

This Is Our Home: Everyday Resistance of the Palestinians in Israel 1948-66

Marwan Darweish

Accepted manuscript PDF deposited in Coventry University's Repository

Original citation:

'This Is Our Home: Everyday Resistance of the Palestinians in Israel 1948-66', in *Resistances Between Theories and the Field*, ed. by Sarah Murru and Abel Polese, pub 2020 (ISBN 978-1-78660-935-9)

Publisher: Rowman and Littlefield

Copyright © and Moral Rights are retained by the author(s) and/ or other copyright owners. A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge. This item cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the copyright holder(s). The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Darweish, Marwan (2020). *This Is Our Home Everyday Resistance of the Palestinians in Israel: 1948–1966, Resistances Between Theories and the Field*, Edited by Sarah Murru and Abel Polese, Rowman & Littlefield International, London.

Published by Rowman & Littlefield International, Ltd. 6 Tinworth Street, London SE11 5AL, United Kingdom www.rowmaninternational.com

Rowman & Littlefield International, Ltd. is an affiliate of Rowman & Littlefield 4501 Forbes Boulevard, Suite 200, Lanham, Maryland 20706, USA With additional offices in Boulder, New York, Toronto (Canada), and London (UK) www.rowman.com

Copyright © 2020 by Sarah Murru and Abel Polese

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form or by any electronic or mechanical means, including information storage and retrieval systems, without written permission from the publisher, except by a reviewer who may quote passages in a review.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Information A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN: HB 978-1-78660-935-9 ISBN: PB 978-1-78660-936-6

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Murru, Sarah, editor. | Polese, Abel, 1976– editor. Title: Resistances : between theories and the field / edited by Sarah Murru and Abel Polese. Description: London : Rowman & Littlefield International Ltd, [2020] | Series: Resistance studies: critical engagements with power and social change | Includes bibliographical references and index. | Summary: “This book reflects upon the implications, social relevance, and ethical challenges of the growing field of Resistance Studies” — Provided by publisher. Identifiers: LCCN 2020000906 (print) | LCCN 2020000907 (ebook) | ISBN 9781786609359 (cloth) | ISBN 9781786609366 (paperback) | ISBN 9781786609373 (ebook) Subjects: LCSH: Government, Resistance to. | Social change. Classification: LCC JC328.3 .R494 2020 (print) | LCC JC328.3 (ebook) | DDC 323/.044—dc23 LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2020000906> LC ebook record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2020000907>

TM The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of American National Standard for Information Sciences Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI/NISO Z39.48-1992.

Chapter Five

Pages 103-122

This Is Our Home Everyday Resistance of the Palestinians in Israel: 1948–1966

Marwan Darweish

The aim of this chapter is to determine and examine what constituted everyday resistance for those Palestinians who lived in Israel,¹ and who experienced life under Israeli military rule, from 1948 to 1966. The establishment of the State of Israel in 1948 and the outcome of the war changed the power relations between Israel and the Palestinians and had an immediate and direct impact on the Palestinian people: Palestinians refer to these events as “the year of the Al Nakba” or “the Catastrophe”. The majority of Palestinians either were forced out of their homes or fled as a result of the war and became refugees in the West Bank and Gaza Strip and neighbouring Arab countries (Pappé 2006, 86–123). Those who remained were reduced to a minority within their homeland, cut off from the rest of their fellow nationals. It is estimated that in 1948 between 80,000 and 160,000 Palestinians remained, representing somewhere in the region of 10 percent of the original population. As a result of Al Nakba, Palestinians faced the destruction of their political, economic, and social structures (Ghanem and Mustafa 2009, 107; Bauml 2007), and this defeated population is largely absent from the Israeli state’s official history: Israel’s founding myth has been that Palestine was a land without a people for a people without a land (Pappé 2014). Where the Palestinian citizens of Israel did appear in the history of Israel, they were cast in the passive role of victims, and, at the same time that they were being excluded from Israeli narratives, Palestinians in Israel were also being excluded from the history of the Palestinian national resistance movement and the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) (Darweish 2006; Rouhana and Sabbagh-Khoury 2011). Scholarly research on the military period has inadvertently reinforced their erasure by focusing on Israeli mechanisms of control and oppression (Jiryis 1976; Zureik 1979; Lustick 1980; Cohen 2010; Sa’di 2014). After Al Nakba, Palestinian areas were divided into three main districts, each directly administered by a military governor. Harsh restrictions were imposed on the lives of the Arab minority, and these restrictions drew upon the Emergency Regulation Laws inherited from the British Mandate of 1945. Palestinians’ movements were restricted, and so people required a permit from the military governor to leave their village, whether it was to work, cultivate their land, visit family, obtain medical treatment, study, or travel for any other purpose outside the village boundary (Lustick 1980; Bauml 2007; Sa’di 2014). This research thus presents a new perspective on the reality faced by Palestinians in Israel after 1948, one which emphasises the agency of this community and documents its history of survival and resistance. While their new reality was characterised by the asymmetry of power between Israel and its Arab minority, and by marginalisation, they were able in their own way to resist the structural imbalance imposed on them. To maintain the fragmentation of and control over the Palestinian minority, the Israeli state reinforced the Palestinians’ economic dependence on the Jewish sector. The majority of Arab land was confiscated, water sources were controlled, and Palestinians were excluded from economic development plans. Having been detached from their land, they were positioned as an unskilled labour force for the Israeli economy. Arab villages became the source of cheap labour and served as dormitories for Arab workers (Kretzmer 1990; Khalidi 1988). Meanwhile, the family, which was the primary social economic unit of Palestinian society, was deeply shattered and became vulnerable. Mari (1978, 18) depicts Palestinians in this situation as “emotionally wounded, socially rural, politically lost, economically poverty stricken and nationally hurt. They suddenly became a minority ruled by a powerful, sophisticated majority against whom they fought to retain their country and land”. The heads of the extended families (mukhtar) became key contacts for people who wanted to obtain permits from

