



WORKING PAPER SERIES NO. 134

Exiled within

Between citizenship and the struggle for return for internal Palestinian refugees in Israel

Haneen Kinani
haneenkinani@gmail.com

March 2021

Refugee Studies Centre
Oxford Department of International Development
University of Oxford

RSC Working Paper Series

The Refugee Studies Centre (RSC) Working Paper Series is intended to aid the rapid distribution of work in progress, research findings and special lectures by researchers and associates of the RSC. Papers aim to stimulate discussion among the worldwide community of scholars, policymakers and practitioners. They are distributed free of charge in PDF format via the RSC website.

The opinions expressed in the papers are solely those of the author/s who retain the copyright. They should not be attributed to the project funders or the Refugee Studies Centre, the Oxford Department of International Development or the University of Oxford. Comments on individual Working Papers are welcomed, and should be directed to the author/s. Further details can be found on the RSC website (www.rsc.ox.ac.uk).

Contents

1	Introduction	1
	Framing the ‘internal Palestinian refugees’	2
	Methodology	3
	Structure	3
2	Citizenship, the national order of things and the refugee	4
	Citizenship and acts of citizenship	4
	Citizenship for refugees as re-territorialisation	5
3	A look at history: the events of the 1948 Nakba	7
	The Palestinian Nakba	7
	UNRWA in Israel	8
4	The provision of citizenship and Israeli policies	10
	Military government 1948-1966	10
	1950 Absentee Law: appropriation of land and denial of return	11
	The Law of Return and the JNF	12
	Between history and memory: the role of the Israeli education system	13
	Citizenship without recognition	14
5	Politics from below: memory, land and return	15
	Adjustment patterns and practices	15
	Land Day 1976	17
	Madrid, Oslo and the founding of ADRID	18
	Acts of citizenship	19
6	Conclusion	21
7	References	24

Acronyms

ADRID	The Association for the Defence of the Rights of the Internally Displaced
JNF	Jewish National Fund
PLO	Palestine Liberation Organisation
UNGA	United Nations General Assembly
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNRWA	United Nations Relief and Work Agency for Palestine Refugees

Abstract

The internal Palestinian refugees represent an intriguing paradox of a people who have suffered displacement and dispossession but are today citizens of the colonial state that was built on their ruins. While there are well-established studies of the (external) Palestinian refugees' impasse, the internal Palestinian refugees, defined as *present absentees*, have historically been omitted from these debates. In this paper, I challenge the preconceived assumption that citizenship is the most durable solution to cease the displacement and rectify the dispossession of refugees, demonstrating that, for internal Palestinian refugees, these processes continue to be a part of their 'lived experience' despite the legal status afforded to them in Israel. By applying theories and practices of citizenship and re-reading the history of Palestine and Israel since 1948, I argue that the provision of citizenship has served to maintain this population in a state of absentia. To illustrate this, I analyse two policies that continue to target the Palestinian community in general and the internal Palestinian refugees specifically: the present absentee land ownership law and the compulsory state education system. While the former ensured their displacement and dispossession from their lands, the latter has systematically targeted their history and identity. Finally, I study how the internal Palestinian refugees have also resisted these policies at the grassroots level by organising commemoration activities and marches to their destroyed villages, mounting a (symbolic) movement for the right of return to re-create spaces of legitimacy and subjectivity. I demonstrate that, ultimately, these acts of citizenship contestation are also employed to actively re-connect and communicate their struggle with the wider Palestinian diaspora – countering their *absence* by asserting their *presence*.

1 Introduction

This research aims to explore the predicaments of a neglected displaced population: the internal Palestinian refugees. This group is part of the larger Palestinian refugee population displaced from their homes and villages during the 1948 Nakba known as the Palestinian catastrophe and perceived by the Israelis as the 'War of Independence'. After the 1948 expulsion, an estimated 800,000 Palestinians became external refugees in what is known today as the Occupied Territories of Gaza and the West Bank, as well as in Jordan, Lebanon and Syria (Khalidi 2010). The so-called 'Israeli-Arabs' became a minority of 160,000 Palestinians who remained in areas of Palestine that became the state of Israel (Sanbar 2001). An estimated quarter of them are the internal Palestinian refugees who were never allowed to return to their villages (Masalha 2005). While there is a well-established international acknowledgement and studies of the external Palestinian refugee situation (Jamal 2005), the internal refugees have elicited less interest. Nevertheless, this population represents an intriguing paradox of people who suffered displacement and dispossession in 1948 and are today citizens of the state of Israel that was built on their ruins (Shihade 2014; Jamal 2005).

Arguably, their considerable neglect in the literature could be attributed to the smaller size of this community, in comparison to the external Palestinian refugees, as well as to their Israeli citizenship status. In conventional discourses, the provision of citizenship rectifies a refugee 'status', as the citizen is unproblematic and rooted in sovereign territory unlike the refugee who lacks state protection, representation, and equal rights (Soguk 1999; Haddad 2008; Long 2008). The provision of citizenship for the internal Palestinian refugees has arguably incorporated them into the Israeli political system as '*full-fledged* members' of the Jewish-Israeli democratic state (Shoughry 2012). However, this displaced population continued to resist and contest their impasse and has recently

attracted a new level of academic and political interest. They have also re-emerged politically at the grassroots level. This revitalisation is particularly notable in the movement of return to their villages of origin through symbolic acts such as Nakba commemorations and marches to their destroyed villages (MusawaChannel 2016).

This political reality raises the following questions: to what extent, if at all, can citizenship be conceived as a durable solution for the internal Palestinian refugees in the state of Israel after their displacement by its creation? Moreover, why have the internal Palestinian refugees been absent from the Israeli-Palestinian debate and how have they attempted to counter this absence? As such, the primary interest of this research is to better understand this revival by exploring the absence of the internal Palestinian refugees from the Israeli-Palestinian debate. In this paper I challenge the assumption that the provision of citizenship for the internal Palestinian refugees has ceased their displacement and dispossession. Given the hyphenated tag 'Israeli-Arabs' they were delinked from the larger Palestinian community, while the Arab countries and the international community was led to believe that they were granted rights and full citizenship (Shoughry 2012). However, the Israeli Government has targeted this population with racist policies aimed at erasing their Palestinian history and identity (Abu-Saad 2006b; Masalha 2005). Marfleet (2006:193) has defined forced migration and displacement as a process and "a lived experience" rather than a singular event. For the internal refugees the experience of the Nakba has not stopped; it continues through the "politics of denial" of their right of return (Masalha 2003).

