. However, the Palestinian situation would only be utopian if land is returned, Hamas ideology is a militant Islamic Palestinian nationalist movement in the West Bank and Gaza Strip that is dedicated to the establishment of an independent Islamic state in historical Palestine. Founded in 1987, Hamas opposed the secular approach of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and rejected attempts to cede any part of Palestine. Hamas mainly adopt thick resistance strategies as in armed struggle but sometimes they take no actions fearing an Israeli heavy retaliation on innocent civilians.
Chapter 3. Resistance and liminality: keeping memories alive through chants, pictures and film.

This chapter examines how Palestinians were able to keep their memories alive through poems that were chanted, though the photographs that show daily life for Palestinians, and through a film that highlights the issues around co-existence for Palestinians and Israelis. The chapter is divided into three sections. The first section (2.1) looks at Palestinian literature written as poems to be chanted by Palestinian people in situations when publishing their literature was impossible or denied. The second section (2.2.) shows how photographs have been used to depict life in the Palestinian homeland through an autobiographical account by Edward Said to accompany the photos taken by Jean Mohr, which highlights the liminality of Palestinian people’s existence. The third section (2.3) continues to highlight liminality, this time with a focus on people living in Israel and their co-existence with Israeli people. In this chapter, I aim to explain how the chosen cultural works keep memories alive and show the liminality of the Palestinian people and how this presents itself as a form of resistance.

**Adab Al Muqawama ALM, Resistance Literature: mobilising Palestinian memories and resistance through poems.**

Although *Adab Al Muqawama*, or (Palestinian) Resistance literature shares some characteristics with other resistance literature such the literature of apartheid South Africa, *Adab Al Muqawama* has a unique character in Palestine, which is still under occupation yet postcolonial approaches simultaneously used with anti-colonial space
in the very same space, Palestinians who reside in historic Palestine who hold Israeli
citizenships practice postcolonial approaches of resistance, while few miles East or
West for example in Nablus or Gaza, anti-colonial praxis are dominate. In South
Africa, there was anti-apartheid literature. Similarly, in Kenya and Nigeria there was
anti-colonial literature. However, in the case of Palestine, there has been a longer and
continuing accumulation of anti-colonial literature due to the lack of a resolution-in
the colonisation of Palestine, therefore Adab Al Muqawama has been produced during
occupation. In addition, Adab Al Muqawama is not only written within the occupied
land, Palestine, but it is both written internally and externally, since most of the
intellectuals have been forced to leave to the West Bank and go to neighbouring
countries, making this literature first and foremost postcolonial. This literature shares
similarities with postcolonial literature. This is because after the Nakba in 1948,
hundreds of thousands of Palestinians, including most poets and writers, were driven
out of their homes. For the Palestinian people, control of the land became synonymous
with the control of their own destiny. Therefore, the history of Adab Al Muqawama is
the history of modern Palestine and the antithesis of Israel's modern history, since this
literature mirrors the desires and aspirations of Palestinians, and this literature is able
to depict the many paths’ Palestinians take to construct their renewed Sumud, such as
passing the message of return to their children. Since the resistance literature is
effective, it has been countered by the Israeli occupiers, evidenced in the assassination
of Gassan Kanafani, a Palestinian author from Akka, and a leading member of the
Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine. Kanafani lived in exile in both Syria and
Lebanon, and was assassinated by the Israeli Mossad in Beirut. The power of
resistance literature that Israel finds threatening is that it inspires collective action,
awakening inner thoughts and feelings in a manner that occupied Palestinians can relate to, and it can mobilise feelings of despair towards strength and liberation actions.

Mahmood Darwish writes:

Besiege your Siege,
No other choice

Fight your enemy,
No other choice

Your arm has fallen,
so pick it up

I have fallen,
so pick me up

And fight your enemy with me,

For you are now free... Free... Free!
(Darwīsh 78)

This poem was chanted during the first and second Intifadas. “Besiege your siege” is a mobilising poem. It is not what the Israelis want to hear. Darwish has resorted to the body and to advocacy of the armed resistance when he was faced with a lack
of alternatives and consequent lack of hope. Thin resistance was used to ignite thin resistance. In addition to mobilisation, resistance literature has always shown subtle strategies of resistance: evident in scenarios where Palestinians cope with exile, struggling with the displacement of their identity, and struggling with how they have to perform their daily duties to survive in exile, or to survive and stay on the land in Palestine. A literature that can depict all of that and more needs to have had a history of development to counter the barriers that have been put in its way by the Israeli occupation.

This history of cultural production concerns the novel more than other forms. For instance, in South Africa during apartheid, there were many poetry protests and some political theatres. There were a few novels, but not as many as were to come later. One reason is that novels cannot easily respond to immediate circumstances because they take a longer time to write.

In addition to the literature being threatening for the occupier, issues around resistance literature also includes access to outlets.

According to Kanafani, writers and poets who have remained in occupied Palestine have seen their prose and poetry banned from being published, with the exception of Ghazal Poetry, the poetry of love. Poetry in standard language was unable to represent the new realities created by occupation due to censorship, and prohibition of publishing. Many writers and poets therefore adopted other forms of literary production, such as popular poetry, that was performed in small groups and in village gatherings. The importance of location in cultural expression has been
counter the forms of governance or apparatus intended to muzzle resistance to power. This proves that resistance literature has entered the thin resistance sphere. Many Palestinians were also prohibited from chanting their political poetry to commemorate their losses in massacres committed by Israel, for instance, the *Deir Yassin* massacre in 1948, and the *Kufr Kassem* massacre in 1956. When men gathered to chant popular resistance poems, nine years after the *Kufr Kassem* massacre, they were barred from performing. The following is an extract from Tawfik Ziad. Tawfik was a Palestinian poet, whose poems were chanted in such protests.

Here on your breasts,

as at the wall,

we shall remain.

We starve, live naked

beneath the open sky.

We chant poems,

fill the angry streets

with protests.

And we fill prisons

with pride. We give birth
to a generation of children

who takes revenge,

one generation after another 1 (Kanafani, Resistance Literature In Occupied Palestine 1948-1966, 27)
Thus, literature became a site of resistance. The continuation of resistance by children, by prisoners, by those protesters who fill the ‘angry streets’, and chant poems, sends a message of the collective resistance movements created by Palestinians. Filling streets, chanting, and being imprisoned are all acts that require the presence of the body. Passing the message of resistance to other generations sends explicit messages that the right of Palestinians does not fall retrospectively. And that the memory in question of the right to belong and return to Palestine are also cognitive and conscious recollections. Passing such memories to the next generation is both intended and planned. The renewed rights to Palestine across generations amongst Palestinians contradict David Ben-Gurion's prophecy. Israel's first prime minister warned in 1948: "We must do everything to insure they (the Palestinians) never do return". He assured his fellow Zionists that “Palestinians will never come back to their homes, the old will die and the young will forget” (Awda 1). Poems that represent the stance of Palestinians after the Nakba depict the people as being unwilling to compromise and therefore as finding ways to renew resistance against the Israeli occupier. The above poem also implies that for Palestinians to renew their resistance by chanting poetry, the amalgamation of their bodies has to be present.

The *Adab Al Muqawama* (Palestine) resistance literature has at least two functions: the first is to convey and highlight events. For example, popular poets shame traitors, announcing their names so that others can learn about them. Secondly, the resistance literature itself has become a resistance site, protest poetry and the protest novel for instance. Palestinians are not prepared to simply capitulate. Practices of Sumud could rupture the space and time they exist within. In *Now, As You Awaken*, Darwish writes,
Dreamers don't abandon
their dreams,
they flare and continue
the life they have in the dream (Darwish 17)
Darwish describes the Palestinians as dreamers who turn their dreams into reality through endurance by not abandoning those dreams. Thin resistance operates according to an indigenous, unwritten code but is useful in formulating Sumud strategies. It is Sumud in the making.

**Resistance Literature: using photographs to tell a story, keep memories alive, and demonstrate liminality.**

In After The Last Sky: Palestinian Lives (1986), Jean Mohr, a Swiss photographer travels to Israel, the West Bank, and Lebanon to capture photographs of Palestinians continuing with their lives. After The Last Sky consists of an autobiographical text about Edward’s Said homeland, written to accompany a fascinating series of pictures by the Swiss photographer Jean Mohr. The status of the people depicted is either being expelled from Palestine through living in exile or being marginalised within Palestine through being in a minority in their own country. Edward Said, an American Palestinian scholar, comments on those photographs from his perspective as an exile. In After The Last Sky, I analyse how Said looks for signs of hope in the photographs as a strategy of resistance to exile. This enables me to locate people’s notion of hope vis-à-vis resistance from exile while still being connected to the land and people of Palestine, through the photographs, images, and signs which depict this. The
photographs speak of the biopolitical vicissitudes that Palestinians experience: through the presentation of images or signs associated with their bodies. Said gives a voice to the bodies we see in the photographs in order to comment on the statutes of Palestinians lived realities in adjusted geographies to correspond to the politics of settler colonialism, such as living in liminal space in occupied Palestine or camps in occupied Palestine and neighbouring countries. The images represent both the Palestinian body and the place in which Palestinians’ conduct their daily battles of *Sumud*. They also depict how the Palestinian body bears witness to the visible Israeli biopolitical occupation practices. In my analysis of *After The Last Sky*, I discuss the relationship between body and voice more concretely, to show liminality between the body and the voice of the Palestinians. For instance, in the photographs we see bodies, while it is Said who speaks in with the authority of a poet able to capture the collective Palestinian experience.

According to Turner, liminality is often associated with the literal crossing of a threshold (Turner 25). In *After The Last Sky*, voice is connected to body from the eye of exiled Said, who is able to comment on the relationship between people and the landscape as an exile. Said is able to expose the liminality of people, whose everyday life has been changed, in particular, in the land of his hometown, that he once knew, which has now been ascribed by the Israeli occupation to different functions. Functions that have contributed to identity alteration within both Palestinians and Israelis, and have created this space of liminality.
According to Brand, in her review of *After The Last Sky*, Said attempts to explore the political, cultural, social, and economic aspects of Palestinian identity, 40 years after the Nakba (Brand 315). Said writes in *After The Last Sky*:

Identity of who we are, where we come from, what we are—is difficult to maintain in exile. Most other people take their identity for granted. Not the Palestinian, who is required to show proofs of identity constantly. It is not only that we are regarded as terrorists, but that our existence as native Arab inhabitants of Palestine, with primordial rights there (and not elsewhere), is either denied or challenged (E. Said, *After the Last Sky: Palestinian Lives* 16-17).

Said clearly mentions a change of status, “with primordial rights” (E. Said, *After the Last Sky: Palestinian Lives* 17), which creates this liminal space for Said to interpret signs, pictures, and statuses. Moreover, the liminal gap does not only consist of the then and now, but contains within it layers of exile that have further altered the identity of exiled Palestinians, such as Said. To Stuart Hall, “[I]dentities are the names we give to the different ways we are positioned by, and position ourselves within, the narratives of the past.” As Palestinians undergo constant dislocations, a Palestinian identity in Hall’s term is “not an essence but a positioning” (Hall 394-395). In his book *Egypt Character*, Jamal Hamdan writes that geographic relocation and dislocation shapes the identity and the character of its citizen (Hemdan 17). Said concludes his exilic view on the Palestinian identity as being disrupted: “Exile is a series of portraits, without names, without context. Images that are largely unexplained, nameless, mute” (E. Said, *After the Last Sky: Palestinian Lives* 12). Palestinians’ identities in exile are
disrupted, and this resonates with the disrupted Palestinians bodies (and identities) of the occupied territories. One of Israel’s war techniques that is used against the Palestinians consists of the mortification process which Orlando Patterson (1982) refers to as "social death." This is a concerted effort to demolish Palestinian national consciousness, or their sense of identity as a nation. It includes attacks against the symbols of nationhood, such as the Palestinian flag (outlawed by Israel Army Order 101), the national anthem, national songs, and folklore (quoted in (Moughrabi 48-49).