the military governor. The Israeli authorities employed a divide-and-rule policy, extending privileges to those mukhtars who were willing to cooperate with them. This became one of the key means by which the Israeli authorities maintained the subordination of the Arab minority and reinforced patterns of social and spatial fragmentation within the Arab population (Lustick 1980, 189). Sa'di (2014) has ably analysed the surveillance, political management, and control systems used by Israel to contain the Palestinian minority and silence this already fragmented community. This chapter examines the ways in which the Palestinian community responded to that control and oppression; it gives voice to their stories, especially during the period of the military rule from 1948 to 1966; and it counters the tendency to focus on the Palestinian territories occupied in 1967 (Hilal and Khan 2004; Hilal 2013) by assigning value to the voices of Palestinians in Israel and to the acts of resistance they carried out to contest the military rule imposed on them between 1948 and 1966.

This Is Our Home

This research draws on relevant academic literature in relation to everyday resistance, particularly where it explores the Palestinian context. Gordon (2008) identifies the specific underlying principles or “modalities of control” that have informed Israel’s use of power and suggests that, unlike the types of sovereign power, disciplinary power, and bio-power (Foucault 1982) that inform power relations in an array of political contexts and countries elsewhere, these modalities are specific to Israel’s controlling practices and do not necessarily exist in other places. The form and logic of these modalities of control shaped the numerous practices of resistance undertaken by Palestinians living in Israel from 1948 to 1966. If Foucault argues that “power is exercised only over free subjects, and only insofar as they are free” (Foucault 1982), Gordon (2002) further explains that Foucault’s account of the subject regards the subject neither as merely the passive product of power relations nor as entirely self-creating but allows for the ability to maintain agency within a restrictive structure. This situated practice of freedom, or what Lilja and Vinthagen prefer to call self-reflexiveness, allows for the choice either to resist or to submit (Lilja and Vinthagen 2014). Moreover, Bayat (2013, 5) has pointed out how little attention has been paid to the manner in which subaltern populations and communities of the disenfranchised can bring about changes in their life-worlds through their “quiet and unassuming daily struggles”. In many ways, the Arab minority within Israel in the years immediately following Al Nakba could be depicted as what Bayat (2013, 15) calls a “social non-movement”, which he characterises as “the collective actions of non-collective actors; they embody shared practices of large numbers of ordinary people whose fragmented but similar activities trigger much social change”. Bayat emphasises that the struggle to survive can quietly impinge on the domain of the propertied and powerful by means involving the unlawful acquisition of those resources necessary to enhance the life chances of disempowered people. Bayat (2010) distinguishes these “everyday forms of resistance” from the peasant resistance described by Scott (1990, 2013), and his distinction between quiet encroachment and survival strategies or everyday resistance rests upon the existence of a logic that shapes agents’ struggles and gains. In Bayat’s terms, everyday resistance could be described as a propositional act with its own logic that informs the numerous practices undertaken by individuals without coordination with each other. Despite this perspective, the chapter draws on the extensive work of Scott to analyse the actions taken by the Palestinians living under military rule, especially early research on silent resistance which was often invisible to the power holder (Scott 1987, 1990) and the everyday actions of pilfering and dissimulation which he terms as “Infrapolitics” (Scott 2005). Power relations are multiple, and resistance therefore manifests itself in multiple interactions. Abu-Lughod’s research on Bedouin women describes how resistance reveals the changing and multiple relations of power in their struggle. Lilja and Vinthagen (2014, 107) develop the idea of multiplicity further, arguing that “if resistance is a reaction to power, then the characteristics of the power strategy/relation affect the

kinds of resistance that subsequently prevail. Accordingly, it becomes interesting to discuss what kinds of resistance emanate from what kinds of power". Vinthagen and Johansson (2013, 2) state that "everyday resistance is about how people act in their everyday lives in ways that might undermine power". The next section presents seven forms of everyday resistance, which take the form of: reclaiming the home, resistance through agricultural cultivation, determination to remain, cultural forms of resistance, resistance to restrictions on movement, audible protest, and political and civil movements. The chapter then goes on to analyse how these different forms of resistance inform the conceptualisation of resistance and linkages between theory and practice in the case of the Palestinians in Israel. In conclusion, I will reflect on these forms of resistance, the issues they raise, and their implications for the field of Resistance Studies, as well as for the status of Palestinians in Israel.

