Introduction: Knowledge, Power, and the "Settler Colonial Turn" in Palestine Studies

Journal:	*Interventions*
Manuscript ID	Draft
Manuscript Type:	Special Issue Paper
Keywords:	Palestine, settler colonialism, indigeneity, resistance, Israel

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Introduction: Knowledge, Power, and the "Settler Colonial Turn" in Palestine Studies

This special issue presents articles on the topic of "Settler Colonialism in Palestine," covering conceptual and empirical, historical and contemporary, as well as literary, legal and political aspects of the debate. All articles examine the validity and applicability of the settler colonial paradigm to the context of Palestine (West Bank, Gaza Strip, East Jerusalem, and the 1948 territories). They approach this paradigm as a powerful means to challenge and disarticulate established historiographies and narratives, and, as such, engage with settler colonialism as a structure (Wolfe, 1999, 2006), but also with the various forms of resistance and decolonisation that aim at undoing this structure.

1. The 2015 Exeter "Settler Colonialism in Palestine" Conference

The special issues stems from an academic conference organised by the European Centre for Palestine Studies (ECPS) at the University of Exeter and funded by the UK's Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC).[1] The conference, held under the title of "Settler Colonialism in Palestine", took place in October 2015 and aimed to discuss the application of the paradigm to the case of Palestine, as reflected in the content of the present special issue. It was followed by a workshop on the Naqab Bedouin, gathering the main experts in the field. In the pursuit of fresh and original discussion, the event welcomed established academics and emerging scholars into a space for lively debate. The conference aimed at exploring the interpretative opportunities for further scholarly work on Palestine offered by the settler colonial paradigm, as well as testing the limits of the application of a concept that has been mainly developed with regards to white Anglo-Saxon settler colonies (Australia, Canada, Aotearoa/New Zealand, etc.). The main questions that were raised not only regarded the intellectual and political opportunities opened up by a settler colonial lens of analysis (Lorenzo Veracini tackles this problem at length in his contribution to this issue), but also delved deeper into the historical circumstances that produced and continue to reproduce present colonial practices of dispossession, displacement, violence and elimination against Palestine's native population.

Shortly before the conference, we, the organizers,[2] were informed that the conference, which was originally scheduled to take place in Exeter's main campus where the ECPS usually runs its activities, would be moved to the picturesque but rather isolated St. Luke's campus. What at first glance may seem an irrelevant anecdote is in fact an indication of the amount of political frenzy that followed the publication of the conference call for papers, and which shook for a few months our otherwise quiet and rural university town. Repeated conversations between the conference organisers, the University's management, and the Exeter police were required so to ensure the event would take place, and that it would go ahead without infringing on the principle of academic freedom and the intellectual integrity of those participating in the event.

---

[1] The conference was funded through the AHRC Early Career Fellowship (2014-16) on "Gender and Settler Colonialism: Women's Oral Histories in the Naqab".

[2] The conference was organized by Francesco Amoruso, William Gallois, Andrew Meyer, Ilan Pappe, Sophie Richter-Devroe and Endika Rodriguez-Martin.

URL: http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/riij Email: riij-peerreview@journals.tandf.co.uk

For Peer Review Only

As Lorenzo Veracini discusses in this issue, comparative work on Palestine and other settler colonies tends to spark significant outcry amongst supporters of Zionism. Repeated efforts to interfere with academic freedom have had the consequence of dragging research out of academia and into Israel's hasbara and lobbying efforts. Two arguments often upheld in Zionist responses to a settler colonial approach on the study of Palestine/Israel are relevant to the topics treated in this special issue and to the context in which the conference took place. The first argument is that Israel is an exceptional case in history, and therefore the Jewish national movement cannot possibly be understood vis-à-vis the impact it has had on the Palestinians. However, settler colonial studies in no way negates differences (which are intrinsic to any comparative endeavour); what it does is to compare what happens when one people replaces—through violent acts of conquest and dispossession—another that had previously established its presence on the land. Israel was founded on and continues to rely on the settler-colonial logic of conquest through displacement, dispossession and elimination of the native Palestinians from their land (as even past Zionist leaders and contemporary commentators have acknowledged; see Degani 2016).