Negation of a Palestinian identity and history is yet another apparatus of the Israeli’s occupation. Aware of the latter, Said is not merely trying to describe Palestine's ruptured identity through the bodies (images) of the Palestinians, but he shows that the rupture of Palestine is allegorical and can be read through the ruptured identities of Palestinians.

Over the years, the Israeli occupation has altered its occupation forms of governing, for instance, from military occupation (tanks on the ground) to enforcing separation, to the expansion of settlements. With the 1993 Oslo Accords, the ‘peace negotiation’ enabled a change of Israeli tactics: to accelerate the building of settlements in the West Bank and East Jerusalem. That is, to create a new physical biopolitical reality of apartheid on the ground, or what could be referred to as new realities in altered geographies (and hence liminality) of settler colonialism. The changing occupation apparatus of the Israelis has obliged the Palestinian body to change its methods of resistance, its camouflaging strategies in order to survive and resist occupation, and to deal with the biopolitical apartheid created, causing Palestinians to react (and act) to new liminalities. One very important strategy of resistance is literature. After The Last Sky demonstrates clearly that resistance can be seen through postcolonial literature and
cultural production such as photos. Moreover, biopolitical liminal occupation subjects are key to defining Palestinian strategies of resistance. This resistance is based on hope within the existing liminal space, even if this resistance is uncertain in its rationale.

In her article, “Radical Hope: Transforming Sustainability”, Laila Strazds writes that uncertainty implies a certain neutrality—it does not suggest the future will be either positive or negative, rather it implies our actions have the capacity to determine its direction. In Strazds’s article, Solnit (2016) suggests it is this uncertainty of not knowing what will happen, or how and when, that is the space for hope. In the same article, Shade (2001) argues; having hope within uncertainty is not unrealistic positivity or optimism—rather hope fuels meliorism; a belief in our agency to make the world a better place in spite of the turbulence we experience. And finally, Orr (2007) suggests, “[A]uthentic hope … is made of sterner stuff than optimism….hope requires courage to reach farther, dig deeper, confront our limits and…work harder….optimism does not require much effort because one is likely to win anyway” (Strazds, Radical hope: Transforming sustainability 1391). For many Palestinians, hope is the only source left that can be transformed into resistance strategies. The future for many Palestinians is uncertain and thus so are their strategies of resistance. With a gloomy visibility for the future, to being hopeful for a better future is what constitutes the Palestinian identity (and character) of resistance that consists of actionable trial and error rather than mere optimism.

The first of the two photographs that show liminality are found on page 128 of After The Last Sky where there is a close-up image of an old man with a shattered lens in his glasses.
This picture reminded Said of Rafik Halabi, a Palestinian-Druze-Israeli journalist who was fired by the radio and television company for which he worked, for “reporting the news in a way unfavourable to Israel” (E. Said, After the Last Sky: Palestinian Lives 127), and in addition, the picture reflects the irony of Said’s own existence: his looking at the development of the conflict as an exile, from the outside; and his looking at these photos with a ruptured gap between reality and memory. Said has liminality as an exilic spectator, yet he has privilege and can write to express his views. As such, Said reads the conceptualisation of the photos on different levels: as a rupture between his memory of Palestine and the reality, and as an allegory of the situation of Palestine/Israel. In his article, After The Sky: A Liminal Space, Yifen Beus illustrates a photo-prose (body -voice) collection by Said and Jean Mohr which makes the hybridity of art self-positioning: Said, as a Palestinian in exile writing from the outside, and Mohr, as a Swiss photographer shooting pictures on the ground. This
hybridity allows cultural memories in sketching out a “third space” for signification that can never arise from either self or other alone (Beus 211).

In the old man, Said saw a genuine smile (represented through an artificial means—photography) and the duality of his being (strong and gentle; wistful and assertive; clear vision in one eye and smudged in the other due to the broken lens). Said calls this a “textual imbalance” (both in the photo and the book, 129) thus alluding to Palestinian identity (Beus 214). The liminality of how many Palestinians view issues in both a clear and a ruptured way or a combination of both is a result of repositioning their identity to adapt to the Israeli occupation or its consequences such as exile.

The photo below comes from page 42 of After The Last Sky titled “Kalandia, 1967” and encapsulates the dynamics of the struggle. The Swiss photographer, Jean Mohr captures the individual characters and places that are either representative of, or symbolic of, wider groups, as shown for example in the photo below of Kalandia, a check point that is crossed daily by 26,000 Palestinians (Jacobs 1). The Palestinians in the photos are without power and are reliant on Mohr to represent them to an extent. It depicts an old Israeli officer lost in thought and a young Palestinian village boy behind a window frame looking in
through it a few days after the end of the June war (E. Said, After the Last Sky: Palestinian Lives 42). The liminal positions of the two subjects are shown: the soldier is inside, ‘protected’ and the Palestinian boy is outside, in the open. Each occupies one half of the frame. The contrast of the countenances, their ages, the dark colour versus the light is striking. The images and their contrast could emit the irony of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. It is a sheer emotional impasse for both, but often depicted as a one-sided political turmoil in Western media. However, there is a co-existence between the two “nations” and thus, two peoples, that have realities, dreams, and aspirations. As a Palestinian in exile, Said could have been severely hostile and defensive in his rhetoric. However, Said’s conclusion in the above shows a compromise of one reality: the existence of the two nations. Thus, one strategy of resistance in exile is compromise; in the hope that both nations could exist together in a space rather than within a liminal of a space. Reading the representative liminality between the two nations can depict society at large and even how different commentators perceive the end of the conflict. Said’s own paradoxical positions, as both the author and the subject of his own portrayal, resides somewhere between the
two ends, constantly drifting in an open space and taking up additional attributes and qualities as it moves along. After The Last Sky is about Said’s own life, but also about lives from which he has become distanced, as he no longer resides in the place where the other lives take place (Beus 215).

In her critique of After The Last Sky: Palestinian Lives, Lesley Hazelton asserts that the book is a preliminary attempt to define Palestinians through the concrete details of their existence. Hazleton asserts that Said often sees too much in these scenes. The scenes for her, as an Israeli, are normal everyday scenes. Hazleton attempts to remove the legitimacy of Edward Said’s reading of such images by pointing out that, although Said was born in Jerusalem, he had only returned briefly to attend a family wedding on the outskirts of Ramallah in 1966, and Jean Mohr was merely a Swiss photographer who was only able to communicate through an interpreter (Hazleton 21-22). Therefore, according to Hazelton, their views cannot be representative. Hazleton neglects the fact that Mohr had produced 26 books with literary commentary including his book Side by Side or Face to Face, Israelis and Palestinians: 50 Years of Photography. In this way Hazelton dismisses both Said, a distinguished scholar, and Mohr, and repositions them as people without the capacity to understand. This attack on Said is reminiscent of the earlier attacks on resistance literature.

In his article, Permission to Narrate, Edward Said demonstrates how facts are manipulated to align with certain ideologies, such as Zionism (E. Said, Permission to Narrate 31). The power of imagination lies in its ability to build new literary interpretations of postcolonial bodily and spiritual approaches in resistance, and the interpretation of the different kinds of resistances lies in its ability to have a voice. One method to interpret literary excavation in search of lost memories is in the locality of
the postcolonial writing and cultural products such as pictures. Locality does not only mean living in Palestine. Kanafani for example was writing from exile, while witnessing the repercussions of the *Nakba* and the *Naksa*, when Palestinians were exiled again after Israel’s aggression in 1967. Edward Said argues that the literary expression demands an innovative critical consciousness or a “permission to narrate”. The permission to narrate includes that Palestinians participate in building their own biopolitical, artistic, and spiritual history in resisting the occupation. Participating in building their own history is another strategy of resistance. Separation colonist strategies aim to prevent the social inclusion of Palestinian and therefore, they resist any amplification of their agency, voice, and dignity.

Said’s search for hidden meanings in order to build hope in the face of obstacles is attributable to his exilic positioning. However, Hazleton sees the Palestine that Said describes simply as the Palestine inside the mind of Said, and not the Palestine of daily life that Hazleton knows. “Palestine becomes a state of mind”, she claims (Hazleton 21-22). Ruptures viewed from exile are adjusted only when the pictures in the mind are connected to a utopian Palestine, this causes fatigue. Hazleton does indeed acknowledge that “Hope and exhaustion play off each other well throughout Said’s book” (ibid).

In *After the Last Sky*, hope and exhaustion are allegorical of what characterises the resistance of Palestinians at large regardless of their geographic locations. To come back to questions of embodiment and the question introduced earlier of the dissociation of body and voice, a theme of dissociation is witnessed throughout *After the Last Sky* (Döring 74). In the latter, visual-verbal actions are intentionally in league
to record life for exilic Palestinians, divided and scattered. Palestinian existence is represented throughout as an existence in-between, always on the move, not in occupied Palestine, nor in exile. Said claims that such fragmentation also affects Palestinian self-representations in literature and writing. All narratives he claims are "broken," “often wayward and meandering in the extreme" because, with the foundation of the state of Israel, the "story of origins, of home, of nation is underground” (E. Said, After the Last Sky: Palestinian Lives 20). Even strategies of resistance are broken in betweenness, I argue. Perhaps the other side of the hope coin, a request to choose resistance strategies, as I argue, is exhaustion. A body wants to act while a voice sees a fraction of hope and empowers the acting body to resort to Sumud strategies instead.

The image below is from *After The Last Sky*. Mohr’s picture of the former mayor of Jerusalem and his wife exiled in Amman, Jordan. Here we see them in their living room where they sit in front of a photograph of their lost city, signified by its central holy shrine. To them, the interpretation of the picture (voice) is what defines their past. While their bodies live in exile, their voice is in the picture that furnishes their temporary home in Amman.

In his article, “Edward Said and the Fiction of Autobiography”, Tobias Döring uses Susan Sontag’s analysis of the role of photographs in family life: family photos function as portraits of national life (Döring 74). Mohr’s is a picture within a picture as if to demonstrate that the previous mayor of Jerusalem and his wife, literally, inhabit a space of photographic memory (ibid). In her book, Palestinian Village Histories: Geographies Of The Displaced, Rochelle Davis cites James Olney: “it is in the interplay of past and present, of present memory reflecting over past experience on its way to becoming present being, that events are lifted out of time to be re-situated … in patterned significance” quoted in (Davis).

Images that match memory become sites of resistance of those refusing to forget. The present is as such because of the past. Documentation and ‘Narrating the Self’
becomes a new postcolonial bodily resistance tool in the many facets of occupation and its consequences: denial of recent Palestinian history, the loss of the homeland, and the consequences of not belonging elsewhere. The sense of hope from the past (seeing the photo of the homeland) gives the Sumud of carrying on as clarified by Sontag where the personal become national and vice-versa. Perhaps a sense of denial, that reads something between the lines of 'yesterday I (Palestine) was free, today I (Palestine) am/is occupied, tomorrow, I and Palestine will be free again.' If not my generation, I will assure passing this message to my descendants.

**Resistance Literature: the use of film to tell a story, keep memories alive, and demonstrate liminality.**

With respect to passing on the message of Palestine and being unwilling to give it up, we are mindful of the poem by Prairie Schooner:

> The Lemon Tree is dying.
> Still, for some reason,
> the leaves are still there
> unwilling to give up
> their place on the branch.
> 
> Prairie Schooner (Campos 37)

This section shows how the film *The Lemon Tree* is a powerful piece of cultural material that can help to show liminality for Palestinian people, the co-existence for
both Palestinians, and the way that friendships could be formed, but are not allowed, and the way that resistance can be developed in the face of loss.