The current international state system recognises the status of 'citizen' as representative of the national order of things (Malkki 1992) and the highest measure of social, political inclusion, the recognised mode of belonging, subjectivity and rights (Heater 1990; Oldfield 1990). However, I will argue that the *absence* of the internal Palestinian refugees from the debate on Israel and Palestine in the international community and the study of Palestinian refugees is, interestingly, due to their citizenship. While other considerations contributed to such absence, including the lack of historical inquiry, targeted policies, and the abrupt experience of displacement and dispossession (Masalha 2005, 2003; Boqa'i 2008; Chatty 2010; Humphries 2004, 2009; Al-Haj 1988), their status as citizens has been the main determinant for concealing their ongoing experience of displacement and dispossession. However, a new narrative of *presence* is being asserted by the internal refugees in re-creating their villages of origin as spaces of legitimacy, recognition and subjectivity (Boqa'i 2005). Engaging with acts that contest their citizenship, the internal Palestinian refugees have been able to organise themselves politically and challenge the solid structures of the colonial state from within (Isin and Nielsen 2008; Boqa'i 2008). Furthermore, I argue that these acts of citizen contestation should not be reduced to a struggle for civic equality in the state; rather with these practices the internal refugees actively re-connect and communicate their struggle with the larger Palestinian population (Humphries 2009; Jamal 2005).

Framing the 'internal Palestinian refugees'

In this research, I will use the term 'internal (Palestinian) refugees' to refer to the Palestinians that were displaced and dispossessed because of the 1948 Nakba and remained in Israel. My point of departure is that the Nakba has been a collective experience of expulsion (Shihade 2014) that constitutes with it a sense of ongoing 'refugeeness' for all Palestinians wherever they reside (Rosemary 1979). Therefore, I do not use the term internally displaced Palestinians. Furthermore, the United Nations Relief and Work Agency for Palestine Refugees (UNRWA) definition of a Palestinian refugee encompasses both internal and external Palestinian refugees: "persons whose normal place of residence was Palestine during the period 1 June 1946 to 15 May 1948, and who lost both home and means of livelihood as a result of the 1948 conflict" (UNRWA 2018). While the

academic literature addresses the population as ‘internal refugees’, the term ‘internally displaced’ will only be used with reference to the Association for the Defence of the Rights of the Internally Displaced (ADRID). Although the Director of ADRID, Wakim Wakim, describes those Palestinians who were displaced but remained within Israel as refugees, he argues that the term “internally displaced” has been employed strategically to reach larger international platforms in order to promote their case according to the internationally recognised terminology (Musawa Channel 2016).

There are no precise statistics on the internal refugees, since there is no registration system such as UNRWA’s, and Israel’s census did not differentiate between the internal refugees and the rest of the Palestinian community who remained within its borders (Masalha 2003). According to the Legal Centre for Arab Minority Rights in Israel (Adalah), nearly one-quarter of the Palestinians who remained in Israel were displaced from their homes and villages, becoming internal refugees (Adalah 2018). Boqa’i (2008) suggests that the number of internal refugees stands at 30,000–40,000 following the displacement. Jewish-Israeli scholars, although critical of Israeli policies targeting the internal refugees, have suggested a more conservative estimate of 23,000 (Benvenisti 2000; Cohen 2003; Kamen 1987). The Badil Centre for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights in Bethlehem suggested similar statistics to Boqa’i (2008) and provided calculations of these, including descendants of internal refugees that number approximately 260,000 (Badil Resource Centre 2002).

Methodology

Defined and classified as ‘present absentees’ in academia and under Israeli law, the relative shortage of literature available on the internal Palestinian refugees reflects the neglect this group has suffered over history (Shoughry 2012). However, the recent interest shown in publications, and in light of recent political developments, can be understood perhaps since this group has forced itself on to the political and academic agenda. This reflects my entry point in studying the current political activities of the internal refugees in comparison to historical accounts. Therefore, I relied on relatively recent publications of academic journals, think tank reports and articles. These all address the policies that targeted the internal refugees, and also their political activities and mobilisation. Furthermore, in order to engage with wider scholarship and to compensate for the literature shortage, I relied on various theses, history books, and academic articles written in both Arabic and Hebrew. Primary sources were used, such as published interviews conducted with the Director of ADRID by Musawa Channel 2016 and official pages of ADRID on social media. The objective of this research is to draw attention to the interplay between being a citizen and a refugee, and to convey the historical development that led to the predicament of the internal refugees and the implications of the policies that targeted them. However, while this research attempts to fill some gaps in existing literature by laying out the connection between history, policies and political activities of the internal refugees, it does not claim to fill a total vacuum. Doing so would require much more extensive research.

Structure

This paper is organised into four parts: a conceptual framework, a historical overview, analysis of state policies and their implications, as well as political activities within the state. I begin this paper by exploring the meanings and definitions of citizenship and how they relate to the situation of Palestinian refugees in Israel, focusing on how conventional discourses convey a return to citizenship as the ultimate restoration of order for the refugee and the international community. Secondly, I apply this framework to the historical developments, both before, during and after 1948, which apply to the internal refugees, arguing that citizenship was used as a tool to conceal the experiences of displacement for this population. In the third part, I analyse how Israeli policies, including education and land policies, targeted and subjugated the internal refugees despite their

legal status as ‘Israeli’ citizens. The fourth and final part addresses how the internal refugees organised themselves politically through acts of citizenship contestation, including by protesting historical and present injustices, as well as restoring their villages as places of legitimacy.