The second argument is that looking at Israel as a settler state implies bias and one-sidedness towards the Palestinians. It is this second argument that sustained repeated efforts by various Zionist activists and organisations to halt our event. In a letter to the AHRC aimed at stopping the research body from funding the conference and the attached workshop, head of the Board of Deputies of British Jews Gillian Merron wrote: "It appears that this is a publicly funded attempt to further a political agenda masquerading as an academic exercise" (Firsht 2015a). Similarly, the Jewish Leadership Council (JLC) lamented "a lack of opportunity to submit opposing views on the issue of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict" (University of Exeter News). We find the notion that any critical discussion about Israel needs to necessarily include representatives of all views on the issue questionable. It would be like accusing of bias a conference on British colonialism which does not include at least one discussant believing that Great Britain was never a colonial power (or, likewise, that it justified its colonial rule). Frustrated by their failure in halting the event, the JCL appointed two defenders of the Zionist cause, Alan Johnson (BICOM) and Professor Gabriel Noah Brahm, who attended our conference with the stated purpose of "sharing a Zionist perspective" (Firsht 2015c). Johnson and Brahm contributed to the Q&A sessions, taking it upon themselves to try to discredit the organisers on a personal level and intimidate one of the junior scholars present. Until here nothing new under the sun, had the JLC not released a statement regarding an alleged agreement with the conference organisers, according to which we would have invited the two to participate as commentators to our panels (Firsht 2015b). Not only we dismiss this claim as false, but we restate our contrariety to any form of dialogue that equates the oppressor with the oppressed, or the coloniser with the colonised.

After sustained conversations with the University management, we finally succeeded in going ahead with our conference on "Settler Colonialism in Palestine". Given that other universities had previously cancelled academic conferences deemed "anti-Israeli" such as the 2015 Southampton conference on the State of Israeland international law (Abunimah 2015), we think it is paramount to recognise the success obtained in securing our University's support for the conference. In fact, we hope that Exeter could serve as a precedent for further critical discussions of Israel to take place despite Zionist backlash. We therefore would like to renew our thanks to all the conference and workshop participants, and to the University's leadership, who proved that despite political

URL: http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/riij Email: riij-peerreview@journals.tandf.co.uk

interference, academic investigations of Zionist settler colonialism in Palestine are destined to grow and, one can only hope, contribute to bring justice and equality for all.

2. State of the Field

Scholarly engagement with settler colonialism as an historical, geographical and political formation is relatively recent (Piterberg 2008). Of course, among Palestinian writers (e.g. Hilal 1976; Said 1979; Sayegh 1965[2012]), settler colonialism has featured as interpretive paradigm for the Zionist invasion since early on. Painfully aware of Zionism's aim to drive the Palestinian natives from the land in order to inhabit it with settler-colonisers, these works highlighted Zionism's settler colonial focus on territorial gains rather than native labour exploitation.

The fact that territorial control and expansion is at the heart of the Zionist settler colonial project moved even more into scholarly focus after the 1967 war, when Israel occupied the West Bank, Gaza and Golan Heights. Maxime Rodinson's *Israel: A Colonial-Settler State?* (1973) promulgated a settler colonial perspective internationally, and the work of revisionist historians contributed to establishing the paradigm further. These works variously foregrounded Israel's focus on land expropriation and ethnic cleansing of the native population (Pappe 1992); frontier expansionism and land acquisition patterns, also in comparative perspective (Kimmerling 1983) as well as land and labour exploitation (Shafir 1989).

From the mid-1990s onwards the settler colonial paradigm has gained prominence in Palestine Studies, to the extent that one might even speak of a "Settler-Colonial Turn" (Busbridge 2018, 94) emerging. This turn was sparked by Patrick Wolfe's seminal work on settler colonialism on the one hand (1999), and the growing disillusion in Palestine with the 1993 Oslo two-state solution framework, and its conceptual underpinnings which frame Zionist settler colonialism in Palestine as an ethno-national "conflict" between Palestinians and Israelis rather than a settler colonisation, on the other.