The Lemon Tree film is directed by Eran Riklis, who won 18 international awards for his film The Syrian Bride. Riklis wrote, directed and produced The Lemon Tree, which won prizes in the 2008 Berlin International Film Festival, Mill Valley Film Festival, and Israeli Academy Awards.
The plot of the film starts when the Israeli defence minister, pointedly called Israel Navon, moves with his wife Mira Navon, the woman in the bottom of the above picture, opposite the house of Salma Zaidan, the woman in the top of the above picture, on the ‘border’ between the Opt and Israel. Salma is a Palestinian widow whose husband died at a young age. Salma had inherited a lemon grove from her father, and it was the main source of the family's income. Since the lemon grove was not giving them enough income, Salma’s husband had to undertake another job. With a weak heart, he had a stroke and collapsed. Salma was left with three children and the lemon grove. The grove is her only source of income besides the monthly $150 that her son Nasser sends her from washing dishes at a restaurant in Washington DC. However, once the defence Minster is appointed to his role and moves to his new residence, the Israeli Secret Security Service, the Shabak, notice the lemon grove and become suspicious that ‘terrorists’ could take cover there to enter Israel. The Shabak decide to confiscate the grove and send Salma a court order informing her that the lemon trees are going to be uprooted, and that she is entitled to compensation. Looking for a glimmer of hope that she may keep the lemon grove, Salma is introduced to an attorney, Ziad Daoud, and together they take this legal battle all the way to the Israeli supreme court. The cornerstone of the film is the silent but powerful relationship between Salma and Mira, the wife of Israel’s defence Minster. The silence between the two women can be interpreted as the manifestation of their thin resistance. This silent yet powerful relationship is allegorical of the Palestine/Israel relationship at large, as I shall show.

Mira and Salma live opposite each other, but they do not really meet; they are close neighbours yet are torn apart by blood and politics. Mira and Salma gaze at one
another across their respective places. Both are watching but cannot meet on a mutual terrain. There is a relationship between Salma and Mira that is difficult to support. One of the main concerns is whether or not Salma can keep her land which means everything to her, which Mira husband’s and the Shabak see as a place where terrorists could hide out. This is allegorical of the Israel-Palestine situation at large. The land which is sacred for Palestinians is falsely viewed as a 'security threat' by Israelis. As soldiers, the Shabak, and the Israeli legal apparatus that uphold the oppressive occupation apparatus deployed in Palestine, are involved in the enforcement of biopolitical separation as shown in the film, that corresponds to the Palestinian land and the Israeli security equation. As such, the biopolitics of the occupiers have created this liminal space. I argue that analysing the interrelationships between Salma and Mira, which are allegorical of the relations of Palestinians and Israelis at large, particularly when occupational apparatus create biopolitics, shows how biopolitics have created liminal spaces.

At the Navon's housewarming party, the employees of the Arabic restaurant who are catering for Mira and Navon’s musical and food reception, forget to bring lemons. As a result, Mira sends soldiers into Salma’s lemon grove to bring a few lemons. Salma faces the soldiers steadfastly, and shouts at them to stop stealing her lemons and to leave her land immediately. On this occasion, Mira apologises to Salma for having sent the army to steal lemons from her grove without permission. Mira feels the unjust situation that Salma has been placed in, and she apologises. Mira’s intention is shown by the simplicity of the way she asked the Shabak to bring some lemons. Rikli makes it sound like a normal, simple act; that taking a few lemons from a neighbour could be simple and usual. However, Salma’s reaction is not only about a few lemons that the
soldiers tried to steal. She has a lemon grove and losing a few lemons would hardly make any difference. Salma uses the lemons as the subject of the argument in front of Mira and her guests to convey a message that she will defend her land. On this occasion, the lemons are equal to the land. Using the lemons to symbolise the land, a Palestinian’s thin resistance borrows a characteristic of something representing something else. Palestinians reciprocally may endure a consequence of an Israeli occupation apparatus for the hope of continuing to stay on their land. The land's value is depicted in the testimony of Abu Hosni, the old man who has worked all his life in the Lemon grove, and considers Salma to be his daughter, since he had no children. Abu Hosni gives his testimony in court, in a poetic style, and in a celebrant voice, about the life he has spent in the grove. Before the court, he narrates his story:

40 Years
Day in, day out
Salma and I cultivated the land and the trees
It’s not just watering and fertilizing
Trees are like people
They have soul, they have feelings
They need to be talked to, need tender loving care
I don’t use a tractor
I only use my own hands (Riklis pt:56)

Abu Hosni shows how the land has been almost like a family, and the way he describes his attachment to the land shows his resistance (thin resistance) to the theft and loss of land. Abu Hosni wants the Israeli judge to feel what he feels, that Abu Hosni is alive
only as long as he is attached to the land. The Israeli judge may sympathise with Abu Hosni, but he too, like Mira’s personal guard, has received guidelines by the Israeli occupation institution. Israel is largely disinterested in the aspiration of Palestinians. Some attention might be paid to Palestinians if they affect the situation. Isolation and separation primarily aim at stopping the communication between hope and resistance. The film shows that Palestinians are more concerned with the value of the land than Israelis are. Israelis are shown to be more concerned with their own safety than with the nurturing of long-established groves, not only of lemon trees but also of olive trees; Israelis who proclaim a superior love for the land merely use this as a form of mythmaking to extend their occupation.

In the relationship between Mira and Salma, the two women develop eye contact more than once, but they only meet for a second time after the row over the lemons at the supreme court hearing. There, they exchange a friendly gaze that is worth hundreds of words. They both have been embedded in the development of the lemon grove story that is allegorical of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict at large, in particular they gaze at one another, watching one another carefully without being able to fully get to know one another. Mira and Salma’s relationship becomes emblematical of the relationship at large of the two sides that wish to compromise by living in peace. Mira is seen frequently contemplating Salma’s situation and often stands by the window looking at the lemon trees pondering how Salma might be feeling. Such contemplations voice the unsaid between the two women each resisting from her end, with Mira resisting by opposing the power of her husband. On one occasion, Mira breaks into Salma’s grove to meet her, but she is stopped by her own personal guard, who asks Mira to immediately leave the grove, otherwise, he will lose his job. Here again, we see the
personal guard’s response to Mira shows that he is performing within an Israeli occupation apparatus that is systematic and does not necessarily reflect what people on both sides really want.

Soon after Israel Navon relocates next to Salma’s grove, the Shabak places a giant iron watchtower on the very spot separating the liminal. A young Israeli student soldier is appointed to guard the watchtower. The symbolism of the youthful soldier placed over the watch tower, where his IQ test is playing in the background throughout the film, perhaps can be interpreted as this conflict deserving another intelligent look. Like the lemons themselves that are perhaps allegorical for the peculiar shape of the country in which both Palestinians and Israelis exist, that have a bitter taste and to become edible they need to be sweetened. The hope of today for both nations is clashing with a state that takes all colonial measures, including assassination, to extend its existence.

The Palestinian/Israeli conflict seems require the hope of resolving contradictions: both nations want to exist. Israel does this by deploying occupational strategies on the false pretext of ‘security’ for example, while Palestinians respond to this apparatus with thin and thick resistance strategies dependent on the level of hope left for them. The deployment of a young student soldier in this liminal position between Israel and the occupied territory, between Salma and Mira, between his life as school graduate and a university student demonstrates a hope in waiting that is allegorical of the situation in Palestine/Israel. In this land, many seem to wait unnoticed or silently, and they will only be noticed when their bodies move, fight, leave, protest, shout and so forth. In order to achieve such hopes, not only do Palestinians use postcolonial strategies of survival and resistance, but Israelis also use postcolonial tactics to survive
and fulfil their hopes. This raises the question of whether the colonial subject can use postcolonial tactics?

It is important to depict the change of Israeli forms of governing or apparatus. This is because the shift from thin to thick resistance or deploying a mixture for occupied Palestinians depends on the changing apparatus of occupation. Neve Gordon argues that the particularity of each configuration (sovereign, disciplinary and biopower) determines how individuals and the population are managed (Gordon 14–15). During the first twenty years after the 1967 Naksa, Israel’s occupation of the West Bank, Gaza, and East Jerusalem (until the first intifada in 1987), Israel attempted to control the population in non-violent ways. A military report in 1970 states that after the 1967 war, the ‘Green line’ a liminal space, was demolished and since then these areas depend on Israel in providing services and economic infrastructure. An analyses report, checking strategies of resistance and dependency before and after altering a liminal space, concludes: “The only way to avoid a potential outburst of social forces is to strive continuously for the improvement of the standard of living and the services of this underprivileged society” (Gordon 29).

After the Oslo Accords, Israel decided to shift its configuration of managing the Palestinian population. Israel shifted to what Gordon calls the “temporariness of the occupation.” Israel understands the notion of hope within Palestinians well. Therefore, many of the occupation apparatus are designed to allow some elements of hope, some on economic grounds, others on minimal political rights. However, there is no compromise on geographic issues such as the lands illegally confiscated by Israel. Gordon notes that the “temporariness of the occupation” was employed as a control
modality. He gives the contradictory example of the huge investments in the infrastructure in the occupied West Bank and the transfer of thousands of Jewish citizens which dismantles Israel’s claim that the occupation was temporary (Gordon 29). The Intended aim by the Israelis with the promise of temporariness was to give false hopes to the Palestinian psyche of the temporariness of occupation, by giving the impression that through negotiation, Palestinians and Israelis could achieve ‘peace’. Since this never happened, the Palestinians reached the conclusion that this hope is fallacious. As a result, many Palestinians turned to thick resistance in the mid-1990s through armed resistance and suicide bombings. Therefore, it is worth investigating how the trajectory of their hopes was manipulated in the first place. After all, Palestinians defend against occupation, they are freedom fighters.

Throughout the film, as mentioned, this liminal space created by the biopolitics between Salma and Mira can be seen as a metaphor used to portraying the liminal space between occupied Palestine and Israel. In Rüki’s film, as in real life, we see that biopolitics concerns not only human life but the relations of humans to their land. While Palestinians depend on hope to formulate their resistance responses, the notion of hope is pruned for Palestinians and for many Israelis. It is pruned because of the Israeli occupation’s endeavours: the extensive discrimination faced by Palestinians, especially in the West Bank and Gaza, and the constant evictions, demolitions and settlement expansion in the occupied territories that run counter to international law and undermine prospects for ‘peace’. Israel always wants to confiscate more land, impose more restrictions, build more settlements on occupied land, and imprison tens of thousands of Palestinians who reject occupation and try to resist thinly or thickly. The degree of hope that formulates the Palestinian strategy is never realised. It is
pruned, disabled, imprisoned, suspended, and often dies. This is when active armed
thick resistance takes place as I will show in the Story of Saber. For Salma/Palestinians,
the supreme court’s final decision was to prune the grove as an alternative to uprooting
it. Similarly, Salma’s hope is pruned in respect of simply staying in her natural habitat,
seeing, and caring for her lemons.

When Israel tells his wife Mira that their Palestinian neighbour is going to the supreme
court, Mira replies: “I’m not surprised, I would have done the same” (Lemon Tree,
p0.1:07 min). And on another occasion, Mira is interviewed by a foreign journalist on
how she feels about the grove case. In English, Mira answers: “I hope that I can be a
better neighbour, a normal neighbour, but I suppose that is too much to hope for. It’s
too much blood and politics involved, and there is a lemon grove in between (Riklis
pt:54:00)” (Lemon Tree 54:00). Blood and politics are barriers to Mira’s hope. Blood
and politics result from biopolitical occupation apparatus (BOA) that Palestinians
react to. Such apparatus is designed to guarantee Israeli supremacy and control, the
reduction of Palestinians’ status, and to discipline the Palestinians for being occupied.
This is all achieved by putting the Palestinians, in Fanon’s words, in their place.

Different apparatus of Israel’s occupation is depicted in the film, which shows how
the apparatus affects bodily, spiritual, and mental interaction, and the nature of the
resulting resistance, in particular whether it is thin, thick, or a combination of both.
Israel tries to project an image of being invincible in the land. However, on a few
occasions, especially if a case gains public or international attention, such as the lemon
grove or the case of certain political prisoners who undergo hunger strikes to negotiate
their freedom using their bodies, instead of obliterating the cause of a problem, Israel
may decide to prune it instead; for example, in the Lemon Tree, the Israeli court
decides in the end not to uproot the trees but decides to prune them. This space between pruning and killing equals hope for Palestinians.