2 Citizenship, the national order of things and the refugee

Citizenship and acts of citizenship

The concept of citizenship is closely tied to “the invention of the nation-state” (Brubaker 1992:46), and its counterpart national citizenship – representing the most exclusive, unambiguous subjectivity of eligibility, which is membership in the nation-state (Soguk 1999). Since then, this system has been developed through processes of colonisation and decolonisation to become global in scope (McNevin 2011). In this way, political community, identity and practice have been conceptually linked to a fixed relation between state, citizen and territory (McNevin 2011). This is clear in Heater’s (1990:2) definition of citizenship as a status, duties and rights composed “not primarily in relation to another human being, but in relation to abstract concept, the state”. Here appears the dichotomy between the bearer of rights as the individual, and the granter which is the nation-state (Isin and Wood 1999). Oldfield (1990:2) argues that “the function of the political realm is to render service to individual interests and purposes, to protect citizens in the exercise of their rights, and to leave them unhindered in pursuit of whatever individual and collective interests they might have”. However, this conventional approach emphasises the relationship between citizenship and identity as a legal status and entitlements which individuals should possess by virtue of their membership in a state.

Others have highlighted a broader understanding of citizenship, which entails a set of practices through which individuals and groups formulate and claim new rights or struggle to maintain existing rights (McNevin 2011; Isin and Wood 1999). Such approaches aim to recognise the rise of new identities and claims for group rights as a challenge to the modern interpretation of citizenship (Isin and Wood 1999). Isin and Wood (1999) define citizenship as both a set of practices (cultural, symbolic and economic) and a variety of rights and duties (civil, political and social) that defines an individual membership in a given polity. Thus, citizenship is neither a purely sociological concept nor a purely legal one. This definition suggests that citizenship is both a practice and a status, which without the former, ‘citizens’ cannot hold civil, political and social rights to exercise such citizenship and become a competent fully-fledged member of the polity (Isin and Wood 1999).

Yet it comes as no surprise that the ideal of citizenship, as it is understood in its universal sense, does not always translate to truly equal treatment of all citizens (Young 1989). Various social groups such as women, LGBT, racial and ethnic ‘minorities’ have charged that behind the veil of citizenship, exists a systematic form of oppression that actively marginalises them (Isin and Wood 1999). Different social groups are defined not primarily by a set of shared attributes, but by partially constituted individual identities, cultural forms, social situation, and importantly, history with which they identify (Young 1989). This is not to suggest that the concept of identity is fixed and based on repetition (Jenkins 1996). By contrast, an individual is composed of multiple identities (McNevin 2011). This is why, as part of the broader definition of citizenship, group differentiated citizenship must recognise differences and acknowledge them as irreducible (Isin and Wood 1999). To promote social justice within a state requires decolonising the institutions working to melt away difference,

and collectively reinstating systems that promote reproduction of, and respect for, group differences, without facing oppression as an institutional constraint to self-determination and development (Young 1989). Furthermore, while citizenship is comprised of social rights such as education and health, it is wrong to perceive these as static objects as opposed to social relations (Young 1989). The inclusion of all citizens must require rights attending to group differences, that allow self-organisation, collective empowerment and experiences (Isin and Wood 1999). Here, the role of education is essential as a means for social mobility and individual empowerment and liberty in order to promote inclusive and common citizenship (Pinson 2005; Pinson and Agbaria 2015; Young 1989).

On an ontological level, being a citizen is conventionally interlinked with being part of a nation-state (McNevin 2011). It is also related to racialised and gendered discourses through which the citizen takes specific embodied meaning (Isin and Nielsen 2008). But it also raises the question of whether particular kinds of ‘bodies’ can ever really belong to a nation-state. As such, the contestations of citizenship challenge its meanings and, in their most radical forms, undermine the legitimacy of a legal status as a self-evident determinant of political belonging (McNevin 2011). Isin and Nielsen (2008) describe this contestation as “acts of citizenship”, which focus on performances that create new local and global “scenes” which bring into being new kinds of citizens that are beyond its definition in law. In their formulation, they represent a departure from normative understandings of citizenship. Such acts call for critical attention to be focused on moments of “rupture” when political “acts” break away from routines and rules, and “regardless of status and substance, subjects constitute themselves as citizens, or better still, as those to whom the right to have rights is due” (Isin and Nielsen 2008:2). Isin and Nielsen (2008) assert that citizens and noncitizens may be implicated in acts of citizenship insofar as those challenge the very terms of which citizenship and non-citizenship as well as legality and illegality are defined. For example, the *Sans-Papiers* movement in France is comprised of undocumented migrants who demand their right to stay based on the integration of their labour in the French economy and the history of colonial oppression that shaped their migration paths (McNevin 2011). Their struggle is an example of undocumented migrants who act like citizens and in some cases win political rights regardless of their status. When we start identifying these forms of contestation, it renders it difficult to deny the potential of alternative configurations or formulations of political communities that they might form (McNevin 2011).

Citizenship for refugees as re-territorialisation

With citizenship being a fundamental form of membership in a territorial nation-state, the figure of the refugee stands out uncomfortably. Nationality and citizenship could not have taken such a powerful hold on members of each political space without the simultaneous invention of the ‘foreigner’ (Kristeva 1991). Similarly, Brubaker (1992) emphasises that a citizen and a foreigner represent correlative categories, mutually exclusive. Hence, the creation of the parallel identity of the foreigner is essential in establishing the state-citizen-territory hierarchy (Soguk 1999). The refugee was to follow as one distinct category of the established ‘foreigner’ and would take centre stage in the twentieth century (Haddad 2008; Soguk 1999). The conventional discourse defines a refugee as one who lacks the citizens’ decisive grounding in a territorial space, and hence, lacks the protection and representation of the state. With regards to state building, Brubaker (1992) recalls how the displacement of people constituted a part of a process by which the image of the ‘outsider’ was constructed as a nation-building tool and consolidated the concept of citizenship. However, Haddad (2008) and Soguk (1999) emphasise that this is not to say that the nation-state requires the figure of a refugee, but rather that the nation-state requires an ‘other’ – a role inevitably fulfilled by the refugee as the ‘anomaly’ of the nation-state system.