Countering this orthodox liberal peace paradigm, a steadily growing group of scholars (Piterberg 2008, Shafir 1996, Veracini 2010, 2013, 2015; Wolfe 1999, 2006, 2016; Yiftachel 2006, Falah 2005, Yiftachel 2006, 2008, Nsasra et al. 2014) have been providing in-depth analysis of the Zionist project as settler colonial. The paradigm has been applied in particular by scholars analysing the context of Palestinians in Israel, studying "the geopolitics of enclavisation" (Falah 2005), the "internal colonialism [of Palestinians inside Israel]" (Zureik 1979), or revealing the "ethnocracy" of the Israeli regime which promotes the expansion, settlement and domination of the dominant group in contested areas while maintaining aspects of a democratic form (Yiftachel 2006, 2008). A sign of the growing relevance of the paradigm is the foundation of the *Settler Colonial Studies* journal, edited by Edward Cavanaugh and Lorenzo Veracini.[3] Since the journal's inception in 2010 three special issues have been dedicated to Israel and Palestine (Salamanca, Qato, Rabie, Samour 2012 Svirsky 2014; Veracini 2015)

Patrick Wolfe's (1999, 2006) two-part argument that, one, settler colonialism is based on a "logic of elimination of the native" (2006, 387) and, two, must be understood as a "structure not an event"

[3] (http://ojs.lib.swin.edu.au/index.php/settlercolonialstudies/index).

URL: http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/riij Email: riij-peerreview@journals.tandf.co.uk

(2006, 338), has laid the foundations for the expansion of a critical and revisionist scholarship that adopts the settler colonial paradigm to analyse Israeli rule over Palestine and Palestinians. Wolfe argued that settler colonisation is not a one-off event, but rather an ongoing structure whose primary aim is the elimination of the native to secure settler control over the land. As a continuous project of indigenous displacement, removal and depopulation, the ultimate aim of settler colonialism is to eliminate the native and inhabit the land with the settler population.

As such, settler colonialism is decidedly different from other forms of colonial rule, in particular in its relation to the indigenous colonized population and as regards land and labour relations. In colonial settings the indigenous are ruled predominantly from the metropole, whereas settler-colonisers come to stay on the land and aim to erase indigenous presence (Veracini 2013, 27). Settler colonialism thus in an ongoing event, as Wolfe explains:

> settler colonies were (are) premised on the elimination of the native societies. The split tensing reflects a determinate feature of settler colonization. The colonizers come to stay-invasion is a structure, not an event (Wolfe 1999, 1).

Wolfe's focus on the structural continuity of settler colonialism thus also highlighted that the 'elimination of the native' is not a one-off event, but takes different and evolving forms and modalities (see articles by Nutt and by Rodriguez-Martin, this issue). The logic of elimination passes through various stages: expulsion and killing, but also assimilation, and various forms of discursive elimination. While the Israeli state continues to expel, displace and ethnically cleanse Palestinians (see Pappe 2006), it has also tried to eliminate the indigenous population by assimilating them as well as discursively erasing them denying them their status and as natives of – and thus with rights to – the land (see Rouhana and Sabbagh-Khoury, this issue). Wolfe explains:

> This logic [of elimination] certainly requires the elimination of the owners of that territory, but not in any particular way. […]. Indeed, depending on the historical conjuncture, assimilation can be a more effective mode of elimination than conventional forms of killing, since it does not involve such a disruptive affront to the rule of law that is ideologically central to the cohesion of settler society. When invasion is recognized as a structure rather than an event, its history does not stop—or, more to the point, becomes relatively trivial—when it moves on from the era of frontier homicide. Rather, narrating that history involves charting the continuities, discontinuities, adjustments, and departures whereby a logic that initially informed frontier killing transmutes into different modalities, discourses and institutional formations as it undergirds the historical development and complexification of settler society. (Wolfe 2006, 402)

What liberal logic presents positively as policies of integration, access and/or assimilation thus might in fact constitute in a settler colonial context a form of elimination of the native in disguise. This is particularly relevant in the case of contemporary settler colonial practices, such as Israel's, where the state employs strategies of elimination while also simultaneously striving to preserve its image as 'multicultural' modern liberal democracy. We might ask then how policies which isolate individuals from non-national (e.g. kinship, see Wolfe 2006, 397) structures, integrate them into wage labour, or transfer communal lands to individual property – that is policies that aim at transforming and uplifting the native to 'modern' autonomous citizens, owners and/or legal

URL: http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/riij Email: riij-peerreview@journals.tandf.co.uk

subjects – are not only modernising trajectories, but also function to eliminate the native. The relationship between settler colonialism's logic of elimination and liberal democracies thus can be commensurable and mutually reinforcing.