In his review of *the Lemon Tree*, Eran Riklis notes: “The hope-defeat dichotomy created by these two women is mind-boggling, and yet simple”(*Lemon Tree* 14:40). The hope-defeat dichotomy is one example of a liminality or what was referred to earlier as in betweenness. Israeli biopolitics created this dichotomy between the hope of living or surviving or alternatively using violence that triggers more violence and revenge. The liminal for Salma is between her fear of losing her land, considered a defeat for her, and the hope that Salma translates into thin resistance strategies, such as taking the defence minister to court to keep the land. Salma wakes up one night, dreaming of her lemons falling off the trees and remembering as a child her father holding her high enough to reach the lemons. Her memories of the land and her beloved father are mixed within her subconscious, and this demonstrates how the land is integrated in her body and mind as an allegory of the significance of the land in the bodies and minds of Palestinians. Her land means her father, her childhood, and her adulthood. Salma’s hope to preserve the land, simultaneously being fearful of being defeated and losing the grove, is the liminal precarity that Palestinians exist in, not knowing what will happen next, living with uncertainty as the protagonist of the circumstances in Palestine/Israel.

The representation of women as the main focus in *Lemon Tree*, suggests the continuous importance of women’s roles within the conflict. The film highlights the reciprocal actions of both Salma and Mira and shows their similar situations. For
example, Mira and Salma respectively have a daughter and a son in the United States. Nasser, Salma’s son is working and Sigi, Mira’s daughter is studying. This is itself a liminal space as they are migrants. They both see Palestine/Israel as home. However, Rikli shows that this younger representation of a Palestinian/Israeli community is also looking to advance its future, perhaps with less engagement in this conflict. The interesting yet dangerous point that the film raises is that both youngsters think that the ‘lemons’ that their parents are arguing about are a waste of time and that their parents should move on and compromise to live in peace. For example, when Salma speaks to her son Nasser to inform him about the uprooting court order, he answers: “Damn the lemons, but who needs this grove anyway? It’s not worth the effort since dad died” (Riklis pt:33). Nevertheless, Salma stays on her land, despite invitations to a higher-quality life in the US by her son. Salma chooses to perform Sumud as Shehadeh did, stays on her land. Perhaps the director wants to show a transition of the perception of the coming generations. In their responsibility towards the land and rejection of the historical claims of both Palestinians and Israelis. Although this may be the objective of this planned coincidence, both Nasser and Sigi are in the US, outside the immediate heat of the conflict. However, as Mira indicates above, too much blood and politics are involved.

Many Sumud or thin resistance practices will be less evident when Palestinians have no hope. Palestinians will instead turn to thick resistance, and this is acknowledged in the following conversation. Israel Navon, Israel’s defence minister in Rikli’s film is discussing the planning of a new segment of the separation wall in a press interview, when Gera, the Yedioth Ahronoth’s Journalist, who is Mira’s friend as well, asked Navon a question, on his way to the car:
Gera: What are you doing about the appeal filed by your Palestinian neighbour?

Israel: It reached the press already!

Off the record, to be honest, I was opposed to the idea

Uprooting the grove. But who can oppose the Shabak?

Gera: But you are in charge of them

Israel: Gera, I don’t know this lady (Salma), I’ve never even seen her.

Mira says she seems very nice. You know what my father used to say:

The Jews will sleep quietly only when the Palestinians have hope.

And in any case, the trees must be uprooted.

On the record (Riklis pt:1.29, emphasis added).

Israel Navon swings between ‘on and off the record’ shows both a personal and a ‘professional’ (occupation) stance. It shows that a government official is also struggling to make a sway between the personal and the professional being caught in this liminality. However, the last say is for those who have the power and can use it, in Foucault’s term to manage the population. Contrary to Salma’s stance wherein she does not know what the future holds for her, Navon gives orders. It seems that the lives of many Israelis, and to a much higher degree the lives of most Palestinians, are caught within this liminal situation. They are caught within a conflict that is rooted in occupation and the denial of rights. The manifestation of both the denial of rights and the origin of the conflict are all around. These manifestations of injustice create these limbo states, thresholds between what is considered human rights, what is considered ethical vis-à-vis planned occupation apparatus. The latter are in place to sustain the occupation. Indeed, the official stance won and the lemons, and Salma’s hope, were
pruned. On the Israeli side, towards the end on the film, Rikli shows Israel Navon lonely in his home as Mira has left him. Navon's home is now surrounded by the separation wall. The man Israel surrounded by walls in the film is a reality of the state of Israel isolating the Palestinians by an apartheid wall; settling only Israelis in lands taken by force, and planting checkpoints that fragment both the space and the livelihood of both Israelis and Palestinians.

The order of the Israeli supreme court over the lemon grove depicts the intertwined notions of hope and resistance. The Lemon Tree film chooses to show three female judges at the final hearing. Perhaps this is to lighten some of the heavy patriarchal scenes and to show that Israel is a democracy. Many women in Israel are used to abiding by the created law under the vague auspices of security. The court verdict reads as: We (female judges representing the state of Israel) believe the individual right to a dwelling providing adequate protection for life and body, supersedes the right of possession of land and provided the breach of this right is kept most minimal in attaining the required purpose. In order to give sufficient response to the security demands, we have decided that it would suffice to prune, not uproot, 50% of the trees down to 30 cm. This would allow a clear view into the grove. Leaving the roots of the trees will give hope to Salma to exist for another day.
Chapter 4. Resistance and hope: showing how memory, hope and resistance are intertwined.

In this chapter, I analyse three works by two different authors. The first two works are by Gassan Kanafani and titled *Returning to Haifa* and *Um Saa’d*. The third work is by Mahmood Issa and titled *Hikayet Saber* (The Story of Saber). Through these three literary works, I aim to show how Palestinians may keep their hope alive, but if this hope is lost, then the people will move from thin resistance to thick resistance.

**Resistance Literature: resistance, memory, and the notion of hope in the work of Kanafani – *Returning to Haifa***

Exploring some of Kanafani’s work allows a history of biopolitics in Palestine to be uncovered. The novellas *Returning to Haifa* and *Um Saa’d* (1969) were written after the rupture of yet another loss of the Palestinian homeland, *Al Naksah*, referred to in the west as the six-day war. Kanafani witnesses both *Al Nakba* of 1948 and *Al Naksah* of 1967 and writes the novellas in between and after these two major catastrophes of the Palestinians. Therefore, Kanafani’s writing manifests the turning points of resistance and memories of this period. Memories need a base of reality, and an imaginative other, to complete the rupture between the then and now. The imaginative other is hope, I argue. This rupture is postcolonial because it attempts to read gaps between memory and hope. Thin and thick resistance emerge as a consequence of different levels of hope.
In *Returning to Haifa*, Kanafani writes the story of a Palestinian couple, Said and Safiyya, who decide to take the opportunity of the open border after *Al Naksah*, of 1967; and go for the day to Haifa to look for their infant son, who was left behind in the midst of the terror during the 1948 Nakba. After a search, they find their home in Haifa, now resided in by a Jewish Polish family. When the new family moved into Said and Safiyya's home, they found Said and Safiya’s missing son, Khaldoon, and adopted him. They gave him the name Dov. Growing up in a Jewish family, Dov joined the Israeli army and is an Israeli soldier at the time when his parents seek him out. As Said and Saffiya enter their home, Miriam, Dov’s adoptive mother, says that she has been waiting for them, for a long time. Dov, or Khaldoon, repudiates his biological parents, condemning them for abandoning him. In *Returning to Haifa*, and in Kanafani’s literature at large, Kanafani reintegrates the past (memory) with the present. Such memories of Said and Safiya’s before the Nakba and their repercussions turn into performative and actionable resistance strategies. I wish to argue that mobilisation of memories into the present, in an attempt to bridge the chasm between past and present, determines whether the resistance is thin or thick. Thus, this bridging of past to present not only shapes Palestinians present actions, but also mobilises actions towards the future- shaping forms of resistance that depend on the word and the sword together, for the sake of their survival and the political development in their homeland.

In their article, “Ghassan Kanafani’s Returning to Haifa: tracing memory beyond the rubble”, Mohammed and Meryan contend that the ruptures in the histories of the dispossessed compel postcolonial writers to carry out a kind of literary excavation in search of lost memories to bridge this chasm (Alhaj Mohammad and Meryan 67). One
method for reading the chasm is through postcolonial literature because the real locus of authentic feelings, imagination, and bodily resistance ought to be local and authentic. For example, the Palestinian writer Edward Said, in his article, “Permission to Narrate”, insistently asked friends and family to write down their experiences during the siege of Beirut in 1982. He was aware that they were just trying to survive and knew this task was difficult. Had he not done that, the result afterwards would have been that a significant part of the Palestinian narrative was lost. However, Said's action allowed some narrative to be included about the siege of Beirut. The loss of recorded narrative exists to a much lesser extent after the Sabra and Shatila massacre, carried out in Beirut between the 16th-18th of September 1982, because Palestinians were not in a position to record their experiences (E. Said, Permission to Narrate 38).

Said demonstrates how facts are manipulated by occupiers and victors in battles to be in line with certain ideologies. As such, the narratives that are spread worldwide are likely to be those based on Zionism (E. Said, Permission to Narrate 31). To counteract that, there is power that lies in the narratives of the occupied and the conquered through their ability to build new literary interpretations of postcolonial bodily and spiritual approaches in resistance, and the interpretation of the different kinds of resistance found in their ability to make an impact.

One method to find lost memories is in the locality of the postcolonial writing, whether written by those still in situ, those who have fled into exile, or those who are already exiled but still a part of the same people. Kanafani was writing from exile, while witnessing the repercussions of Al Nakba and Al Naksa. Postcolonial, resistance, prison, and biopolitics literature written at different times throughout the conflict
enable the reading of the allegorical postcolonial body of Palestine and Palestinians. The figurative picture of Palestine as a prison came from Nashif, claims that more than a quarter of the Palestinians have been imprisoned by Israel on political grounds through the siege of Gaza (Nashif x). The Gaza Strip is one of the most densely populated areas in the world (El Baba, Kayastha and Florimond 7499). Checkpoints are planted all over the West Bank with prison-like iron gates. Real-life imprisonment is one chapter of the imprisonment of Palestine. Palestinian cities are imprisoned by checkpoints and separation walls. Diasporic Palestinians are imprisoned by borders. Gaza is imprisoned by its siege. And the dreams of Palestinians are imprisoned by the Israeli occupation practices. Different chapters of imprisonment therefore make the individual and collective story.

Palestinians hold onto hope; their approaches of resistance manifest as Sumud (steadfastness, endurance, spiritual resistance). However, when they lose hope, their approaches (or of those who they can influence like their children) of thin resistance transform to thick resistance. However, deep inside their psyche, many Palestinian echo their belief in Jamal Abd Elnasser’s famous phrase: “What was taken by force, can only be restored by force”. Naser’s phrase advocates force and armed resistance. Many Palestinians do not undertake this way as they cherish life and have children, parents, and loved ones that they want to care for. Therefore, although thin resistance will not liberate their homeland from occupation, it means that Palestinians survive, albeit often imprisoned in one way or another (literal prisons, being unable to leave Gaza, or having their movement in the West Bank controlled by the Israeli army, among other Palestinian experiences), where they realise that their aspirations beyond mere existence are not always realisable.
Returning to Haifa did not go without criticism. Sandra Singer writes: "In Returning to Haifa ideological claims threaten to overshadow its literary, narrative complexity. Through a number of interrelated plots concerning return and a sustained examination of the problematic metaphors of home and land, Returning to Haifa concerns the impact of Palestinians who ‘fled’ during the 1948 war with Israel, returning in 1967. As 'travelling trauma' text, the drama-infused novella has the effect of sharpening consciousness by inviting debate to broaden "implacable" historical positions. Through its narrative instancing of discussion across geopolitical borders, Returning to Haifa has significance for a cosmopolitan readership invested in contemporary Middle Eastern issues. While the work ends with appeals to violence, its characters' aspersions are toward inevitable dialogue". (Singer 4).