Anderson (2006) defines the imagined community as limited, in which it has finite boundaries where beyond it other nations exist. For Malkki (1992), this is the “national order of things”, for it is evident that ‘real’ nations are fixed in space and recognisable on the map (Smith 1986). As Geertz (1983:92) highlights, common sense “lies so artlessly before our eyes it is almost impossible to see”. The naturalisation of citizenship as the ‘common sense’ mode of political belonging and recognition in what is known as the dominant nation-state system “masks the processes of exclusion that condition their possibility” (McNevin 2011:18). Based on such observations, the next section will convey how the internal Palestinian refugees experienced displacement and dispossession in 1948, and were caught in the middle of Zionist-Jewish nation-state building on their land.

The ultimate aim of durable solutions is to re-define the refugees’ relationship to a space of sovereignty (Haddad 2008). The citizen is perceived as unproblematic and is rooted in her territorial space while the refugee constitutes a problem by lacking state protection and representation; she is uprooted and displaced and lacks affinity with a national community (Soysal 1994; Soguk; 1999; Joppke 1999). To restore order to the international state-system, the imagined state-citizen-territory must be reaffirmed and re-established (Soguk 1999; Haddad 2008). The refugees’ relationship to space of sovereignty must be redefined so that she can once again, in one way or another, be rooted in a national space. Accordingly, this situation is rectified through the three durable solutions to refugees – repatriation, resettlement and naturalisation – which all constitute forms of *re-territorialisation* (Soguk 1999; Haddad 2008). The introduction to a 1993 UNHCR Note on International Protection submitted to the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) articulates the problem of refugees’ lack of protection: “international protection is provided by countries of asylum in cooperation with the UNHCR in an effort to compensate for the protection that refugees should have received in their own countries, and its objective is not fulfilled until refugees once again enjoy protection as *full-fledged members of a national community*” (UNGA 1993:2.I -2.3, emphasis added).

In this discourse, the ‘management’ of the refugee as a universal problem is through ultimately providing them with a citizenship. This process requires repatriation, or, in the case that no state recognises the right of return, assimilation into a new society based upon civic nationalist principles, with a consequent return to citizenship (Long 2008). The territorial approach to citizenship can be also drawn from the issue of statelessness. Hannah Arendt proposes that the proliferation of stateless persons was the culmination of the inexorable conquest of the state by the nation; therefore, Arendt (1968:276-7) perceives stateless persons as “the most symptomatic group in temporary politics” of people who live of necessity “outside the pale of law”. Through its ambitious campaign to end statelessness by 2024, UNHCR has begun taking action to maximise the number of states to rectify the 1954 Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness (UNHCR 2015). At the heart of their campaign is the understanding that citizenship is the solution to the lack of opportunities for human development (Gabián 2015).

The ‘refugee’ and ‘citizen’ are both correlated concepts; the rectifying of a refugee status is done by a form of re-territorialisation and the consequent return to citizenship (Long 2008). This approach underlines the conditions and intentions of the provision of Israeli citizenship to the internal refugees. Accordingly, I will adopt the definition of citizenship as both status and practice (McNevin 2011; Isin and Nielsen 2008). I adopt this definition since it encompasses a legal status that provides state representation and protection which are critically essential to rectify a refugee status, and the understanding that citizenship is a form of practice. The question I address is: what happens after the provision of citizenship? I will convey how it was applied by the state that incorporated the

internal Palestinian refugees as citizens, how the refugees themselves made sense of this form of membership in the state, as well as how it was mobilised throughout the years as a non-Jewish minority in a Jewish ‘Democratic’ state.

3 A look at history: the events of the 1948 Nakba

The aim of this section is to re-read the history of the 1948 events for the Palestinians, Israelis, the Arab communities in the Middle East, and particularly, for the internal Palestinian refugees. To this day, in any study of Palestinian history, the internal refugees are at best either referenced in passing and more often omitted entirely. I discuss this literature gap by employing a historical approach to address the absence of their story. I argue that the internal refugees have been absent, given the predominant historical focus on the establishment of Israel (Pappé 2011; Shlaim 2000), alongside the defeat of the Arab armies formulated by the Arab League (Khalidi 2010). The Palestinians experienced the Nakba (Catastrophe) that befell them (Sanbar 2001), where a majority became refugees residing in Arab countries. At the same time, the internal refugees in Israel were absent from the high politics of that time, and were not considered in the same context or political structures. Most importantly, this section will focus on a crucial turning point concerning the interplay between UNRWA’s provision of humanitarian assistance and the provision of Israeli citizenship to the internal Palestinian refugees (Cohen 2000; Bligh 1998; Jamal 2005; Masalha 2003), which further problematised their impasse that would determine their predicament for many years to come.

The Palestinian Nakba

The 1948 War started on May 15 and lasted less than twenty months (Rogan and Shlaim 2007), yet it transformed Palestine and the political and physical landscape of the Middle East beyond recognition (Sa’di 2008). Within these events, the ‘problem’ of the Palestinian refugees emerged, the causes and consequences of which constitute one of the greatest controversies in the Middle East (Morris 1987; Shlaim 2000). By the end of the war, half of Palestine’s population, over 800,000 people, became refugees, 531 villages had been destroyed, and 11 urban areas had been emptied of their inhabitants (Pappé 2006). Some 150,000 Palestinians remained in areas that constituted the new state of Israel, among them approximately 30,000–40,000 who became internal refugees. Like the external refugees, this population had been expelled and were not permitted to return to their homes and villages (Boqa’i 2008).