Furthermore, settler colonialism also differs from colonialism in its structuring of labour relations. As Shafir (1996) has shown, settler colonialism depends on the elimination of the indigenous labourer and economic separatism rather than colonialism's racialised labour exploitation. While some of the early settler colonial scholarship also employed class as an analytical lens, reading the relationship between settler-colonizers and the colonized as one dominated by their labour relations, and relation to the means of production (see e.g. Hilal 1976), Shafir (1996) provided a comprehensive typology of different colonies. Out of the four types he describes, 'pure settlement colony' aimed at maximising settler and eliminated indigenous presence on the land. In such a settler colony the economy should rely on the labour force of the settlers, not the native colonized. Pure settler states' economies, such as Israel, rely on settler and immigrant labour force while using the resources and land expropriated from the indigenous population. In Israel the conquest of labour thus depended on the conquest of land, and it is here that that state violence and exclusion was coupled with forced displacement and land expropriation (Yiftachel 2003). Settler colonialism's focus on territory is thus tightly linked to its logic of elimination. Settler colonialism, in contrast to colonialism, does not destroy to exploit, but to replace (Wolfe 2006, 388).

Replacing means eliminating the indigenous, but, as an ongoing structure, settler colonialism also requires the settlers' continuous striving to indigenize (see Veracini, 2013 and this issue). Veracini (2013 and this issue) maintains that while colonialism operates by sustaining and maintaining the difference between colonizer and colonized, "a settler colonial project is ultimately successful only when it extinguishes itself—that is, when the settlers cease to be defined as such and become ''natives,'' and their position becomes normalized" (2013, 28). Settlers thus need to indigenize.

Veracini (2013 and this issue) argues that while Zionist settler colonialism was successful in maintaining this classic settler colonization model in the 1948 areas of Historical Palestine, today's Israel, it did not manage to continue this model after the 1967 occupation of the West Bank, Gaza, East Jerusalem and Golan Heights. Whereas the Zionist regime adopted a strategy of eliminating the native through population transfer, cleansing and killing before during and after the Nakba, and then continued to assimilate, through for example extension of settler citizenship (a form of eliminating indigenous claims), the minority of Palestinian who remained in what became Israel, they could not do so in the 1967 Occupied Territories. Palestinians constitute the majority in the Occupied Territories; the distinction between ruler and ruled, occupier and occupied thus is starkly maintained, not dissolved. Settler colonizers did not manage to indigenize in the Occupied Territories.

> On the one hand, the occupation is essential to the entire settlement project, and dismantling it would jeopardize the viability of the settlements themselves. On the other hand, the occupation erases the very conditions necessary to produce a viable settler colonial project. It is a double bind from which, from the Zionist point of view, there is no way out. Israeli planners thought they could achieve settler colonial goals via essentially colonial means, apparently not realizing how inherently antithetical the two circumstances are. (Veracini, 2013:32)

URL: http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/riij Email: riij-peerreview@journals.tandf.co.uk

For Veracini the aims and structures of occupation/colonization and settler colonialization thus ultimately are incompatible.

Given these marked differences between occupation, colonialism and settler colonialism, the indigenous population's quest and strategies for decolonization thus also might differ in the two contexts. Wolfe's structuralist account has been critiqued for leaving little space for indigenous agency, resistance and politics (see, among others, Busbridge 2018; Svirsky 2014), and for reifying and essentialising the polarity between settler and native (see Svirsky and Ben Arie, this issue) – how can decolonization happen if settler colonialism is an ongoing structure aimed at the elimination of the native? What forms of agency are available to the native if the relations between settler-colonizer and colonized are understood through such absolute binarism? And might settler colonialism, as a paradigm, risk foreclosing transformative and decolonizing perspectives and agencies?

In addition to interrogating the paradigm of settler colonialism at a conceptual level, the contributions in this special issue aim to answer these questions, highlighting the different forms of decolonization, agency and resistance as enacted by the colonised themselves.