Kanafani demonstrates the journey between thin and thick resistance. For 20 years, Said and Safiyya had held the hope of finding their son Khaldoon, their home, and their Haifa, (thin resistance). When Said and Safiyya were coping with exile, generating energy from the hope of memories, Said discouraged Khaled, their other son, from joining the armed resistance. However, when they meet their son Khaldoon in Haifa and discover that he is now a proud Israeli soldier who stands against the Palestinians, Said tells his wife that their other son, Khaled, who wanted to join the armed resistance, had a clearer vision than them both, and the first thing that Said will do upon his return to Ramallah is to encourage Khaled to join the armed resistance (Kanafani, Returning to Haifa 171). This story shows how, for years, Said and Safiyya have performed steadfastness with hope being its catalyst. However, the gap between what was hoped for and reality, or what I have referred to as ‘the chasm’, awakens them to renew their thinking. That Kanafani's writing may be allegorical of many
Palestinians is illustrated in Nahla Abdo’s book, tilted *Captive Revolution*. Abdo states:

"Kanafani’s significant contribution to world literature resides in his development of the philosophy of resistance literature, wherein he establishes a strong relationship between the voice and physical movement and between resistance as a concept and actual resistance on the ground" (Abdo-Zubi, 105).

The plot in *Returning to Haifa* is shown in the conversation between Said and Dov. Before the arrival of Dov, Miriam, the Israeli lady who inhabits their old house and adopted Dov, informed Said that she does not want to engage with their story; it is over for her. Miriam says to Said: “Do you think this hasn’t been as much of a problem for me as it’s been for you?” (Kanafani, Returning to Haifa 172). Miriam wants Dov to choose between his biological and adopted parents; he is of an age, 20, that allows him to do so. English is the language of conversation between Said and Miriam, therefore, Said translates for Safiyya. The latter answers: “That's a fair choice. I'm certain Khaldoon will choose his real parents. It's impossible to deny the call of flesh and blood…Said bursts out laughing, his laughter filled with a profound bitterness that bespeaks defeat” (ibid).

On Dov’s arrival, he approaches Miriam and says to her: “What did the two of them come for? Don’t tell me they want to take me back “.

Said asks quietly: “You are in the army? Who are you fighting? Why?”
Dov jumps to his feet and says: “You have no right to ask those questions. You’re on the other side” (Kanafani, Returning to Haifa 179-180).

Overwhelmed, Said's moment of awakening arrives. His hope is crushed. After Said hears that his son is loyal to the Israeli state, he questions what a true Palestine is:

I am looking for the true Palestine, the Palestine that’s more than memories…more than a son,…I was just saying to myself: What’s Palestine in respect to Khaled (his other son who had never seen Haifa, Khaled's brother Dov, or any of its associated memories). For us, for you and me, (Said and Safiyya) it’s only a search for something buried beneath the dust of memories. And look what we found beneath the dust. Yet more dust (Kanafani, Returning to Haifa 186-187).

At this point Said realises the utopian restoration of Palestine will only be accomplished by the armed struggle. Khaled, his other son, has wanted to join the armed resistance, to take back his country from the occupiers. Khaled does not have any memories of utopian Palestine, pre-Nakba, and therefore, refuses to live another 20 years, as his parents, holding a hope against a phantom. Said is astonished that his son Khaled reached this conclusion before he did. Safiyya too was preserving her hopes for 20 years to bring back her son Khaldoon. When Said informs her of the conservation, in which Miriam proposes that the parents leave Dov in Haifa, Safiyya's experience is thus:

All at once, for the first time, she [Safiyya] faced the truth. Said's words seemed to
her to be true, but she was still to hang on to the invisible thread of hope she had constructed in her imagination for twenty years as a sort of bribe to compensate for the hope finding her son (Kanafani, Returning to Haifa 179-180).

Some Israeli intellectuals interpret *Returning to Haifa* as a balanced history that shows both catastrophes and losses (Abdo-Zubi, 116). On the one hand, the struggles of Miriam who for twenty years does not know the future of her adopted son. This is perhaps symbolic of the Israeli situation at large. Israel has the military superiority but still spends much money and energy on security, fearing the unknown. Many Israelis to live with the constant worry that things could be overturned in a relatively short time.

On the other hand, *Returning to Haifa* ends on Said adopting armed resistance and believing the liberation of Palestine will come through men and women like his son Khaled, enlisting in the armed resistance.

After his meeting with his son Khaledon/Dov, Said's hope of regaining his son and his home is crushed. Consequently, Said transforms his ruptured memory that represents a moment of transition in his experience between rootedness in Palestine and exile in Ramallah. In Haifa, pre-Nakba, the exile after the Nakba and then a reality (the stance of Dov) in the chasm stops all the uncertain voices and gives the command to a bodily action. Said mobilises his son Khaled to join the armed resistance, as the moment that ended Said’s hope and thus his thin resistance had come. On leaving their house in Haifa, Said tells Miriam and Dov: “You two may remain in our house temporarily. It will take a war to settle that.” After Safiyya and Said leave their home in Haifa, they
do not utter a word until they reach the edge of Ramallah, when Said says to Safiyya: "I pray that Khaled will have gone while we were away!" (Kanafani, Returning to Haifa 187). On this hope, Kanafani ends his novella.

Thin and thick resistance subvert colonialism in different ways, and the swings between the two are located in Palestinian postcolonial literature, and other cultural and art productions, as we shall visit later. In her article, “Memory and Mobilization? Identity, Narrative and Nonviolent Resistance in the Palestinian Intifadas”, Julie Norman writes that the reasons for Palestinians' interest in documenting the history of the Nakba is twofold: one is to document the past by mobilising memories of displacement, the second is to allow the past to influence current strategies of the conflict (Norman 5). Therefore, memories that have turned into hope inform whether Palestinians opt for a thin and/or thick resistance. Elias Khoury writes: “Palestinians talk a great deal about memory but are unable to give it new form, not because they lack imagination, but because their experience of reality is trapped” (Khoury 91). Past memories define present and future forms of resistance.

In the following passage, when Said and Safiyya arrive at their house in Haifa, Kanafani narrates the rupture between past and present memories.

Said hesitated for just a moment as he let the engine die down. But he knew inside himself that if he hesitated for very long, it would end right there. He would start up the engine again and leave. So, he made the whole thing appear, to himself and to his wife, perfectly natural, as though the past twenty years
had been put between two huge presses and crushed until they became a thin piece of transparent paper (Clare 64).

The twenty years have been put inside pressure to become a transparent paper, people surviving on hope. When this hope of returning to his home in Haifa is possible even for one day, Said is willing to erase the difficulties associated with bearing this hope for 20 years. Palestinians subvert their suffering (their reality) for the purpose of reviving their hope.

Past memories that inform present and future resistance fuel collective, more than individual, resistance. Fanon’s future-oriented resistance-hope analysis provides some grounds to evolve from the contended transformation from thin to thick resistance. In Fanon’s opinion, life is future oriented, or life is hoped to be lived (Byrd and Miri 2).

In line with this, Kanafani writes: “[T]ens of thousands like Khaled won't be stopped from searching in the depths of their defeat for scraps of armour and broken flowers. Men like Khaled are looking toward the future, so they can put right our mistakes and the mistakes of the whole world. Dov is our shame, but Khaled is our enduring honor (Kanafani, Returning to Haifa 181)”

Hope is the main ingredient to liberate the occupied land and people in Palestine, irrespective of Israel’s undefined border. To problematise things further, hope in this context is different from the sad hope that occupied Palestinians utilise to prolong their life on their land. What I mean by sad hope is, for instance, how a Palestinian peasant may want to grow food on his land and therefore, needs to access it. His access is under Israeli control barred off by the separation wall, checkpoints, and so forth. At
a checkpoint, the body of this peasant is cooperative with the occupation soldiers since his end goal is to access his land, not liberating Palestine, at least on this occasion. He does all this only to access his land in order to provide for his family. Tomorrow, he is likely to be cooperative again, performing Sumud. Nevertheless, each day his ruptured memory accumulates, and one day this memory should lead to the mobilisation of his bodily resistance, when hope clashes with expectations. Said differently, the occupation made the body of the farmer docile. Hence, thin resistance or Sumud are paramount as a basis for thick resistance. While performing Sumud, Palestinians who witnessed the Nakba, enter a phase of reduction, or the ‘Homo Sacer’ of bare life, in Agamben’s term. That is, they tend to physically resist less, many become focused the future and the security of their families for instance. However, many of the children of the Nakba generation choose the future not the past. Explicitly and implicitly, these sons and daughters of the parents that witnessed the Nakba refute being reduced to mere bodies, or to be without a function. The young are not conforming to their subjection. However, both generations meet again when the wishful thinking of the first generation of refugees meets with the reality of the second generation. This scenario changes for the third and fourth Nakba generations as we will see when considering Riklis’s film, “The Lemon Tree”. We may question why the bodies of the Palestinians are changing the resistance methods from generation to generation.

King provides perhaps the most comprehensive study on the use of nonviolence in Palestine during the first Intifada, drawing upon social mobilisation theory to ground the work of social movements (King 16). Non-violent resistance actions ask the occupier to adjust his polices slightly to accommodate the demands of the occupied.
On occasions, the coloniser can be depicted providing crumbs of hope here and there to the occupied as I demonstrated in *The Lemon Tree* film.

**Resistance Literature: resistance, memory and the notion of hope in the work of Kanafani – *Um Saa’d*.

In *Umm Sa’d*, 'the mother of Saa’d' Kanafani symbolises the Palestinian *Nakba* victim who is physically placed outside Palestine. Umm Saa’d, the heroine who represents the revolutionary Palestinian peasant, educates Kanafani (and the reader) through her far-sighted and spirited revolutionary wisdom. *Umm Saa’d* fulfilled Kanafani's own demand for his fictional writing. Kanafani wants the story to be completely realistic and, at the same time, to give the reader the feeling that he is not there (Coffin 33).

Many consider Umm Saad as a refugee. However, even what it means to be a refugee can be questioned. In his article, “Nothing to Lose but our Tents”: The Camp, the Revolution, the Novel”, Nasser Abdurrahman interrogates a scene at the opening of Elias Khoury's *Bab al-shams* (Gate of the Sun, in English, 1998). Its main character, Khalil narrates a nightly story to help his adopted father, Yunis, an old revolutionary Palestinian militant, wake up from his coma. Khalil recounts when Yunis arrived at Ayn al-Hilwa Palestinian refugee camp in Lebanon. After his release from prison, Yunis found people pitching tents, he was enraged and shot his gun in the air. Khalil jogs Yunis’s memory:
As they were setting up tents that winds blow through from both sides, you told them, We’re not refugees. We’re fugitives and nothing more. We fight and kill and are killed. But we’re not refugees. You told the people that refugee means something shameful, and that the road to all the villages of the Galilee was open (Abdo-Zubi, 107).

In Khoury's work, the refugee can be equated to a fugitive, and this reveals the true feelings many refugees have. They want to believe that they are moving as fugitives, and not stuck in the limbo of camps indefinitely. Mobilization gives hope and therefore, many refugees are in denial of their status. Palestinian resistance was in part circumscribed by the challenge encountered in the ‘refuge’. According to the Collins English Dictionary, refuge is "the protection from unpleasantness and unhappiness which one hopes to obtain from being in a particular situation or taking part in a particular activity". (Sinclair 656). On the contrary, rather than protection from unpleasantness and unhappiness, the hope of many Palestinians in the camp arises in any particular situation or activity that makes them feel closer to Palestine. This perhaps explains the fugitive figure in Bab Al-Shams.