For the Palestinian refugees – internal or external – the Nakba is many things at once: the uprooting of people and the destruction of their social fabric that had existed uninterrupted for centuries (Sa’di 2008). It is the frustration of national aspirations, and it functions as counter memory and a constant reminder of an injustice which has left them in political, social, economic and psychological disarray (Sa’di 2008). Scholars of collective memory and history contend that those who undergo traumatic events produce belated memories; they can take decades to be able to assimilate their experiences and provide them with meaning (Kamen 1987). Edward Said captured this bleakness in his book *The Question of Palestine* (1979), arguing that there were no history books on contemporary Palestine written by Palestinians. Sanbar (2001:87) has argued that the contemporary history of Palestine turns on a key date, 1948: “that year a country and its people disappeared from maps and dictionaries. The Palestinian people do not exist, said the new masters, and henceforth, the Palestinians would be referred to by generally vague terms as either ‘refugees’ or in the case of a small minority that had managed to ‘escape’ the generalised expulsion, ‘Israeli Arabs’. A long

absence was beginning.” Further emphasising this void for the Palestinians who remained behind ‘enemy’ borders, particularly the internal refugees, the Arab leadership post-1948 became obsessed with their nation-states, thus buying into Western discourse and in a strange way mirroring Zionist thought; for the Arab leaders too, the Palestinians who remained within the Israeli settler state in 1948 did not exist (Shihade 2014).

Given such historical inquiry, the external Palestinian refugees have gradually become the focus of the discourse on Palestinian displacement: their circumstances and situation in Arab countries, their historical background, and position in international law (Al-Haj 1988). Such focus is inevitably interlinked to the Western conventional understanding of the figure of a ‘refugee’, who crosses an internationally recognised border and seeks out and succumbs to the ministrations of international humanitarian aid, as manifested in prefabricated administrated holding camps (Chatty 2014). This is due to the refugee camp being seen as an essential empowering device (Malkki 1995). Through camp administration and institutionalisation processes the refugee emerged as a “knowable, nameable figure and as an object of social-scientific knowledge” (Malkki 1995:498). The internal refugees, among such an immense void, experienced a process of forgetfulness and absence. This is not to say that the focus on the external Palestinian refugees is over-studied. On the contrary, the study of the external refugees is essential, particularly in deconstructing the current approach that perceives their condition only from a humanitarian perspective delinked from any political perspectives (Peteet 2005; Sa’di and Abu-Lughod 2007). However, such focus, although unintentional or inevitable, has overshadowed other simultaneous forms of oppressions faced by the internal refugees following the Nakba. Indeed, on a domestic level, far from the geopolitics of the 1948 events, the internal refugees have been absent due to further practices that concealed their situation.

UNRWA in Israel

The Palestinians who remained in what became Israel in 1948 have suffered displacement and dispossession from within (Boqa’i 2008). Most of the internal refugees found refuge near their original villages, at least during the first phase of the expulsion (Cohen 2000), with the hope of being able to later return to their villages (Al-Haj 1988). For example, in Shafa’amr town internal refugees originated from nearby villages of Waart al-Saris and Ksair (Al-Haj 1988). UNRWA (2018) has defined a Palestinian refugee as: “a person whose normal residence was Palestine for a minimum of 2 years immediately preceding the outbreak of the conflict in 1948, and who as a result of this conflict has lost his home and his means of livelihood”. This definition encompasses both external refugees who moved to neighbouring countries and internal refugees who moved to localities within the newly established Israeli state (Al-Haj 1988). The Israeli military destroyed most of the depopulated Palestinian villages and declared them ‘closed military zones’ to prevent the internal refugees from returning (Boqa’i 2005). In addition, the Israeli authorities collaborated with the Jewish National Fund (JNF), who formed an alliance and planted forests in the depopulated villages in order to ‘conceal’ and hide traces of the original Palestinian villages (Masalha 2008; Boqa’i 2008, 2005; Cohen 2002). In most cases, the Israeli government distributed emptied Palestinian houses to newly arriving Jewish settlers and established settlements on the land of these villages (Khalidi 1992), which were given Hebraised names (Masalha 2015). For example, destroyed Bayt Dajan village was named Beit Dagan (Wakim 2001). Terrified by the advancing Israeli army, many found refuge in neighbouring villages which had not yet been conquered (Boqa’i 2008). But most of these areas were indeed conquered, and their residents as well as their ‘guests’ were uprooted. In the rare cases where the host towns and villages stayed in place, the refugees from neighbouring villages stayed with them (Manna 2017). Some family members from the destroyed village of Saffuriyya

were dispersed and became either internal refugees in Nazareth or external refugees in Ayn al-Halweh camp in Lebanon (Humphries 2009).

In September 1948, the UN intervened to provide humanitarian assistance, known initially as the UN Disaster Relief Project and then replaced by UNRPR (United Nations Relief for Palestinian Refugees) mandated by the International Red Cross (Cohen 2000). This was following an official appeal by the Arab League to the UN to provide humanitarian assistance to Palestinian refugees wherever they reside (Gabbay 1959). Interestingly, however, the response of the different states and international organisations was not limited to the territories outside of Israel; it also encompassed territories inside Israel (Cohen 2000). Gradually, it became clear to many of these international organisations that it was not only the internal refugees who were in need of shelter and assistance; other Palestinians who were not displaced and remained within the new state were also found to be requiring similar support (Cohen 2000). When it seemed that the refugee problem was not to be resolved soon, the UN established UNRWA with a mandate that it would provide comprehensive assistance (Gabbay 1959), highlighting the destruction and damage caused to the Palestinians by the Israeli military during 1948 and beyond.

The Israeli authorities have struggled with many attempts by the internal refugees to return to their villages that were deemed closed military zones (Boqa'i 2008; Al-Haj 1988). At the same time, the newly settled government perceived the international humanitarian assistance and presence in Israel as a cause for the delay to the rehabilitation of the internal refugees (Cohen 2000; Manna 2017). A representative of the Ministry of Agriculture contended in a 1950 report to the Rehabilitation department that as long as the assistance provided to the internal refugees by the Red Cross and other international organisations is ongoing, there should be no surprise when these organisations demand from Israel to settle the refugee problem (Cohen 2000). The fear of the increasing international attention on Israel's new sovereignty prompted the new government to terminate the mandate of UNRWA and the Red Cross in 1952, taking upon itself to 'manage' the issue of the internal refugees. The main underlying aim behind this decision was to prevent further scrutiny being drawn to the Palestinian refugees inside Israel (Cohen 2000). Bligh (1998) has argued that there were other factors and motivations, such as UNRWA's budget. However, Al-Haj (1986) explains that the termination of UNRWA's mandate in Israel was an essential act to Israel's perception of its sovereignty, because it internalised the internal refugee problem as a domestic matter of the sovereign state (Yazbak 2017; Al-Haj 1986). Therefore, it forced UNRWA to focus solely on the external Palestinian refugees, thus further 'externalising' the problem to the UN and neighbouring Arab governments (Yazbak 2017).