EVERYDAYRESISTANCEOFPALESTINIANSINISRAEL

This section explores the ways in which the remnants of the Palestinian population, who found themselves living under alien rule in a country that was once their own, attempted to reclaim some degree of autonomy and control over their lives through the years of military rule from 1948 to 1966 (Darweish 2006; Rouhana and Sabbagh-Khoury 2011). This research is based on thirty-three qualitative structured interviews conducted in the Galilee, Triangle and Nakab2 (Negev) from 2013 to 2016, and it presents a case study from Umm al-Fahim to illustrate the story of one family who tried to return to their home after they had been evicted. The study's sampling reflects different locations and gender perspectives, along with varied social, political, and religious backgrounds. The study's interviews were conducted with the generation of Palestinians who lived through military rule, most of whom are now in their seventies, eighties, and nineties, and so it took the unique opportunity to document their experiences while firsthand oral accounts are still available. The study's interview questions focused on people's experience of living under military rule, and the analysis set out to determine what was understood to constitute resistance within this context. Each interview lasted up to an hour and half, was conducted and recorded in Arabic, and was then transcribed and translated into English. The interviews were analysed using Nvivo software according to a spectrum of everyday resistance developed for this chapter. Based on analysis of the interviews, seven forms of everyday resistance were identified, and these involved: reclaiming the home, resistance through agricultural cultivation, determination to remain, cultural forms of resistance, resistance to restriction on movement, audible protest, and political and civil movements. In developing these categories of action, the research drew on previous scholarship which related to unarmed resistance to the Nazi occupation in Europe (Rings 1979; Sémelin 1989), as well as quiet resistance (Scott 1987, 1990).

"Reclaiming Our Home"

The case study set out here is drawn from Umm al-Fahim, a village in the Triangle where some of the interviews were conducted, and it tells the story of an individual woman who took the initiative to resist the military governor's plans to keep occupying the family home.³ The military governor, who was appointed to the small village in Wadi Aa'ra, occupied its main two storey house, made it his headquarters, and expelled the owners, who tell their story here. Umm al-Fahim is a small town with olive, almond, and fig trees besides the seasonal crops of wheat, barley, lentils, and vegetables. After the armistice agreement, the town was transferred from Jordanian to Israeli rule.

My father grew up in the twinned towns of Umm al-Fahim and Lajjun that were later turned into rubble by Zionist forces and its residents expelled. He went to pursue his higher education in Birzeit and later joined the growing ranks of city labourers and worked in the British Oil Refinery in Haifa.

My father had built a dream house, the house that made his marriage possible. A two-storey stone structure in a luxurious setting. A house in a small town of four thousand, where people mostly live in traditional mud houses. The family house was in the middle of the town, placed high up, and noticed by everyone who approached the town. One day the soldiers entered the house and kicked all the family out, removing and throwing away whatever their hands picked from the neatly organised items of the newlywed couple's household. They returned with military and office equipment and their commander settled in at my parents' bedroom. My parent's house was turned into a military headquarters. My father refused the abusers' offer to make him a school teacher and never felt happy again. My mother maintained her personality by telling us the stories and joining my father's militant position and with an inner anger and sadness. We moved to live in the Haddad's house, owned by a Christian family. I grew alien to that place, internalising my parents' and grandparents' alienation. "This is not our house" was probably the first complete sentence I learned to master and I heard it every day from my mother and grandmother. My parents hardly did any maintenance on the building and never made any permanent changes. Thirteen years later in a stormy winter, the whole house structure began to collapse. One day I was collected by my sister from school and when we got closer to our home, I mean the Haddad's home where we were living, my sister asked, "Do you promise not to tell anybody?" My sister whispered: "Today, we are going back to our home". After that she struggled hard to keep up as I speedily ran toward the Haddad's home. There I found my mother in control like a commander, her older sister next to her and the kids ready to move. The rain was heavy and lightning and thunder in the sky. But we moved toward our own real home where my parents got married and enjoyed their first days of love together. We had reached the "headquarters" as our home had come to be referred to by the people of Umm al-Fahim. The Israeli flag was raised and an Israeli soldier watching the workers and the road below. She moved forward, entered the gate, and looked above and inside as if seeing the place for the first time. We followed her to the second floor, to her first and original bed room, the Military Governor's office. My mom and her older sister and their eight kids reached the "headquarters", as our home had come to be referred to by the local people. We were happy and scared, orderly and chaotic. My mom was silent and worried in anticipation of something happening. The heavy storm continued outside and the Military Governor, the ruler of the town and area, didn't make it that day to his office and we stayed there.

The military governor agreed that the family could return to their home and he negotiated with another family in the village to rent a house and moved to the new location.

Resistance through Cultivation

This section demonstrates the everyday quiet resistance that was enacted by Palestinians who continued to cultivate their land. In 1948, large areas of Palestinian land were confiscated or designated as closed military areas to which entry by Arabs, including the landowners themselves, was forbidden. In addition, the Israeli authorities would restrict access to some Arab land to weekends or Jewish holidays as a way of undermining the local agricultural economy and weakening the Palestinians' attachment to their land (Kretzmer 1990).⁴ Local people found ways to circumvent the restrictions imposed on them, as they knew that Israel would confiscate any land left uncultivated. One farmer explained how they persisted in cultivating their land: "[F]armers and land owners in Umm al-Fahim did not accept such a closure and they used to go in secret or undercover, without the approval or knowledge of the army, to work on the land and cultivate it in order to protect and maintain the ownership of the land and to prevent the risk of confiscation". Israel placed a particular emphasis on combatting the planting of trees such as olives and almonds because these trees represented a long-term claim on the land. Instead, local farmers were encouraged to cultivate

vegetables and seasonal produce. In this context, the planting of trees came to be seen as a form of resistance. A more obvious type of resistance involved the formation of foraging teams who went to the nearby Jewish settlements in order to reclaim (or steal) grain and other produce that was often grown on land expropriated from the families of the raiders. Sometimes villagers reclaimed their property through a combination of quiet stealth and courage. Mua'awiya was a small hamlet near Umm al-Fahim, and in 1948 the Israeli military forced the 370 residents to leave the village before proceeding to destroy their homes (Jabareen 2007). The displaced people arrived in Umm al-Fahim with very little because they had left all their possessions behind. However, the village leaders refused to accept their expulsion and dispossession as a fait accompli. One of the residents explained how they used agricultural activity as a form of resistance:

We used the livestock as a method of returning to the land. We started immediately to take animals to graze on the land of the village. Step by step, we got closer to our homes and then recovered food and possessions. Gradually, we began to stay there. Another strategy we employed was to work on the land and harvest it. Eventually, the military issued temporary permits to work the land. Finally, this culminated in the military agreeing to allow us to return to our homes and rebuild them with one condition – that we would not ask for any compensation. (Jabareen 2007, 35)

Determination to Remain

The destruction of hundreds of entire villages and their infrastructure resulted in the kind of humanitarian crisis that accompanies the aftermath of any war, and the effects were exacerbated for the Palestinian minority who were subjected to extremely harsh living conditions (Pappé 2014). As the largest village in the Wadi A'ara region, Umm al-Fahim became a staging post for the thousands of dispossessed people who had been driven from their homes in neighbouring villages. The displaced lived in schools, deserted homes, mosques, and anywhere they could find a semblance of shelter. Some were able to stay with relatives for many months, and modest homes became crowded as people sought refuge. One resident vividly described the situation in those days: "Olive trees were covered with plastic sheets and became homes for the refugees, the little water springs became a magnet for refugees to stay in the area, and the whole village became like a big tent". In fact, many internally displaced people continued to live in caves for several years, enacting what is perhaps a "silent" form of resistance: the determination to stay in one's homeland whatever the suffering incurred (Scott 1987, 1990). The displaced and dispossessed received little support from the UN or any other international agency, whilst the newly established state of Israel showed little concern for the well-being of those they considered to be former enemies, and as such suspect aliens, in their midst (Jiryis 1976; Zureik 1979; Lustick 1980). As a consequence, most forms of relief were provided by relatives and local inhabitants who had managed to hold on to some of their property. Villagers would organise community-wide collections of basic supplies such as flour, oil, rice, eggs, and vegetables to distribute amongst the needy families. It all helped engender a very strong sense of communal solidarity between the locals and the displaced, a feeling that has endured over the years. As one informant recalled, "[A]fter we were expelled from our village, we lived with distant relatives for two weeks. They welcomed us and agreed that we could stay with them. They fed us and cared for us. We had nothing with us; no food and no money". One consequence of the harsh living conditions and shortages experienced by the Palestinian minority living under military rule was a renewed focus on developing means of self-sufficiency. Residents started to grow their own vegetables and rear chickens and rabbits secretly in their gardens and on rooftops in defiance of the military authority's regulations. Anyone discovered contravening these regulations risked a significant fine or imprisonment. Refugees and local residents alike started to forage for wild plants and vegetation such as spinach, asparagus, and the like. There were also figs,

grapes, different types of berries, and grains and pulses to be gathered if you knew where to look. Others made the most of whatever opportunity arose to trade and survive. A displaced person explained how his family managed after they were expelled from their village: "We used to buy eggs, barley, and flour and then sell it to the Jewish communities; this was a way of supporting our family and our extended family. This was done against the laws and regulations of the military authorities. Sometimes we were arrested and imprisoned and we paid a fine" (Interview, Umm al-Fahim, 13 July 2013). The Israeli authorities exerted strong pressure on social and political leaders to leave the country, even offering compensation for their land and property. Mohammed Abed Al Qader Younis, a leading figure amongst the Arab minority from the village of A'ara, was a particular target of the military authorities who faced direct intimidation and threats. His son explained that "my father was aware of the political implication[s] of the attempt to get him to leave and rejected all the pressure put on him by the government. For that he paid a high price: there were arrests, harassment, and obstacles put in his way by the Israeli authorities" (Interview, A'ara, 20 June 2013). In Umm al-Fahim, the head of one of the larger land-owning families had been out of the country in Lebanon in April 1948 but decided to return to the village and follow developments on the ground. The return of the landowner, who represented social, political, and economic authority in the village, encouraged many people to remain steadfast and stay on in their homes and hold on to their land.

Cultural Resistance

Another type of resistance to occupation was enacted through symbolic cultural activism. Protagonists refused to cooperate with military rule and demonstrated their continued loyalty to their community and its values by means of gestures, culture, individual actions, and dress. These actions are characterised by their symbolic nature and self-assertiveness and are sometimes regarded as the "quietest" form of resistance because they carry small risks (Rings 1979; Sharp 1990, 2005). This form of resistance is most likely to become pervasive because it is open to everyone and can operate at different levels of visibility and volume. Arabs in Israel found a number of ways to express their resistance in cultural form. For example, in 1949, when the village of Umm al-Fahim was handed over to Israel by the Jordanian forces, the Israeli military commander required all the residents to gather in the centre of the village and demanded that they hand in all their weapons to mark the end of the fighting. The residents were then instructed to celebrate the arrival of the Israeli army through singing and dancing. As an expression of resistance and in defiance of this order, women sang songs expressing their sorrow and anger rather than joy. This was an early instance of the ways in which Palestinians in Israel would express their opposition to Israeli military rule through songs, literature, and other cultural forms of resistance. Arab and Palestinian culture became a means to highlight their national identity. Poetry festivals and public meetings were held in Nazareth, Haifa, and other villages and provided people with the opportunity to express opposition to military rule in ways that did not provoke the military administration. Saud al-Asadi, a poet and folk singer from the Galilee, recalled celebrating the birthday of the tenth-century Arab poet Al Mutanabbi at the YMCA in Nazareth in 1965: "It was a large gathering. In this way, culture brought people together and was a very powerful means of struggle. Al Mutanabbi was proud of his Arab identity and he was used as an outlet to express our own Arab identity in Israel" (Interview, Nazareth, 9 June 2013). Weddings, as well as national and religious celebrations became a medium for political expression and provided opportunities for the singing of national songs as a quiet way of challenging military rule. Sometimes traditional songs would be sung in the local dialect denouncing the military governor and describing him in a scathing and disrespectful manner whilst he was