In ‘Remembering Ghassan Kanafani, or How A Nation Was Born Of Story Telling’. Elias Khoury writes:

He who writes the losses also writes the dreams. How did this boy (Kanafani) from Akka, this young Damascene and later Beiruti, succeed in turning dark despair into the ferment of hope? The secret lay in his intense awareness of the fleeting nature of time. He constantly battled to keep his diabetes at bay, but it was his love of life that fashioned the writer, the lover, and the fearless fighter.
He transformed his duel with death into an affirmation of life, and helped forge a nation from his words. (Khoury 88)

I wish to argue that in Kanafani’s novella, *Umm Saa’d* (1969) the hope of Palestinians who live in the camp is to be outside the camp, in the space that makes the journey of return to Palestine closer. 'Palestinian refugees’, including the PLO, after the 1967 *Naksa* were trying to liberate Palestine, from outside Palestine. Palestinians refused to be reduced to refugee status. Kanafani portrays the Palestinian mother in Umm Saa’d who knows the sacrifice needed to return to Palestine and is willing to give for Palestine, the most precious person she has, her son Saa’d, who sees that his true mission is to live a dignified life. He believes this is only achievable by armed resistance (thick resistance).

Like Kanafani’s other texts, the camp too is a site of realisation but at a different rate. The camp is the site of resistance strategies of thin resistance, and that often culminates in thick resistance since hope is almost only ever found in armed resistance. In addition to transformative memory, as shown in *Returning to Haifa*, it is the bare life, the reduced status that refugees feel that makes the camp a site of resistance. Therefore, when revolutionaries at the camp mobilise their bodily forces, in Fanon’s terms, they want to cleanse and restore their humanity by action (violence).

In *Umm Saa’d*, Kanafani raises awareness of many problems, such as poverty, the camp, exploitation, humiliation, refugees, and the reduction of humans to merely surviving bodies dependent on handouts). All problems are related to being forced to leave Palestine because of Israel. It is easy to conclude from Kanafani's work that the
solution therefore is to return to Palestine, and the rifle is the means to accomplish the return. When this conclusion is reached, I contend that one must have read Kanafani too quickly. Perhaps more weight is given to thin resistance than thick in Kanafani’s work, I argue. The dialogue below between Umm Saa’d and the narrator demonstrates how the prison apparatus is used for those who refuse to be reduced. The scene takes place as the mayor passed by Umm Saa’d's house and promised her to release her son Saa’d and his comrades from prison.

Umm Saa’d: Did I not tell you not to think about the mayor? Do you know what happened?

The mayor went to the prison and wanted to make each of them (her son Saa’d with a group of his comrades) sign a paper in which they pledge that they are *awadim* (humane) or will behave humanely. They refused and kicked him out.

Ghassan: who?

Umm Saa’d: Saa’d and his comrades. The mayor told me that they laughed at him, and Saa’d asked him What does *awadim* mean? The mayor said that they were crammed into a cell and all have burst out laughing. A person amongst them whom the mayor doesn’t know said: *awadim* means sensible? Yet a third man added: “it means that we receive a slap, and we say thank you? Finally, Saa’d stood up directing his speech at the mayor: “ *Ya Habibi* oh darling (in a sarcastic way), *awadim* means to fight, this is it” (Kanafani, Umm Saa’d 19).
These revolutionaries, from the perspective of Israelis, must be reduced so they can be deterred from participating in the revolution. However, the apparatus of bare life in the above dialogue has partnered with the apparatus of imprisonment. Saa’d and his comrades care more about their spiritual freedom than their bodily freedom. Therefore, they refuse to be reduced and would rather stay imprisoned than be given artificial freedom, to only go to a bigger prison, whose residents have “In one way or another” signed this paper (Kanafani, Umm Saa'd 70).

The dialogue of Umm Saa’d teaches the wisdom of resistance in Palestine. The tree symbol that Umm Saa’d uses in the novel reveals the relations between the appearance and the essence (or the voice and the body). In a conversation with Kanafani, Umm Saa’d illustrates the value of the grape vine:

Maybe you don't know anything about the grape vine, but it is a generous plant that doesn't need much water. Too much water ruins it... You say, "How?" I'll tell you. It takes its water from the moisture in the ground and the air, then it gives without taking back... Also olives do not need water, they absorb water from dampness of the soil and the depth of water in the deep earth (Kanafani, Umm Saa'd 69).

The two trees mentioned in the above quote are the most prominent trees in Palestine. Often Sumud is associated with the olive tree in Palestine. The body of the tree with no visible water to the observer is allegorical of Palestinians seen with no power. However, I argue that Palestinians turned hope into a source of power. When Palestinian are seen with no visible or material power, then the Zionist occupation or
the state in power as in exilic Lebanon or Jordan can practice biopower such as in the case of the imprisonment of Saa’d and his comrades in *Um Sa’ad*. While trees are looking deep for water and Palestinians for hope, the bodies and the trees develop inner voices that enable their bodies to survive. The bodies of the trees and those of Palestinians survive without much mobilisation, as in thin resistance. However, when the bodies decide to shake the grounds, to move, and be visible; iterations of the body move from stagnant to motion, from thin to thick resistance. Because the water, the source of power, the hope, may not be seen by outsiders or observers, the movements of the bodies seem dramatic or unprecedented. During the search for hope, voices are mute and bodies stagnant. The practices of thin resistance are the audible device to end the silence. Umm Saa’d’s description of the depth and the resilience of the trees can be read as an allegory of Palestinians who will look deep for hope, thin resistance, before choosing the armed path.

The occupation of Palestine, and its major catastrophe, the *Nakba*, is the original cause of resistance whether in the camps or in the occupied territories. Despite that same cause, resistance in the OPT and in the camp diverges and converges in what constitutes their thin and thick resistance strategies. Palestinians converge in the notion of hope and diverge in bodily actions. Thick resistance in the camp is more of a spectacle. Militants marching used to be a major spectacle in camps, where refugees put forward their sons proudly as militants ready to fight. Or, as we saw in the 2021 Israeli attack on Gaza, missiles were fired from the border with Lebanon, and many crossed to Israel despite all the dangers. The below extract reveals how the hope of Saa’d’s father is boosted:
Poverty can change an angel into the devil or the devil into an angel. What could Abu Saa'd do except lose his temper and take it out on the people and on me [Um Saa'd] and on his shadow. Abu Saa'd had been crushed, crushed by poverty, crushed by defeat, crushed by the ration card, crushed under a tin roof, crushed under the boot of the state. What could he do? Saa'd's going restored his spirits and that day he was a little better. He saw the camp in another way. He lifted his head and began to look around. He looked at me and he looked at his children differently. Do you understand? If you could just see him now, strutting around like a rooster. He can't see a gun on a young man's shoulder without moving aside and caressing it, as it were his own old gun that had been stolen and he had just now found it again. … This morning he woke up very early. When I looked for him outside, I saw him standing in the road smoking a cigarette and leaning up against the wall. Even before wishing me good morning, he said, 'By God, Umm Sa'd, we live and learn (Kanafani, Umm Saa'd 73).

Abu Saa’d in *Umm Saa’d* learns from his son, and Said in *Returning to Haifa* learns from his son, Khaled. They learn that thin resistance cannot be the norm and that liberation will come using thick resistance. In the camps, in particular where the apparatuses of reduction and imprisonment are used, thin resistance will only repeat yesterday's experience. While the collective spectacle of resistance is less visible in the OPT, for censorship reasons, it is more widespread there than in the camps. In his final interview, Kanafani recalled working and living in the “sad and moving environment of the camp,” that left such a mark on him. He added that it was not hard to find the political roots of this environment. Arriving at these roots in fiction requires mediation:
the unveiling of the interrelationship between appearance and quintessence. *Umm Saad* shows this mediation between how thin resistance leads to thick resistance. Kanafani’s life and death resembles my argument. In his life, he resisted using the word. And in his death, he paid by his body as he was politically assassinated.

**Resistance Literature: biopolitics and thick resistance, resistance to pruned hope in the work of Mahmood Issa - *Hikayet Saber* (English translation: *The Story of Saber*).**

Since 1967, more than a quarter of the Palestinians in the OPT have been imprisoned by Israel on political grounds (Mayer and Mould 164). Almost every family and every village have been marred by this mass incarceration policy. Prison is both a microcosm and a reality of Palestine. A novel that is written by the Jerusalemite prisoner Mahmood Issa, *Hikayet Saber, The Story of Saber* is a story of a person that embodies the situation of a nation, and the story of a nation that is embodied in a person. *Hikayet Saber* (The Story of Saber) is autobiographical of Mahmood Issa’s life (Eissa). Mahmood Issa is also known as Abu Al-Bara’, father of Al Bara’. Bara’ is an Islamic name that means innocence.

In the Oslo accords in 1993, Palestinians participated in negotiations with Israel and the results were devastating, leading to more than half a million Israeli settlers in the West Bank, more confiscation and more Judaisation of Jerusalem and other places. Israel seems to respond only to armed resistance, as in the 2021 war on Gaza when thousands of rockets were fired at Israel. Therefore, Hamas's thick mode of resistance
cannot be ignored if we wish to understand the anticolonial, postcolonial, and resistance literature that comes out of Islamic parties such as Hamas and Islamic Jihad, that adopt jihad as it their main doctrine, Dr. Abd Al Aziz Al Rantisi, one of Hamas's leaders, and a prominent leader who was deported to Marj Al-Zuhoor, in south Lebanon, by Israel in 1992, asserts:

Rantisi credited the success of Palestinian resistance not to weapons or numbers but to the fact that those who were ready to die prevailed over those who feared death, and he observed that nations which acquire honor in history do so through death. He concluded that the human bomb was the most powerful ideological expression of the Palestinian national struggle in the past century (Meir 716).

According to Saber's comrades, Saber has resisted within the Israeli prison system and machine of oppression all these years because he is a man who is close to the holy Quran.

Saber is still in an Israeli prison, and in solitary confinement. Saber is known as the dean of solitary confinement prisoners as he has spent a total of over thirteen years in solitary confinement, ten years of which were consecutive in solitary confinement, and another fourteen years in group cells. Solitary confinement is another Israeli apparatus of occupation that is used to humiliate prisoners (Eissa 63-67). In The Story of Saber, Saber and his comrades describe solitary confinement as a continuous death-like state. In his solitary confinement, Saber prays alone; eats alone; in Ramadan, he breaks his fast alone; in Eid, Muslim festive celebrations, Saber is all alone, no one can visit him expect his fellow Israeli prisoner; books are not allowed, and the filth of his 1.8m times
2.70m cell is unbearable. This cell has a dirty hole that Saber uses as a bathroom. This is also the home of mice, and infectious smell. The door of the solitary confinement cell has a hole, that opens merely to give Saber his tasteless meal that is not sufficient to nourish him but just to keep the prisoner alive.

Saber is not allowed any clothes from outside. On the rare occasions that clothes are allowed, the majority of what has arrived is rejected by the guards, and Saber has to give up something for anything he receives. Saber is not allowed to enrol on a university degree, although the majority of prisoners are allowed to enrol in Hebrew-only universities (Wehr and Cowan 501). Despite this, Saber manages to write his book, published as his prison literature and depicting his true story. And since the Israeli guard keeps putting obstacles before him, and insisting on humiliating Saber in his confinement, his endurance is a sign that he is stronger than the Israeli occupational machine. Quranic verses are referenced throughout his story. Quranic verses of Jihad and the promises of paradise are Saber’s and his friends’ major promise of hope.