Following the transfer of UNRWA's authority, Bligh (1998) argues that the problem of the refugees was arguably resolved, meaning their status as refugees 'ceased' (Jamal 2005; Masalha 2003; Cohen 2000). The internal refugees were removed from all of UNRWA's figures (Cohen 2002). The same year as the termination of UNRWA's mandate in Israel, the internal Palestinian refugees were accorded Israeli citizenship under the 1952 Israeli Nationality Law (Masalha 2003; Boqa'i 2008). The cessation of UNRWA's work in Israel was closely interlinked to reducing international attention regarding the presence of refugees on its soil. Subsequently, the names of the destroyed villages were removed from all official maps (Cohen 2002; Masalha 2015) and in the Israeli population censuses. In parallel, the internal refugees were registered as belonging in their villages and cities of refuge, not of origin (Cohen 2005), and thus were given the hyphenated tag 'Israeli-Arab' citizens (Boqa'i 2008).

4 The provision of citizenship and Israeli policies

In this section, I challenge the understanding of equality, protection and rights that the internal refugees were thought to receive due to their granting of citizenship in the Jewish state. Furthermore, I demonstrate that the kind of citizenship the internal refugees were provided did not cease their dispossession and displacement (Jamal 2005). Specifically, I focus on two policies that targeted the internal Palestinian refugees formulated within the context of the military government: the 1950 Absentee Property Law and the 1949 Compulsory Education Law. This analysis will demonstrate how the internal refugees were still ‘present absentees’ and were not allowed to regain their properties (Manna 2017). Moreover, it will be argued that the educational system was used as a form of ideological control over the internal refugees and was shaping them into ‘Israeli-Arab’ citizens (Abu-Saad 2007).

Military government 1948–1966

While the Palestinians experienced forms of displacement and dispossession, the state of Israel engaged in state-building activities to fulfil Zionist visions of a Jewish homeland. Edward Said has described Zionist ideology as an “unchanging idea that expressed the yearning for Jewish political and religious self-determination – for Jewish national selfhood – to be exercised on the promised land” (Said 1992:56). Israel was thus constructing its self-image as a Jewish nation-state. Its legitimacy would be cast in terms of “the intensity of its meaningful presence in a continuous body of bounded territory. It works by policing its borders, producing its people, and constructing its citizens” (Appadurai 1996:189). However, this process of state construction does not occur in a place with homogenous social terrain; it is rendered problematic due to the presence of ‘groups in question’ (e.g. minorities, indigenous groups) whose incorporation into the dominant society challenges the ideological framework of the nation-state (Garland 1997). Yet citizen production and border policing constitute essential surveillance practices which all states engage in (Zureik 2001).

To ensure full occupation and domination of the territory gained during the course of the 1948 war, Israel first and foremost imposed a military government – ‘Mimshal Tzvai’ in Hebrew (Ben Ze’ev and Aburayia 2004). The military government applied to areas that had a large Palestinian population under the British Mandate’s Emergency Regulations (Pappé 2011). Israeli officers had executive, legislative, and judicial powers, which served as an important tool for consolidating governmental supervision over the Palestinian community remaining within its borders (Pappé 2011; Masalha 2005). During military rule, the authorities developed a system of controlling the Palestinian community that was based on objectives of segmentation and dependency (Lustick 1980; Seliktar 1984). Complete segmentation involved physical separation of the Palestinian community in Israel from the Jewish one (Jiryis 1979). This was evident since the military government was never enforced on the Jewish community (Abu-Saad 2006a). Furthermore, the segmentation attempted to split the Palestinian community into categories of different geographical areas: The Negev, the Triangle, and the Galilee (Abu-Saad 2006a). Also, emphasis was placed on religious and cultural divisions, such as Muslims, Christians, Bedouins and Druze, which were introduced as new exclusive identities (Lustick 1980).

In the post-Nakba period, the issue of both internal and external refugees continued to preoccupy the military governors (Boqa’i 2005), as the new state had to tackle the task of preventing them from returning to their villages (Cohen 2003). Indeed, the then Prime Minister Ben Gurion’s objectives were to find a solution for the transfer and resettlement of internal refugees while simultaneously facilitating the populating of Jews in emptied Palestinian villages and towns (Shihade 2016). The

military government was abolished in 1966 when the objectives of segmentation and dependency regarding the remaining Palestinians had been, supposedly, firmly established (Abu-Saad 2006a).

1950 Absentee Law: appropriation of land and denial of return

A major policy that allowed the expropriation of internal and external Palestinian refugees' lands was carried out under the Absentees Property Law 1950 (Boqa'i 2008; Cohen 2000; Al-Haj 1988). This law was employed to transfer Palestinian properties to Jewish hands via the Custodian of Absentees' Property who subsequently transferred them to the Israeli Development Authority, namely the JNF (Masalha 2005; Schechla 2001). While the declared objective of the 1950 Absentee Property Law was to 'protect' the property of the absentee owners and facilitate the development of the Israeli economy, millions of dunams of Palestinian refugee land were *de facto* seized by the state (Cohen 2002; Kimmerling 1977). By the same token, the military government aimed to make the remaining Palestinian community, and the internal Palestinian refugees specifically, as dependent as possible on the Jewish infrastructure and marginalised economically (Seliktar 1984).