actually present, sitting unawares as one of the important guests at a wedding or a social gathering. Al Asadi described one occasion when his father used a wedding to sing the praises of an Egyptian general who was respected for his stand against Israeli, British, and French forces during the Suez war of October 1956, which aimed to provoke regime change and depose Abdel Nasser. The general's name was Abed Al Muna'im Riyad, and it so happened that the groom was also called Riyad. Al Asadi recalls that "[m]y father used this occasion to highlight the groom's steadfastness, courage, and resilience but in fact he was referring to the Egyptian General. Everyone in the celebration understood this play on names and metaphor. He was accused of incitement and praising the enemy, but he totally denied that and insisted that he was singing about the groom" (Interview, Nazareth, 11 June 2013). In 1952, members of the Palestinian nationalist movement established an association for Arab poets in different villages in the Galilee and Triangle area. The association's centres became a focal point for political, cultural, and social activities that contested military rule and discrimination against the Arab population. Pappé (2011, 76) has summarised the critical role that culture played in the struggle of Palestinians in Israel for civil and national rights, noting that [p]oetry was the one area in which national identity survived the catastrophe of 1948 unscathed. What political activists did not dare express, poets sang out with force. Poetry was one medium through which the daily events of love and hate, birth and death, marriage and family could be intertwined with the political issues of land confiscation and state oppression and aired in public at special poetry festivals. . . . The Israeli secret service was powerless to decide whether this phenomenon was a subversive act or a cultural event.

As part of the system used to control Palestinians in Israel, the security forces created a network of informers and collaborators. The education system was entirely controlled by the Israeli security services and any appointment required their approval (Sa'di 2014). Teachers, including head teachers, were co-opted to inform and spy about their colleagues and any activity in their village. Schools would organise celebrations of Israel's Independence Day and head teachers competed amongst each other to show loyalty to the military administration. However, some parents and students refused to take part in such events. One informant, who was a pupil then, remembers that "I was asked by a teacher to bring money to cover the cost of the celebration of the Israeli Independence Day held in the school, and my dad refused to give me the money as a sign of rejection to the Israeli authorities" (Interview, Ia'bleen, 20 June 2013). Mahmoud Darwish, then a child in school and later to become a Palestinian national poet, was summoned by the military governor after reading poetry critical of the military authority during a school commemoration of Israel's Independence Day (White 2012, 75). It is understandable that teachers were afraid of expressing their views openly. Al Asadi, a teacher of Arabic language and literature, explained how he expressed his own rejection of the military government: "Once I wrote one of Al Mutanabbi's poems on the wall of my classroom. Its theme was that those who are used to accept humiliation will continue to be humiliated and controlled. I was then called up to the military governor's office and was reprimanded and humiliated because I wrote such a piece of poetry. My argument was that this poetry was written a thousand years ago" (Interview, Nazareth, 11 June 2013). One means of nonviolent resistance against military rule involved refusing to recognise the symbols and the leadership of the state. Photos of the Israeli prime minister and the president, as well as the Israeli flag, were hung on the walls of classrooms in Arab schools. An image of Omer Ibin Al Khattab, one of the most powerful caliphs in Islam and renowned for his commitment to justice and speaking the truth, was hung on the wall of a school in Umm al-Fahim, but the headmaster was asked to replace it with the photo of Chaim Weizman, a Zionist leader and the first president of Israel. One of our interviewees, then a student aged twelve, recalled that "secretly I went and smashed the photo of Weizman. Nobody knew who did it, but the message was clear" (Interview, Umm al-Fahim, 13 June

2013). The 1950s witnessed growing support for the Pan-Arab movement led by the president of Egypt, Gamal Abdel Nasser. He challenged Israel and the colonial powers, and this earned him such wide support that he became an iconic figure across the Middle East. Supporting Abdel Nasser was seen by many Palestinians in Israel as a symbol of their rejection of military rule. One interviewee explained, "I had the radio on the balcony and turned it on high so that others could listen to nationalist songs praising Abdel Nasser as an Arab leader and listen to his speeches. The military governor remanded and threatened me for doing that" (Interview, Umm al-Fahim, 22 April 2012).