3. SUMMARY OF ARTICLES IN THIS SPECIAL ISSUE

Despite the variety of topics and disciplinary approaches present in this special issue, its contributors follow a common thread aiming to discuss the relationship between a geographical locale, Palestine, and the explanatory potential of a conceptual tool box, the settler colonial paradigm, for the exploration of this place and its peoples' past, present, and future. Some of the authors choose to depart from an analysis of different aspects of the settler colonial reality of Palestine to problematize, expand, or highlight the importance of the settler colonial paradigm. Such is the case of the opening article, co-authored by Marcelo Svirsky and Ronnen Ben Arie, which condenses much larger research that has recently been published in a book (2018). Their contribution, titled "Settler Colonialism and the Logic of Double Elimination", makes a significant intervention in the way Patrick Wolfe's "elimination of the native" is usually understood. Departing from an historical analysis of forms of shared life between Jews, Muslims, Christian and other groups under Ottoman rule, they complicate Wolfe's binarism and suggest that the termination of shared existence in Palestine was not a by-product of Zionist invasion, but paramount to the success of the settler colonial project. In this sense elimination is double as it targets both the social reproduction of the indigenous Palestinian collective and the possibility of Palestine's Jews subtracting themselves from the unequal relations that mark settler colonial realities. Their work also contributes to situate racialization as a core process within settler identity-construction and the parallel destruction of identities that challenged the erasure of shared life as part of the erasure of indigenous life worlds.

A similar approach emphasising the importance of historical research into the specific articulations of the Zionist project in Palestine is employed by Endika Rogriduez-Martin. His methodologically sound and fact-based demographic analysis of the impact of land purchases on the demographic

URL: http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/riij Email: riij-peerreview@journals.tandf.co.uk

For Peer Review Only

balance in the sub-districts of Haifa and Nazareth during the British Mandate period points toward the centrality of land purchases for creating the demographic preconditions to the 1948 Nakba. Built on thorough archival research and the redesigning of British colonial censuses, Rodriguez Martin's article revisits population sources and reads them against settler colonial theory to argue that the Mandate period is indeed far more crucial in creating the demographic preconditions for the 1948 Nakba than so far understood. Despite Jewish land ownership accounting for a mere six percent by the time the Jewish state was established, the demographic consequences of land purchases went far beyond the sheer amount of land acquired by the Jewish National Fund and other Zionist companies. Taking as an illustrative example the sub-districts of Haifa and Nazareth, the article quantifies the impact of land purchases in terms of demography, and digs deeper into the politics of land purchases. Rogriduez-Martin's contribution also provides a demographic perspective on the flexibility of settler movements in terms of adjusting their means for population transfer to determinate historical circumstances and population patterns.

Stephen Nutt's "Pluralized Sovereignties" also departs from the settler colonial reality of Palestine, understood through the lenses of Patrick Wolfe's conceptualisation of invasion, to unpack the notion of state sovereignty in order to better understand the destruction of Indigenous life-worlds. If sovereignty is typically interested by a fundamental tension, that between the absolute power of the state and the constituent revolutionary forces that gave birth to the sovereign in the first instance, then settler colonialism comes to represent the ground on which European modernity resolves this contradiction. On the frontier, and by the means of the elimination of the native, the paradox of sovereignty is played out "both literally – in the expansion of self-determining settler societies into space — and figuratively in an ongoing discourse on decentralised constituent power that fetishizes the frontier and the native it encounters there". In the context of Palestine, Nutt argues, the production of a mythology of wilderness parallel to the American one could not take place, and was therefore replaced rhetorically by the desertification of Palestine as a political space. This was achieved by the means of the conquest of labour in the pre-state period as an attack on Palestinians' possibilities of social reproduction, and in the culminating moment of the 1947-48 ethnic cleansing. The multiplicity of sovereignties that exercise eliminatory power over Indigenous people does not cease with their physical elimination — and in the case of Palestine did not end in 1948. Today's frontier expansion in the territories seized in 1967 is an example of how the state, the IDF, and the settlers — a plurality of sovereign agents — enable a process of structural invasion that finds its roots in the constitution of belligerent settlements in the pre-state period.