The crucial provision in the law is the definition of the term "absentees' property". Section (A) defines the term 'absentee' as the following (Kretzmer 1990:56-7):

(A) "Absentee" means –

- (1) *a person who, at any time during the period between the 16th of Kislev, 5708 (29th Nov 1947) and the day on which a declaration is published, under section 9(d) of the Law and Administration Ordinance (5708-1958), that the state of emergency declared by the Provisional Council of the state on the 10th of Iyar 5708 (19th May 1948) has ceased to exist, was the legal owner of any property situated in the area of Israel or enjoyed or held it whether, by himself or through another and who at any time during the said period –*
 - i. *Was a national or citizen of the Lebanon, Egypt, Syria, Saudi Arabia, Trans-Jordan, Iraq or Yemen;*
 - ii. *Was in one of these countries or in any part of Palestine outside the area of Israel or;*
 - iii. *Was a Palestinian citizen and left his ordinary place of residence in Palestine,*
 - a. *For a place outside Palestine before the 27th Av, 5708 (1st September 1948) or*
 - b. *For a place in Palestine held at the time by forces which sought to prevent the establishment of the state of Israel or which fought against it after its establishment.*
- (2) *A body of persons which at any time during the period specified in Para (1), was a legal owner of any property situated in the area of Israel or enjoyed or held such property, whether by itself or through another, and all the members, partners, shareholders, directors or managers of which are absentees' business of which is otherwise decisively controlled by such absentees, or all the capital of which is in the hands of such absentees.*

A critical examination of this definition reveals that a person can be considered ‘absentee’ under this law, even though he/she might be still present in Israel when his/her property was declared as “absentees’ property” (Masalha 2005). In other words, if a person was ‘absentee’ between 29 November 1947 and 1 September 1948, their property is deemed “absentees’ property” (Kretzmer 1990). While this definition applied to those Palestinian refugees outside of the Israeli occupied land, it fundamentally provided the legal dispossession of those internal refugees who were displaced but never left the newly created state (Masalha 2005). Thus, this represented the inception of their situation as absentees despite being present in the state on the relevant dates and their legal status as citizens (Cohen 2003). Between 1948 and 1990 the Palestinians in Israel, including the internal refugees, lost close to 1 million acres of land, and during the first four decades 80% of their lands owned were confiscated (Beit-Hallahmi 1992). Today this land is owned by the state, but it still abides by the JNF mandate that ensures the control of land as the “perpetual property of the Jewish people” (Kretzmer 1990). In effect, lands originally belonging to external Palestinian refugees and *present absentees* are currently held in perpetuity by the Jewish citizens – not all citizens of Israel – a distinction that excludes Palestinian citizens, particularly internal refugees, from land ownership (Masalha 2005).

The most illustrative case regarding the Absentee Law involved the internal refugees from Kafr Bir'im and Iqrit located on the borders with Lebanon (Manna 2017; Ryan 1973). The inhabitants of these villages were ‘evicted’ and transferred to Jish and Rameh in the Galilee in 1948 (Kimmerling 1977). Initially the army ordered them to leave their villages due to ‘security reasons’ along the Israeli-Lebanese border (Kimmerling 1977). The residents complied after they were reassured that they would be permitted to return within two weeks (Ryan 1973). Several months passed, and the inhabitants realised that the army was not intending to hold to their promise (Manna 2017). The history of these villages is one of ‘broken promises’ which demonstrates the functions of the Absentee Law (Ryan 1973). The name of the settlements today is Kfar Biram (in Hebrew) (Masalha 2015).

The Law of Return and the JNF

The 1950 Law of Return grants every Jew, regardless of their country of origin, the “right to come to his country [Israel] as an *oleh*” (Jiryis 1981). An *oleh* is a person who immigrates to Israel (makes *Aliyah*). Aliyah is an important Zionist concept which grants Jews the legal right to assisted immigration and settlement in Israel and automatic citizenship (Shoughry 2012). However, this law privileges Jewish Israeli settlers and does not apply to the Palestinian refugees (internal or external) (Masalha 2005). This is critical, as the internal refugees who hold Israeli citizenship should supposedly be allowed to live in any place they wish in the country, and yet they are denied the right to return to their villages (Shoughry 2012). This is linked to the ‘Present Absentee’ law; although internal refugees live in the state as Israeli citizens, from a legal standpoint they are considered absent with regard to their own lands (Wakim 2001). However, state compensation could be granted only upon internal refugees’ renunciation of rights to lands they owned pre-1948 (Cohen 2002).

Israeli institutional policy, chiefly of the JNF, has been to ‘Judaize’ the land of depopulated Palestinian villages, particularly the Galilee which has a considerable Palestinian population (Ben-Ze’ev and Aburayia 2004). This is evidenced in the use of language as a tool in naming the physical space of the land (Ben-Ze’ev and Aburayia 2004). Masalha (2015) highlights how since 1948, Israel sought to rename systematically Palestinian Arabic place names, claiming in chronology and using modern archaeology as their proofs of Jewish roots and to legitimise ‘historical claims’ asserted by the Zionist movement. For example, the settlement of ‘Nahlal’ was in fact a Hebrew rendering of

the name of the Palestinian village it had replaced, 'Mahlul'; to give it a 'biblical authenticity' it was linked to a name mentioned in the Hebrew Bible (Masalha 2015).

Between history and memory: the role of the Israeli education system

It is well documented that the 'Arab-Israeli conflict' has been fought on the battlefield and the diplomatic arena (Elhanan 2012). However, the war waged in the educational realm is equally significant. Podeh (2001) terms this as the 'silent conflict' which does not constitute physical casualties but rather has a lasting psychological impact. It may prove more durable than any military battle since ingrained images are more resistant to change in the longer term (Podeh 2001). In 1949, the Knesset passed a Compulsory Education Law applicable to all its citizens, and equally applicable to the internal refugees (Abu-Saad 2006a). Compulsory education was an essential component of state-building for the newly founded Jewish state, whose diaspora Jewish population lacked a common language, culture, and history (Elhanan 2012).