Resistance to Restrictions on Movement

Israel imposed curfews and other measures as a way of controlling the movement of Arab residents. In response, the targets of such measures explored ways to bypass these controls. Anyone wishing to leave their village or town needed to apply for a permit at the military governor's office. One way to overcome this obstacle was bribery, as one interviewee explained: "It was possible to bribe both the military officers and the mukhtar; I gave them two kilograms of almonds so that they might give me a permit to work".⁵ Others who were refused permits travelled to work without one, and workers would stay away from their families for months at a time to avoid the risk of arrest and save the cost of travel. The harsh conditions endured by these workers fostered solidarity and mutual support amongst them. One of those who worked in Tel Aviv recalled that "life in Tel Aviv was harsh. We learned how to cook and to make bread and to live with basic supplies. We used to help each other and support each other to the point that strong friendships were forged and remained for years" (Interview, Umm al-Fahim, 18 June 2013). Occasionally the Israeli police would raid workplaces and arrest workers, impose fines, and send them back to their villages. A worker explained that they used to sleep in the orange groves in Jaffa: "We would make hammocks up in the trees as our beds in order to hide from the police. As we were up in the trees the police would see no bedding on the ground and assume there were no workers there" (Interview, Nazareth, 11 June 2013). Workers who went to larger population centres such as Tel Aviv or Petah Tikva in the centre of Israel were under pressure to change their names to Jewish names, so, for example, Mahmoud would become Yossi, Ahmad would become Moshi, and their employers could pretend that they were employing Jewish rather than Arab workers. Here is a story from a man who was a teenager during those years:

I went to high school in Haifa. I used to take the risk travelling every two weeks without a permit to Haifa at the age of 14. I used to travel on the bus and to disguise being an Arab I would buy a Hebrew newspaper and I would sit and read it, so when the soldier or police would ask everyone to come off the bus to show their permits I would stay on the bus and pretend not to be an Arab. So my permit was the Hebrew daily newspaper Yediot. The driver was Jewish and he knew I was an Arab, and he kept it quiet, because I brought him presents such as olives and olive oil. In 1965, I was arrested and taken to Afula police station. I was fined and then released late at night. (Interview, A'ara, 20 June 2013).

From Quiet Resistance to Audible Protest

The overt purpose of military rule was to maintain political and social segregation and control over the Arab community in Israel. The only political party that sought to involve both Jewish and Arab members as equals was the Israeli Communist Party (ICP), which was established in 1948. The ICP was a key vehicle for early campaigns against the restrictions and discriminatory practices imposed on the Arab population within Israel. As such, the ICP played an important role not only in the struggle for full equality for the Arab minority but also in the maintenance of an Arab national identity, and it consequently became the political home of leading Arab intellectuals, writers, and

poets (Pappé 2014; Touma 1980). Any resident who indicated a preparedness to vote for the ICP or any other party that opposed the military rule was threatened. Al Ittihad, the official newspaper of the ICP, was sold and distributed clandestinely because of the risk of arrest and punishment. As one interviewee recalled, “the communist party used to deliver their own newspaper secretly in the village. There were three or four members of the party who would do this. But if you met or visited openly with known members of the communist party or openly read their newspaper you would be punished” (Interview, la’bleen, 20 August 2014). The ICP and other nationalist groups organised the first national open political protest against the military authority, which took place in Nazareth on 1 May 1958. Thousands of demonstrators came from the surrounding villages to Nazareth, with the police attempting to block entrances to the town to deter people from participating and arresting activists before they reached Nazareth. By the end of the day, more than 350 people had been arrested and scores injured. May Day demonstrations then became an annual occasion for Palestinians in Israel to demand their civil rights and express their national identity by proclaiming their solidarity with nationalist and anti-colonial movements throughout the Arab world. One research participant who worked in the military government office in Nazareth explained the impact of such demonstrations: “The communists and nationalists would use the celebration of May Day as an occasion to confront with the military. Activists would spend hours preparing themselves to confront the army and the police” (Interview, Nazareth, 11 June 2013). As the Arab minority within Israel grew in political confidence and assertiveness, the authorities responded by expelling political activists to remote villages far away from their families. Others were placed under military house arrest and were required to report – sometimes twice a day – to the local police station. Activists were also punished when they and their families were denied travel permits. Heads of families were also pressured to prevent their relatives from taking part in political activity. One interviewee told of how the military governor “threatened my father that they would expel my brother to the Galilee if he took part in a national meeting opposing military rule” (Interview, A’ara, 20 June 2013). As a consequence, his father did not participate in the meeting and his brother avoided expulsion. The military government had a wide network of informers that enabled them to identify anyone who spoke out of line. As White (2012, 76) has noted, “by reporting on the day-to-day speech of Arabs and by summoning and interrogating those Arabs who spoke against the state, the security authorities ‘taught’ the minority what was fit to be said and what was unacceptable, thus shaping the contours of Arab political discourse in Israel”. Despite measures to suppress dissent, by the late 1950s, there were a growing number of attempts organised in the Arab villages to give public expression to the emerging aspirations of the Palestinians in Israel. In 1958, one of the first public meetings against military rule was held in Umm al Fahim. The organisers had invited Tawfiq Tubi, a Knesset member from the ICP, first elected in 1949, to address them. But the military governor was intent on frustrating these plans and attempted to block all the entrances to the village to prevent him from reaching the meeting. One of the organisers recalled how they side-stepped such measures:

We went and met him at Lajoun junction (Megido) and disguised him as a woman on a donkey and sneaked him through one of the back entrances. The number of the police and army present was equal to the number of demonstrators. The meeting was held, and a confrontation broke out with the military and more than 40 people were arrested and many were injured. They attacked us with batons, but we responded with stone throwing. We physically attacked the governor and he hid underneath the military jeep. (Interview, Umm alFahim, 18 June 2013)