The last three articles featured in this issue instead take a direct look at the settler colonial paradigm and use it as a conceptual tool to analyse historical, political, and discursive aspects of Zionist settler colonialism and Palestinian resistance to it.

Nadim Rouhana and Areej Sabbagh-Khoury adopt the settler colonial paradigm to analyse developments in Palestinian group identity, resistance, and political behaviour within the internationally recognised borders of the settler state. Their article employs the concept of return of history to explore the relation between narrative and political consciousness amongst the Palestinian constituency within the 1948 territories, today's Israel. The Nakba is here taken as the defining experience in Palestinian history, and its absence/return within the collective memory and discourse of Palestinians in the 1948 territories is seen as crucial for understanding shifts in the community's political and cultural discourses and behaviour. The authors define the return of

URL: http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/riij Email: riij-peerreview@journals.tandf.co.uk

history "as the process in which a dormant past is reconstituted and becomes a constitutive force in present collective consciousness and in envisioning the political future". Such a framework is particularly apt for analysing political mobilisation amongst Indigenous communities within settler states. Indigenous histories are indeed fundamentally incompatible with those of the settler collectives, as Indigenous oppression and elimination is premised upon the erasure of their presence in history. The return of the Nakba in Palestinian public discourse within the state of Israel needs therefore be understood as the defining force of current articulation of the group's collective consciousness. The political consequence of the return of history is that Palestinian citizens of Israel are increasingly aware that the two-state solution framework does not address the issue of their ongoing marginalisation and colonisation.

Equally concerned with the production of narratives and counter-narratives within a settler colonial context is Samar AlJahdali's literary analysis of two novels centred around the events of the Nakba, Elias Khoury's *Gate of the Sun* (1988) and Leon Uri's *The Haj* (1984). Her article that seeks to revisit the settler colonial paradigm in order to better understand the inseparable relationship between Zionist settler narratives and American imperial narratives — hence the analysis of the Jewish American author's novel. AlJahdali's article sheds light on the epistemic erasure of the Palestinian narrative in history and in fiction, as demonstrated through her textual analysis. This contrapuntal reading of the two novels highlights the power of writing in the production of narratives and counter-narratives, with a particular focus on Khoury's narration "from below" of the exodus of Palestinians from the Northern Galilee in 1948. Crucially, whereas Uri produces a typical linear narrative of settler immigration and Indigenous disappearance, Khoury resists closure and persists with a circular narrative that rests on the continuity of the Nakba as an unfinished process, and on the enactment of return.

Closing this issue, Lorenzo Veracini's article on the interpretative value of settler colonial studies and its contribution in reframing the Palestinian-Israeli "conflict". Veracini's article is interested in the political relevance of adopting a settler colonial lens to analyse the past, present, and future of Palestine. In light of the demise of the two-state solution, Veracini argues that understanding the present reality as a settler colonial one is necessary to imagining decolonial scenarios that take into account the specificities of settler colonialism as a distinct mode of domination. This contribution offers a number of valuable insights on Zionism as settler colonialism, and does so debunking exceptionalist claims that argue that settler colonialism cannot explain Zionism because it obscures its specific characteristics. Veracini counter-argues reminding us that settler colonialism as a comparative field is in fact preoccupied with the analysis of the context-specific relations that settler collectives establish with indigenous peoples, and does not aim to conclude that all settler colonial movements are *exactly* the same. Veracini in particular is interested in understanding how Israel is performing as a settler state, compared to other settler states, and what such understanding means in terms of opening up spaces for decolonisation. In line with previous writings (2007, 2013), he argues that the occupation of 1967 and the subsequent colonial policy of segregation in the West Bank, Gaza and East Jerusalem, sits in contradiction with the policy of subordinate integration (e.g. through extension of citizenship rights to erase Indigenous sovereignty) that has characterised the way the state has dealt with its Palestinian citizens. Hence, while seeking to erase the Palestinian collective, the occupation in fact constitutes it and condemns Israel to a perpetual inability to complete the settler colonial project in historic Palestine.