Fight them, and Allah will punish them by your hands, cover them with shame, help you (to victory) over them, heal the breasts of Believers. (The Qur’an,9:14)

In Arabic, Saber means patience and can be used either as a noun or as a proper male name. For the female version, we have to add the female preposition, so the name becomes Sabera. According to the Hans Wehr dictionary of Modern Written Arabic, patience also means: "forbearance, composure, equanimity, steadfastness, firmness; self-control, self-command; self-possession; perseverance, endurance, and hardiness" (Wehr and Cowan 501). To Israel, Saber is considered as one of the most dangerous
detained prisoners. Saber is a natural leader, and he has been able to forge effective armed operations against Israel with minimal resources (Al Jazeera). With his comrades, Musa Akarri, Majed Qteish, Saber Atwan, Saber has formed a private cell that claims responsibility for kidnapping and killing Israeli soldiers and police officers. This is a secret armed cell that follows the armed wing of Hamas (Eissa 62).

Saber was born and raised in Anata, a suburb of East Jerusalem. Saber grew up in Jerusalem and was attached to Haram Al-Sharif, Al Aqsa Mosque. The 1990 Massacre that occurred within the boundaries of Haram Al-Sharif that resulted in the death of tens of Palestinians worshipers and the injury of hundreds triggered a deep-rooted anger in Saber. This motivated him to choose revenge. At the outset, Saber understood that resistance has to take an armed approach since iron can be only combated by iron, or what was taken by force will only return by force (Eissa 7).

While Lemon Tree appears to advocate compromise through an imaginative solution, in actual life the violence and degradations experienced by Palestinians has led many to believe that mere endurance is insufficient. In Lemon Tree, there is a point where the allegory fails for the story to work if the trees are indeed just trees. As we have seen from Salma’s exaggerated reaction to the Israeli soldiers stealing her lemons, her trees equate to Palestinians. This is represented by Salma defending their (Palestinian) lands. Trees symbolise Palestinian presence on the land, but at the end of the Lemon Tree, the trees are pruned instead of uprooted. This is the compromise. Similarly, in the Israeli-Palestinian situation, the compromise for both peoples to live next to each other on the land can be seen as to the pruning of the Palestinian people through Israeli biopolitics. Israel stops short of genocide (the equivalent of uprooting all the trees) by
pruning the Palestinian population: killing and maiming some but not all. However, it is this version of ‘hope’ that is rejected by many Palestinians. When living in a constantly diminished, ‘pruned’ society, hope too is diminished even to the point of non-existence. Some Palestinians, as Saber demonstrates in his prison novel, refuse to live in this pruned hope, and therefore, they take up thick resistance, as in armed resistance, as their means to live in dignity (Sen 201). Israel fears thick resistance much more than thin resistance, as acts of thick resistance are visible and have an immediate effect on Israel. In addition, thick resistance conveys a clear message that Palestinians' actions are reciprocal when it comes to armed resistance, each with his capacity.

Saber is not willing to sacrifice his freedom to be free in this reduced way. For Saber and his comrades, freedom is either complete, or they are prepared to pay a hefty price in the attempt of obtaining this freedom. It is worth mentioning that freedom for Saber and his comrades does not mean defeating Israel. In his article, To Fight Is To Exist, Somdeep Sen writes that Hamas' military struggle is incapable of overcoming Israel’s military power, and hence defeating Israel (Al Jazeera). Being aware of the military power equilibrium, Saber’s freedom therefore is to demonstrate to the occupier that ‘we exist and are able to react’. Resistance gives a voice to existence and through this to negotiate new realities on the ground, for instance the exchange of kidnapped Israeli soldiers for Palestinian prisoners. Saber Atwan, a member of the quartet who formed the private division of the Qasam militias, the armed wing of Hamas, was interviewed in an Al Jazeera documentary. When Atwan was asked about Saber Issa's motive to resist, he answered that Saber always says: “the occupation will notice our existence on the land, and the existence of Muqawama, (resistance)” (Al Jazeera). Atwan, Musa
Akarri, and Majed Qteish were released and deported to Istanbul, Turkey in 2011, as part of a prisoner exchange deal, for Gilad Shalit, an Israeli soldier who was captured by Hamas and held from 2006-2011. Israel refused to release Saber Issa despite the fact that he then had spent over 20 years in Israeli jails (Eissa 33-34).

In the same interview, as well as in the Story of Saber\(^1\), the three comrades confirm that despite their relatively young age when they were arrested in 1993, they were aware of the consequences of the armed resistance against Israel and that their thick resistance would lead to death or imprisonment and other consequences, such as torture. However, what mattered was their dignity and social esteem, in a sense, that they were doing what they could to resist the Israeli occupation in an attempt to change the status quo of humiliation, the pruning of their hope, and the occupation. Axel Honneth suggests that “social esteem” refers to the social value of individuals which can be weighed through their contribution to the aims pursued by their society (Honneth 359). In writing his story, Saber asserts: “I am aware that these words may never see light, and no one may read them. However, I announce that I bear witness to an important period of the history of this population [the Palestinian] that is written by the blood, injuries, pain, and torment of the sons of Palestine” (Eissa 69).

The metonymic relation of the individual body to the social body is addressed by Jameson. In his article, “Third-World Literature in the Era of Multinational Capitalism”, Fredric Jameson argues that:

All third-world texts are necessarily…allegorical, and in a very specific way: they are to be read as what he calls national allegories… Third-world texts, even those which are seemingly private and invested with a properly libidinal
dynamic- necessarily project a political dimension in the form of national allegory: the story of the private individual destiny is always an allegory of the embattled situation of the public third-world culture and society (Jameson 69).

The allegorical situation in Palestine/Israel can become understood by depicting resistance strategies. The latter show the interrelationship between resistance strategies and occupation strategies. While many Israelis believe that the end-goal of jihad is the destruction of Israel and the elimination of the Jews (Milton-Edwards 48), “the Islamic movement (Hamas) has harnessed the notion of jihad and used it as a battle cry to liberate the holy land from Israeli rule” (Klug 10). *The Story of Saber* demonstrates more, Hamas’ endeavour to liberate the land from Israeli rule. Awareness of what the resistance serves can be read in Saber, thus Israel realises the existence of resistance. The Israeli view that Hamas wants to kill all Jews is not feasible, since the Jews are scattered all over the world. And many Jews do not support the existence of Israel. That is, not all Jews are Zionists (Al Jazeera).

*The Story of Saber* can help us to understand why many Palestinians turn to thick resistance, using their bodies to resist. Saber and his comrades imagine the type of freedom that could make them fulfilled, so that they would feel equal to the Israeli people. They dream of thick resistance using Fanon’s term, their dreams of a muscular nature. That is the nature of their specialised operation of kidnapping Israeli soldiers and negotiating with the Israeli authority to exchange other Palestinian prisoners for them. Saber was well known for his strategic thinking and effective methods to resist and hurt the Israeli occupier on the ground (ibid). This knowledge is passed on to us by other prisoners who have learned about Saber’s strategies amongst Palestinians prisoners’ and also outside the prison (Bucaille 53).
The ultimate measure that Israel can take when they capture freedom fighters or, as labelled by Israelis, ‘terrorists’, is to imprison them. According to Israel, terrorists are people who incite violence, and according to Palestinians, freedom fighters resist the occupation with violence being a natural means and, even so, the Palestinian violence towards the Israelis is far less than the Israeli violence towards Palestinians. The resistance of Hamas thus finds meaning on the route to Palestinian decolonisation and postcolonial measures that are taken to shake the Israeli apparatus occupation system. As a destructive power, resistance encounters significance as it consistently challenges the plausibility of the occupation. Saber and his comrades imagine that Palestinian (Hamas) prisoners can be freed only if actions of equal violence are performed on the enemy (Eissa 58-59).

In Saber's story, the author narrates his story of living in dire poverty in a refugee camp, with his mother who does some sewing for her neighbours. The income she brings in hardly meets their daily needs. Saber's father is seen as a martyr who has given his life to Palestine. Saber was born in 1967 in the year of Naksa. Twenty years later, when the first Intifada erupted, he participated in it. While at university, he enlisted with Hamas as, to him, their ideology seemed the most reasonable with Islam as the solution for all means of life. From a young age, Saber disliked being inferior to others, because, for example his clothes were old and shabby in comparison to others. His only compensation was that he was an intelligent student, not as others who were shallow and interested more in their appearance. From a young age, armed resistance for Saber was a choice. One day when he was 13 years old, the Israeli army besieged the camp and ordered all men between the age of 16-50 to stand against the walls in a school yard, leaving them to wait for hours before the military governor
arrived. The soldiers were looking for a man who had a golden tooth who had attacked one of the Israeli settlers. The soldiers ordered everyone to open their mouth so they could inspect them for the golden tooth. When it was Saber’s turn, the soldier looked down on him and asked him about his age. When he answered, the soldier asked him why he was there. Because I am a man as you can see, he replied. Then, the soldier asked Saber to open his mouth. Saber refused and turned the soldier’s hand down and put him on the floor. Saber could see the satisfaction in the eyes of all the men around him, in which previously fear had controlled and confined these men. Since that moment, when Saber saw the satisfaction in the eyes and souls of others, he decided to sacrifice his life for the message of God of Jihad, and to the liberation of his fellow citizens and prisoners.

Life under occupation where the occupier kills, imprisons, humiliates, annexes, demolishes, and reduces, is not a life worth living. Therefore, handling torture while in prison is considered thin resistance because it ‘merely’ concerns endurance. In describing his prison experience, Saber writes: “the torture room is a piece of hell fire placed on earth, as if it is a jollity of torment, where human dignity is disdained, his humanity is stripped, and he is treated like an animal, who does not belong to human beings” (Ben-Dror 157). In Agamben’s term, Saber is reduced to a zoē (related to zoology).

One of the operations that Saber and his comrades conducted was the abduction of an Israeli soldier, Naseem Toledo near Led, a city near Tel-Aviv. The purpose was to exchange the soldier for the Hamas leader, Sheikh Ahmad Yaseen, an old man in his wheelchair, who was captured by Israel. Saber and his comrades gave 10 hours to the
Israeli government to respond to their demand and release Yaseen. Prime Minister Rabin declined. Toledo was killed and his body was thrown in a public place in Jerusalem. Upon the death of Toledo, Rabin and his government were quick to make swift decisions to collectively punish Palestinians. Israel deported 416 Palestinians from Hamas and the Islamic Jihad political apparatus who had not been involved in terrorism in 1992 to Marj Al Zoohur, a village in south Lebanon in the aftermath of the killing (ibid). Palestinians who were deported to southern Lebanon and set in a camp in Marj-Al Zoohur engaged in study and other cultural productions such as poetry. Ben-Dror describes the resistance situation there:

Their poems (of Marj -Al Zoohur) main function was to raise the residents’ spirits and keep their plight in the public eye. They incorporate the expected political messages: anger at Israel and criticism of the international community, the Palestinian leadership, and the Arab states, which were prodded to work harder for the deportees’ return. The poetry was part of a successful media and information campaign, which annoyed Israel so much that it allowed all the deportees to return home by December 1993. Some of the poems were later published and helped cultivate the myth of the Marj al- Zoohur deportation, which Hamas viewed as a victory and symbol of steadfast resistance to Israel (Al Jazeera).

The above quote illustrates how the cultural production of Palestinians is grounded in their resistance. The history of resistance of the Palestinian people is the history they write in their cultural production as it mirrors their strategies: the metonymic relation of the individual body to the social body are hard to separate. We can see that deportees responded to Israelis occupational practice of biopolitics, such as physical deportation
by writing and reading resistance poetry. The deportees belonged to both Hamas and Islamic Jihad political apparatus, who believe in thick resistance as the armed struggle to achieve freedom. However, in certain situations and circumstances, as for instance in the Marj Al Zoohur, they resorted to poetry that was successful in tuning their suffering into thin resistance strategies that obliged Israel to accept their return. When Israel is conscious that a specific strand of Palestinian ideology, such as Hamas, is capable of using thin and thick resistance, Israel will always be fearful of what may come next, as their actions are unpredictable. These may once more break out as an armed attack, a manifestation of thick resistance strategies that will harm Israel and re-ensure that colonialism is very costly to maintain.