Alongside the struggle for civil and political rights the Arab population also focused on issues related to social and economic justice. The high unemployment rate caused by restrictions on travel and land confiscation caused deprivation and poverty amongst many. The scarcity of commodities and

food rationing further worsened the situation and many families suffered severe hardship. An Arab member of Mapam, the Zionist Socialist Party, recalled that “the first demonstration organised in A’ra’ra was in 1952 and we raised slogans like, we refuse to die hungry and demanded, our right for work and bread. The army shot at us but there were no injuries” (Interview, A’ra’ra, 20 June 2013). A few years later in 1957, nationalists and communists established the Arab Front which, in ideological terms, was part of the pan-Arab nationalist movement. Israel refused to register the organisation under this name and so it became the “Popular Democratic Front”. Its main aims were equality between Arabs and Jews in Israel, an end to land confiscation, and the end of military rule. In 1965, the Front was banned from participating in the Knesset election, as was the Arab Socialist List, which had been created in 1958 by another political movement to emerge during this period – Al Ard (The Land). Although it was banned from participating in Knesset elections, Al Ard was influential thanks to the different cultural and sports centres it established (under different names) in those areas of Israel where the Arab population was concentrated, and it became a significant driver of the struggle against military rule (Ghanem and Mustafa 2009; Bauml 2007; Jiryis 1976).

End of Military Rule: Political and Civil Mobilisation

In 1966, the period of military rule came to an end, but the Arab minority within Israel continued to face discrimination in most walks of life, and people operated with the status of “semi-citizens” (Darweish 2010; Kretzmer 1990). Then came the war of 1967 and the occupation of the West Bank and Gaza Strip, which paradoxically “united” the Palestinians from both sides of the Green Line after their years of separation since 1948. It enabled the Palestinians in Israel to renew family relations and commercial links with the newly Occupied Palestinian Territories (oPt). This new situation exposed Palestinians in Israel to the struggle of both the Palestinian national movement in the oPt and the PLO, and this led to political cooperation. The “reunification” led to a growing recognition of their shared history with the Palestinians in the oPt and consciousness of their Palestinian national identity. All this fed into a significant increase in the self-confidence of the Arab community within Israel during the 1970s, which in turn supported the emergence of new movements and organisations seeking to articulate and represent the interests of the Palestinian minority within Israel. One of these was the National Committee for the Defence of Arab Lands (NCDAL), which was formed in 1975 as a coalition of various political groupings and community-based organisations to oppose land confiscations by the Israel. NCDAL called for the first national strike for the Arabs in Israel on “Land Day” – 30 March 1976 – during which six protesters were killed by the Israeli police (Pappé 2014). After years of military rule and relatively quiet resistance, Land Day 1976 was the first act of organised mass resistance and mobilisation by the Palestinians inside Israel against the ongoing expropriation of their land. Furthermore, after years of virtual ostracism by the PLO leadership and the Arab states, Land Day 1976 led to the acknowledgement of the Palestinian minority within Israel as inseparable members of the Palestinian nation, as well as to recognition of the important political role they play in Israel. Since that date, Palestinians from both sides of the Green Line and throughout the diaspora have continued to commemorate Land Day with demonstrations and strikes to protest against the continuing confiscations of Palestinian land and settlement building in Israel and the oPt.

ANALYSIS AND REFLECTION

This chapter has shown how Palestinians in Israel have manifested their resistance against military rule in multiple ways and areas of life as they contest complex power relations. Like the Bedouin women whose acts of resistance were explored in Abu-Lughod’s (1990) research, Palestinians in Israel have brought about changes in their lives through “quiet and unassuming daily struggles” (Bayat 2013, 5) that have helped to reveal multiple relations of power. In the case of the Palestinian

respondents who experienced living under military rule, their understanding of everyday resistance is directional and goal oriented. It fits Bayat's (2010, 20) description that "theirs is not a politics of protest, but of practice, of redress through direct and disparate actions". In these terms, their actions constitute a practice of making a moral choice to survive with dignity and to move forward and improve their lives. This section analyses how the different forms of resistance described here inform the conceptualisation of resistance and can be used to establish linkages between theory and practice in the case of the Palestinians. Power relations between the Palestinians and the occupier between 1948 and 1966 were complex and therefore resistance manifested in a range of ways that allowed Palestinians to exercise agency in an asymmetric power relationship (Foucault 1982). To challenge restrictive laws and structures (Gordon 2002), they made use of every available aspect of their daily lives to "undermine power" (Vinthagen and Johansson 2013, 2). The interviews and stories from our contributors show that the Palestinians who lived under imposed Israeli military rule made moral choices to survive with dignity and to move forward and improve their lives through quiet "everyday forms of resistance" (Scott 1990, 2013). The Palestinians under military rule found ways to bypass the restrictions imposed on them to enable them to go to work, seek medical or travel for study. The quiet encroachment of Palestinians has been so hidden that it could be described as a non-movement focused on acts of resistance so subtle that they risk passing unnoticed. Such acts derive their power less from their direct impact on the oppressor than from the sustenance they provide to the people enacting the resistance and those in their own community who recognise their persistent refusal to acquiesce. The quietness of some of these acts is evidenced by the fact that the examples of everyday resistance discussed above are being documented and reported for the first time here. This case study therefore represents an original contribution to the field of Resistance Studies and adds to our understanding of everyday resistance. As Bayat has so vividly argued, "the story of non-movements is the story of agency in the times of constraints. . . . [B]y bypassing the rigid dichotomies of 'active'/'passive,' 'individual'/'collective,' or 'civil'/'political' resistance which have limited our conceptual horizons, [we open up] wholly new possibilities to explore unnoticed social practices that may in fact be harbinger of significant social changes" (Bayat 2010, 19). The testimony of one Umm al-Fahim family taking direct action and returning to their home reflects an act of resistance with a shared personal goal, rather than the type of resistance offered by a unified group against the prevailing military power. The disciplinary power of the military, as we discussed earlier, aimed to keep control and silence any resistance to oppression; however, the family's choice, understood in Lilja and Vinthagen's (2014) terms, was to resist rather than submit, and so they were able to use their agency to reclaim their home. This chapter has presented stories of families determined to remain in their homeland who were supported by fellow nationals who provided food and shelter for the displaced. Rings (1979) and Sémelin (1989) described such actions as constructive and defensive when locals protect and support their community members and thereby preserve human beings and values that are endangered by the occupying power. Palestinians who provided this kind of support created alternatives to the order imposed by military rule and, furthermore, these alternatives embodied the values of the community under threat. They felt that they had a national and religious responsibility to support the displaced to stay on their land and reject the political order. This example also resonates with Lilja and Vinthagen's (2014) model as families are reclaiming their agency and power in ways that draw attention to the multiple encroachments of the military order on their land, values and community structure. In later years, this type of resilience become central to the Palestinian resistance and seen as a form steadfastness or *sumūd* in Arabic (Johansson and Vinthagen 2015). The farmers' actions in returning to and cultivating their land and reclaiming their homes in a quiet manner invisible to the military governor resonates with Scott's "invasion of the land and squatting", as well as with the "infrapolitics of subordinate groups" (Scott 2005, 65–74). Scott (1999, 11–52), in