URL: http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/riij Email: riij-peerreview@journals.tandf.co.uk

Veracini's current and past contributions are premised on the understanding that historically "settler colonialism has been remarkably resistant to decolonisation" (2007, 1). However, this does not mean that the settler colonial analytical paradigm prevents us from analysing, and proposing strategies for, decolonisation. Nor does the fact that Israeli settler colonialism has been very resistant to decolonization mean that Palestinians cannot find ways to enact their agency and resist this complex matrix of control. It is true that particularly Wolfe's structural lens foregrounds an analysis of settler colonialism as a system. But, given that the settler colonial paradigm stresses the distinctiveness and difference of settler colonialism from colonialism, it also alerts us to read and frame the so-called 'conflict' in Palestine differently, and, relatedly, look for, think through and propose alternative forms decolonization different from both the liberal peace paradigm and "classic" anti-colonial national struggles.

The settler colonial analytical lens thus, we conclude, is needed for genuine decolonization proposals (see also Salamanca, Qato, Rabie, Samour, 2012). A settler colonial perspective unmasks Oslo's liberal peace paradigm and its two-state solution as false promises, that fail to acknowledge and address the root causes of settler colonisation in Palestine. Instead, it encourages us to analyse the ways in which a settler colonial context, such as Palestine, would need to be decolonized through models such as a binational or one-state solution that would extend equal citizenship and rights to the land for all.

The settler colonial perspective thus pushes us to rethink modes and models of liberation and decolonization. This means not only thinking beyond the classic two-state solution, but also approaching liberation and decolonization from perspectives other than classic national anticolonial frames (Salih, Richter-Devroe 2018) and starting our analysis from local modes of indigenous struggles for decolonization (Pappe 2018). An indigenous perspective in this regard is particularly needed, as argued in a recent article by Rana Barakat (2017) in which she engages critically with Veracini's argument. Barakat observes that from an Indigenous political perspective, the paradigm of success/defeat tends to reproduce settler narratives of conquest and does not aid Indigenous political objectives. We understand her argument as an important instance and reminder of the importance of "indigenist" interventions in the field of settler colonial studies. Looking ahead, we believe the settler colonial paradigm should not act as a straitjacket on knowledge production in and on Palestine. Rather, we hope that it can offer ways to think and push beyond established epistemological frameworks that have dominated the scholarship on Palestine and Israel, and offer new and alternative indigenous ways of decolonizing Palestine.

For Peer Review Only

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abunimah, Ali. 2015. "Univ. of Southampton cancels conference after government, Israel lobby pressure." *The Electronic Intifada,* 31 March 2015. https://electronicintifada.net/blogs/ali-abunimah/univ-southampton-cancels-conference-after-government-israel-lobby-pressure

Barakat, Rana. 2018. "Writing/righting Palestine studies: settler colonialism, indigenous sovereignty and resisting the ghost(s) of history." *Settler Colonial Studies* 8(3): 349-363.

Busbridge, Rachel. 2018. "Israel-Palestine and the Settler Colonial 'Turn': From Interpretation to Decolonization." *Theory, Culture & Society* 35(1): 91–115.

Degani, Arnon. 2016. "Israel Is a Settler Colonial State – and That's OK." Haaretz online, 13 September 2016. https://www.haaretz.com/opinion/.premium-israel-is-a-settler-colonial-state-and-that-s-ok-1.5433405

Firsht, Naomi. 2015a. "Board concerned over Exeter University conference on Israeli 'colonialism'." The Jewish Chronicle, 11 August 2015. https://www.thejc.com/news/uk-news/board-concerned-over-exeter-university-conference-on-israeli-colonialism-1.68071

Firsht, Naomi. 2015b. "Exeter University agrees to compromise over Israeli settlements conference." The Jewish Chronicle, 16 September 2015. https://www.thejc.com/news/uk-news/exeter-university-agrees-to-compromise-over-israeli-settlements-conference-1.58226

Firsht, Naomi. 2015c. "Deal over Israel conference is a 'waste of time'." The Jewish Chronicle, 1 October 2015. https://www.thejc.com/education/student/deal-over-israel-conference-is-a-waste-of-time-1.59174

Falah, Ghazi-Walid. 2005. "The Geopolitics of 'Enclavisation' and the Demise of a Two-State Solution to the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict." *Third World Quarterly* 26(8): 1341–72.

Hilal, Jamil. 1976. "Imperialism and settler colonialism in West Asia: Israel and the Arab Palestinian struggle." *Utafi* 1(1): 51–70.