The above explains why Israel is keeping Saber in solitary confinement. Israel knows his leadership qualities and that he will plan to attack Israel from anywhere on earth, even if he is deported. In fact, in the few times that Saber was returned to group cells, as in 2002, he was leading militants’ groups from behind bars. “Saber does not waste any opportunity to resist, and Israel fears him even in his solitary confinement cell” (Amnesty International). In the only time he met with his comrades in Asqalan prison, they excavated a tunnel that took them months to dig in an attempt to escape prison. Their tunnel was discovered by a cut of water shortages, which sent them all back to solitary confinement, interrogations, and torture. According to interviews with Saber's comrades, they persisted because in their view to resist Israel is fuelled by the continuous Israeli apparatuses of biopolitics, killing children, and demolishing homes. And when asked about the attempt to escape prison, they say that they are mainly hurt because they are between walls and cannot resist. Thick resistance is thus the way of life for many Palestinians who refuse to be pruned, reduced, or domesticated.
Unpacking thick resistance strategies vis-à-vis their degree of hope shows that the hope of many Jihadists is to hurt Israel or be rewarded not in this life but the life after. What could postpone acts of thin resistance is the fear of the fighters that their families will be collectively punished, such as demolishing the house, and imprisoning other family members.
Chapter 5. Conclusion.

To exist in a liminal place with unequal rights means to resist. For instance, occupation apparatus of apartheid force Palestinians to resist as, at any expense, Palestinians will attempt to survive. Hope therefore is paramount as often the lack of hope equals death, or living death, homo Sacer, for the Palestinians. They use different strategies of resistance that depend on the degree of hope left while faced with occupation apparatus whose main aim is to destroy that hope. For instance, there are the resistance strategies of negotiation and compromise (Said); there is the witnessing and the documenting (Mohr), there is cultural self-assertion (Darwish) and the recall of memories that motivates bodily actions (Kanafani), there is compromise as a strategy of resistance, and there is intifada from acts of subversion to acts of violence.

Kanafani’s *Returning to Haifa* shows how memories could be turned into hope, and the latter into a sword: *Sumud* and armed resistance, thin and thick. Therefore, Kanafani anchors resistance in his novels, novellas, and short stories, such as *Umm Saad* and *Returning to Haifa* by interrogating key themes, such as memories, representation, and nostalgia and their becoming. Kanafani believes that rights, such as the right of return to Palestine, would need the culmination of all forms of resistance, for example, the pen and the art, *Sumud* and armed resistance. Despite his short-lived life, before the Israeli Mossad assassinated him by bombing his car in Beirut in 8\textsuperscript{th} July 1972 with his niece Lamis, his text still opens new meanings, and new hopes.

In both *Returning to Haifa* and *Um Sa’ad*, Kanafani shows how the resistance duty is
inheritable. Both Said and Umm Saa’d willingly and rationally accept that their sons participate in the armed resistance. Inside and outside Palestine, they reached the same conclusion that returning to Palestine takes a war, and both Said and Umm Saa’d have their hopes of return represented in their sons. In other words, the thin resistance, the *Sumud* of Said and Umm Saa’d is not only passed on to the sons, but is turned into biopolitical bodily actions. Israeli apparatus of biopolitics often have to be countered by biopolitics resistance strategies which demonstrates that the body is the core target of various occupation apparatus.

This fusion between the political and the aesthetic is placed in the purview of what is called biopolitical literature, as corporeal experience is affected by politics. However, Palestinians respond to these biopolitical strategies with their different means, not only bodily. This all depends on the thin or thick strategy that Palestinians adopt according to local and indigenous knowledge that translates into codes. This makes all cultural work under scrutiny postcolonial. Riklis’s Israeli film shows that many Israelis have their hopes in compromise and in living peacefully as normal neighbours. Israelis too have their postcolonial endeavour to rebel against injustice poured on the other side, as they understand that it affects them too, for example, by living in liminal space. However, there is too much blood and politics involved and the entire situation deserves a more intelligent look at the conflict if both sides hope that their children should live a more peaceful life than their own.

The voice that Said gives to the images shows that being forced to leave one's homeland is complex and has acute consequences, such as a Palestinian exiled identity which depends on his positioning, rather than on a constructed identity. This makes
the Palestinian identity united by suffering, disruption of identities, quest for their homeland, the need to survive, and the need to excel in host countries with a reduced sense of belonging, wherever Palestinians reside. Resistance strategies must then differ. While an exile may interpret the unravelling life under occupation as he feels it, a Palestinian who resides in the OPT may to a greater extent use his body to overcome biopolitics occupation apparatuses.

Once combined, Palestinians' diverse means of resistance make the history of a nation that is left with just 'almost enough hope' as a fuel for resistance. The latter is turned into actionable resistance strategies that result in the Palestine cause being alive, despite systemic and institutionalised attempts to bury it. For many Palestinians, to exist is to resist. However, since hope for Palestinians depends on many factors, such as the different exposure to different Israeli apparatus, Palestinians' diverse ideologies, and their spiritual and physical location of exile, this will ensure that thin and thick postcolonial, anticolonial, and decolonial strategies of resistance will continue to proliferate given that the bodies of Palestinians exist. Even genocidal endeavours will not completely wipe out the bodies of Palestinians, as evidenced in the 1948 Nakba and later catastrophes. The Palestinians are enduring and surviving.

A central question of this dissertation is the extent to which Palestinian resistance strategies are biopolitical or not. I have shown the body operating in resistance in many settings, to understand the biopolitical extent. Liminality is designed to restrict bodily movements and therefore, the presence of bodies in liminal spaces requires the body of Palestinians to react to the shaped threshold, to renegotiate the threshold camouflage their bodily appearance to confuse the occupier. Hope is paramount to decide which
type of resistance to undertake. What distinguishes between the militant and the comparatively passive form of resistance is, in my analysis, the degree of hope entailed in each. Bodies have entered the politics and formulate postcolonial approaches to resistance. Such postcolonial approaches rely on dialogues between the body and voice of the colonised to enter new spaces that stretch or break liminality.

The genealogy of the history of a particular occupied country such as Palestine can be read by reading the history of the body. Reading the history of the body can be done by reading the history of torture, imprisonment and by unearthing colonial apparatuses vis-à-vis resistance. In Mbembe's words, to exercise sovereignty is to exercise control and to define life as the deployment and manifestation of power (Mbembe, Necropolitics 12). In sum, the exercise of sovereignty is what Foucault meant by biopower: that domain of life over which power has taken control. Foucault writes: “So after first seizure of power over the body in an individualizing mode, we have a second seizure of power that is not individualizing but, if you like, massifying, that is directed”. (Foucault, Society must be defended: lectures at the Collège de France, 1975-76 243-244). Thus, among other strategies of resistance, the extent to which resistance takes a biopolitical form in occupied Palestine is high. Even within Sumud, the body is highly present. In non-violent resistance, the body is there even if it is silent, docile.

The body entered the political space, and it is at the forefront for Israelis, when it comes to design political, economic, social, and legal apparatus that support occupation. Foucault notes that sovereign juridical power is in fact a power to take life or let live (Foucault and Adams, Biopolitics and Biopower, 1). In this context,
Foucault’s biopower constructs a power to advance life or disallow it to the point of death. This dissertation has shown that Israel does both: advancing life for settlers in Palestine and it brings death for Palestinians. In addition, Israel has used power to prune the hope, bodies, and the very existence of Palestinians, leaving them in a state of limbo between being dead and alive. This intermingling between life and death resonates with the way Deleuze characterises Foucault. Deleuze asserts that Foucault admired Marie Bichat, a French anatomist who claims to have “invented a new vitalism by defining life as the set of those functions that resist death” (Deleuze, 1986, p. 177).

The importance of deducing hope from literary studies and other cultural productions is to unearth the sources for hope such as memories and narration. On hope, therefore, Palestinians in the second intifada and on other occasions had to look for hope from within, for example, from the first intifada. On narration, the outlaw, for example, who holds the countryside for days against the police, or who commits suicide rather than “give up” his accomplices, all constitute for the people role models, action schemas, and “heroes” (Fanon, The Wretched of the Earth 30). We can witness two changed bodies: one before telling the story and one after. In The Wounded Storyteller, Arther Frank writes: “To give voice to the new changed [physical] body so it becomes familiar again” (Arthur, 1995., p. 2). Today’s sick (occupied) body seeks postcolonial bodily and non-bodily resistance strategies to survive today and perhaps be free tomorrow. Similar to a changed body, the colonised need to relate to heroic stories. This voice or heroism comes as remedy to reremind the colonised of his familiarity and capability to resist. The latter give voice to the colonised body. The internal voice-body negotiation shown above manifest how voices administer the move of the body.
Whereas memories and narration articulate the availability of hope to the voice. The architecture of hope informs the body which resistance strategy to undertake; thin or thick.

Memories and stories mobilise collective hope. In his article, “Illness narratives: fact or fiction?” Mike Burry writes that the moral narrative brings an evaluative dimension into the links between the personal and the social (Burry, 2001, p. 274). As Good points out, in his article “Medicine, Rationality and Experience: an Anthropological Perspective” if narratives demonstrate an “ordering of experience” in the face of destructive (colonial) experience, expressions are often given (in narrative) to sometimes concealed ‘dynamic relations’ between people and their social contexts” (Good, 1994, p. 191). Since individual bodies form a social body of a country, the body in this dissertation is not limited to the physical individual body but also includes the social body of the country. Therefore, reading the Palestinian body vis-à-vis apparatus of occupation designed to control the life of the occupied Palestinian facilitates the allegorical reading of Palestine as an imprisoned, dispossessed, and pruned society.

In the light of the above, it can be concluded that Palestinian strategies of resistance have changed to correspond to different forms of occupation governing. Such strategies of resistance exist both in the occupied homeland and in diaspora. These strategies converge and diverge in variant degrees. The hope of Palestinians of gaining freedom and gaining their rights is diminishing by the day. This is because both Israelis and Palestinians have exhausted their occupation apparatus and forms of resistance respectively. The diminishing hope should be alarming for both nations.
The aims of the dissertation were to investigate the relationship between these Palestinian cultural productions as a growing artistic and literary genre and their position in the context of Palestinian politics, the politics of resistance against the politics of settler colonialism. This I have done first, in Chapter 2, through explaining the concepts of power, biopower, biopolitics, resistance, hope and liminality in relation to the Palestinian situation. The dissertation has both explained the historical circumstances in which the productions were produced and, further, through Chapters 3 and 4, shown how the development of Palestinian resistance can be seen through literary and cultural materials. In particular, I have presented a range of different cultural materials. These have included poems designed for chanting, photographs that were used to illustrate the biography of the homeland of a Palestinian in exile, a film that shows Palestinians living in Israel and in the West Bank, two novellas with stories about Palestinians holding on to hope and then losing it, and a book by a Palestinian written while imprisoned. These productions have shown how power can be contextualised and how resilience can endure. Moreover, the productions, especially those in Chapter 4, show how, when hope is lost, people will move from resistance strategies of endurance to those of violence. In this way, I have addressed and answered my three research questions: firstly showing how, and in what ways, postcolonial literature can demonstrate strategies of resilience (Research Question 1); secondly showing why, and to what extent, Palestinian resistance strategies are biopolitical and have arisen to address biopolitical power strategies by the coloniser (Research Question 2); and thirdly, showing how important hope is as to whether or not people simply engage in *sumud*, keep existing in their daily lives though ‘thin’ resistance, or move on to more violent strategies of ‘think’ resistance (Research
Question 3). The hope for Palestinians is diminishing and injecting fragments of it perhaps is no longer valid.
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For example, Hamas ideology is a militant Islamic Palestinian nationalist movement in the West Bank and Gaza Strip that is dedicated to the establishment of an independent Islamic state in historical Palestine. Founded in 1987, Hamas opposed the secular approach of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and rejected attempts to cede any part of Palestine. Hamas mainly adopt thick resistance strategies as in armed struggle but sometimes they take no actions fearing an Israeli heavy retaliation on innocent civilians.