his book *Seeing It Like a State*, argues that the state imposes administrative orders on peasants and the use of land through enforcing growing grain rather than “roots” and trees because it is easier to control and tax, which resonate with the Israeli policies to prevent Palestinian farmers from planting trees. The action of the families to return and reclaim their property through quiet but determined and courageous act can be characterised as active resistance. Through cultural resistance, Palestinians refused to cooperate with military rule and expressed, by means of gestures, folk songs, poetry, individual actions, and dress, their rejection of the military rule. This form of resistance is most likely to become pervasive because it is open to everyone and can operate at different levels of visibility and volume. These actions are characterised by their symbolic nature and pride of their national identity. This form of resistance challenged the occupier in the “quietest” form of resistance with little risks (Rings 1979; Sharp 1990, 2005). Despite the restriction imposed by the Israeli military, the end of the 1950s and the beginning of the 1960s witnessed an overt and organised direct challenge to the military rule in an attempt to undermine this asymmetry of power. The mobilisation of the Palestinians in Israel from all political groups and the support of some of the Israeli liberals resulted in a shift of the balance of power and brought an end to the military rule in 1966. This led to a significant increase in open political organisation and resistance to the Israeli policies of discrimination against the Palestinian citizens of Israel, and they became a political force that could no longer be ignored by Israel or the Palestinian leadership in the oPt.

CONCLUSION

The 1948 war, Al Nakba, and the establishment of the state of Israel had a traumatic impact on Palestinians generally. But whilst the majority of Palestinians became refugees, a minority found themselves living as an alien group within the land that was once their own. In many ways they were a “forgotten people”, separated from their fellow-Arabs elsewhere in the Middle East. But it would be wrong to view them as mere passive victims of fate during those first decades of life in the new state of Israel. As we have attempted to illustrate in this chapter, they engaged initially in quiet forms of struggle to preserve what autonomy they could find as they strove to survive in the face of the harsh living conditions that accompanied their displacement and dispossession. This chapter has demonstrated how a mother with her children, teachers, students, workers, farmers, traditional singers, and others in this minority expressed their rejection of and resistance to the military rule. The resistance to state control enacted by Palestinians in Israel deserves recognition because it gives Palestinians who live in Israel, their children, and their children’s children, access to a history that unlike other versions does not erase their past or situate them as passive and helpless. The recognition of a history that understands their agency helps Palestinians to identify strategies that have been effective in the past and which might be used again. Perhaps just as important, this research provides evidence of, and an unbroken lineage for, Palestinian capacities for nonviolent resistance and strategic collaboration. This chapter has shown that, during the second decade of military rule, Palestinians started to move on from quiet hidden forms of resistance to more audible and open forms of protest and resistance – primarily through the formation of political movements and parties that sought to represent the interests of a minority that was to become increasingly assertive over succeeding decades. The everyday resistance documented in this chapter adds to our knowledge and understanding of the distinct and diverse ways in which people on the losing side demonstrate agency and resistance in asymmetric power relations. This is very tightly linked to the second stream of resistance presented in the introduction of this book, which refers to the struggle of marginalised, ignored, and overlooked groups in society. This research uses firsthand accounts to show invisible quiet resistance “fully alive and operating”, and in doing so it adds to our understanding of the silent invisible struggle, expressed in different forms and often enacted by individuals or small groups, that constitutes resistance achieved without organised mobilisation.

NOTES

1. Palestinians living in Israel, Arabs in Israel, Israeli Arabs, Palestinian citizens of Israel, Palestinians from inside, Palestinians from the 1948 areas, and Palestinian Israelis are all terms that refer to the same population, but their use reflects different political perspectives and contexts. Not all of these Palestinians were granted Israeli citizenship during the period 1948–1966; some were only granted citizenship after the end of military rule. 2. Umm al-Fahim, Mua'awiya, A'ara, A'ra'ra, Kufr Kara', Nazareth, Kfur Kana, Ibillin, Shafa A'mar. 3. Extracts from a story written by Ghassan Fawzi, and interview with his mother, Ifat Sharef. 4. See Adalah (n.d.), "Appeal to Supreme Court against Confiscation of Land in Lajoun", <https://www.adalah.org/en/content/view/6563>. 5. Traditionally mukhtars enjoyed significant social status but under the military