Kimmerling, Baruch. 1983. *Zionism and Territory: The Socio-territorial Dimensions of Zionist Politics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Nsasra, Mansour, Sophie Richter-Devroe, Sarab Abu Rabia-Queder, and Richard Ratcliffe. 2014. *The Naqab Bedouin and Colonialism: New Perspectives*, London: Routledge.

Piterberg, Gabriel. 2008. *The Returns of Zionism: Myths, Politics and Scholarship in Israel,* London: Verso.

Pappe, Ilan. 1992. *The Making of the Arab-Israeli Conflict, 1947–1951*. London: I.B.Tauris.

Pappe, Ilan. 2006. *The Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine*. Oneworld Publishers.

For Peer Review Only

Pappe, Ilan. 2018. "Indigeneity as Cultural Resistance: Notes on the Palestinian Struggle Within 21st Century Israel." *South Atlantic Quarterly* 117(1): 157-178.

Rodinson, Maxime. 1973. *Israel: A Colonial-Settler State?* New York: Monad Press.

Salamanca, Omar Jabary, Mezna Qato, Kareem Rabie and Sobhi Samour. 2012. "Past Is Present: Settler Colonialism in Palestine." *Settler Colonial Studies* 2(1).

Salih, Ruba and Sophie Richter-Devroe. 2018. "Palestine beyond National Frames: Emerging Politics, Cultures, and Claims." *South Atlantic Quarterly* 117(1).

Said, Edward. 1979. *The Question of Palestine*. London: Routledge.

Sayegh, Fayez A. 2012[1965]. "Zionist colonialism in Palestine." *Settler Colonial Studies* 2(1): 206–225.

Settler Colonial Studies website (2011). http://ojs.lib.swin.edu.au/index.php/settlercolonialstudies/index

Shafir, Gershon. 1989. *Land, Labor, and the Origins of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict 1882–1914.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shafir, Gershon. 1996. "Zionism and Colonialism: A Comparative Approach." In *Israel in Comparative Perspective: Challenging the Conventional Wisdom*, edited by Michael Barnett. New York: State University of New York Press.

Svirsky, Marcelo. 2014. "The collaborative struggle and the impermeability of settler colonialism." *Settler Colonial Studies* 4(4): 327–333.

Svirsky, Marcelo and Ronnen Ben-Arie. 2018. *From Shared Life to Co-Resistance in Historic Palestine*. London and New York: Rowman & Littlefield.

University of Exeter News. 17 September 2015. "Jewish Leadership Council and University of Exeter announce new approach to debating issues pertaining to Israeli-Palestinian conflict." http://www.exeter.ac.uk/news/archive/2015/september/title_471745_en.html

Veracini, Lorenzo. 2007. "Settler colonialism and decolonization." *borderlands e-journal* 6(2). https://ro.uow.edu.au/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2342&context=lhapapers

Veracini, Lorenzo. 2010. *Settler Colonialism: A Theoretical Overview.* Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

Veracini, Lorenzo. 2011. "Introducing Settler Colonial Studies." *Settler Colonial Studies* 1(1): 1–12.

For Peer Review Only

Veracini, Lorenzo. 2013. "The Other Shift: Settler Colonialism, Israel, and the Occupation." *Journal of Palestine Studies* XLII(2): 26–42.

Veracini, Lorenzo. 2015. "What can settler colonial studies offer to an interpretation of the conflict in Israel–Palestine?" *Settler Colonial Studies* 5(3): 268–271.

Wolfe, Patrick. 1999. *Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology: The Politics and Poetics of an Ethnographic Event.* London & New York: Cassell.

Wolfe, Patrick. 2006. "Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native." *Journal of Genocide Research* 8(4): 387—404.

Yiftachel, Oren. 2006. *Ethnocracy: Land and Identity Politics in Israel/Palestine*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Yiftachel, Oren. 2008. "Epilogue: Studying Naqab/Negev Bedouins—Toward a colonial paradigm?" *HAGAR Studies in Culture, Polity and Identities* 8(2): 83—108

Zureik, Elias T. 1979. *Palestinians in Israel: A Study of Internal Colonialism*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

For Peer Review Only