In particular, school textbooks have taken a critical role in reproducing a narrative that would connect Jewish students to their origins in the land of Israel by combining history and collective memory (Podeh 2001). Wertsch (2002:172) argues that it is difficult to think of a more extended effort to control collective memory than that mounted by modern states especially through their education system. Podeh (2001) argues that textbooks comprise a dual role. On the one hand, they ensure a sense of continuity between past and present by transferring a specific historical narrative, and on the other hand, they rewrite the past based on contemporary needs (Podeh 2001). Therefore, the school systems are a powerful means by which the state shapes perceptions and interpretations of memory to serve determined national identities of citizens (Elhanan 2012).

Historically, the primary aim of the majority-controlled education in settler states was to assimilate and 'civilise', or in other words, to obliterate the identities of minorities through the replacement of their language, culture, religion and pedagogy with that of the colonising power (Satzewich 1996; Dyck 1997). In most modern states that comprise of minorities this assimilationist agenda has been abandoned, yet state-controlled education remains an alienating place for students (Abu-Saad 2006b, 2004; Magga 2003). The Arab sector of the education system in Israel originated within the context of control by the military government. The 1953 Law of State Education specified the following aims of the state-sponsored education: "to base education on the values of Jewish culture and achievements of science, on love of the homeland and loyalty to the state and the Jewish people...and on striving for a society built on freedom of equality, tolerance, mutual assistance and love of mankind" (as quoted in Mar'i 1978:50). While more than 60 years have passed since its enactment, the objectives stated above remain central to the current Israeli state educational policy (Elhanan 2012).

The provision of education, as mentioned above, should promote a common citizenship for the whole fabric of a society, in order to avoid oppression or marginalisation among its different segments (Young 1989; Pinson 2005). However, Israeli policies of exclusion and inclusion of various groups from the mainstream education programme led to the emergence of separate school systems, and separate tracks for different communities defined on ethnicity, race and class boundaries (Abu-Saad 2004, 2006; Podeh 2001). The school system was further separated in cities that became mixed, in content, language of instruction, curriculum and budget allocation (Al-Haj 1995; Abu-Saad 2006b). The state was responsible for the hiring of teachers and administrative staff, which was subject to security agency approval. Maintaining control of the educational system was

thus an objective of the military government in nurturing a specific kind of 'Israeli-Arab' intelligentsia (Swirski 1999).

In his *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Paulo Freire (1993) contends that education has become an act of depositing, in which the students are the depositories and the teacher is the depositor. Instead of communicating, the teacher issues communiques and makes deposits which the students patiently receive, memorise and repeat. This is the 'banking' concept of education, wherein the aim lies in "changing the consciousness of the oppressed, not the situation which oppresses them" (Freire 1993:47). Such an approach conveys the dichotomy and marginalisation that was to be institutionalized and established in the state, one that Podeh (2001) identifies as a racist dichotomy between the Western and civilised image of Jews and the oriental, belligerent backward image of the Arab. In Israeli textbooks, the emphasis is on the Jewish national identity with minor recognition to Palestinian Arab history (Al-Haj 1995). For example, any reference to the Palestinian refugees and the Nakba was prohibited from being mentioned in schools (Zaher 2010).

In relation to the villages of origin, Raz-Krakotzkin (1999) has argued that not one single geographical map showing pre-1948 Palestinian settlements is portrayed in a textbook. The land itself either has no history of its own or else is presented in terms of Jewish history alone (Abu-Saad 2006b). For example, the presence of Palestinians in the land before the state and the fate of these populations since 1948 is omitted entirely (Abu-Saad 2006b; Raz-Krakotzkin 1999). In regards to the textbook, however, Palestinian populations are present as foils to emphasise their good treatment from the state, such as the reception of education, health and welfare services (Abu-Saad 2007; Elhanan 2012). The education system is not attuned to the Palestinian citizens of the country, among them the internal refugees, and more particularly, it treats them as a 'migrant minority' entitled only to specific rights and recognition (Jabareen 2002). According to Pinson (2005), these complexities reflect that the curriculum, intentional or not, failed from its inception to serve as a tool for developing a common citizenship for all citizens. Elhanan (2012) argued that the Israeli education system takes on the role of propagating the idea of the state as a democracy while reinforcing its existence as an ethnocracy – the state of the Jews wherever they dwell rather than the state of all its citizens.

Citizenship without recognition

Bligh (1998) has asserted that the settlement of the internal refugees combined with the provision of citizenship was a successful project. This argument is attributed to the drastic process of proletarianisation that occurred among the internal refugees due to the loss of agricultural land that was the main source of their economic activity (Al-Haj 1988), forcing all to become a wage labouring class for Jewish-Israeli industry (Humphries 2004). However, this section has demonstrated that the internal refugees have continued to experience dispossession and displacement post their provision of citizenship (Jamal 2005).

Internal refugees are confronted continually with the Israeli dominance of the historical narrative in various ways, from the shaping of their education curriculum to the physical inscription of the Zionist narrative over the land on which they remain. The Absentee Property Law 1950 dispossessed them materially despite their legal status as citizens and their entitlement to their lands and properties, as illustrated through the villages of Bir'im and Iqrit (Manna 2017). The Israeli education system failed, from its inception, to serve as a tool to build a common citizenship for all citizens of the state (Pinson 2005). It systematically denied the internal refugees' history as Palestinians, erased their villages of origin, and their displacement was never taught about (Zaher 2010). Consequently, what becomes evident is that Israel's provision of citizenship to the internal refugees was defined in

terms of legal status only but does not extend to citizenship as practice (McNevin 2011). In other words, Israel provided citizenship to the internal refugees as long as they remain *present absentees*: they were present insofar as they were useful to the state-building project, and absent in terms of self-representation, the daily realities of their lives, and more important, in relation to their homes (Abu-Saad 2007). It is precisely this interplay, between the formal inclusion as citizens with a status and the structural exclusion from equal rights within the state (Piterberg 2001), which internal Palestinian refugees continually reject and reconstruct from below.

5 Politics from below: memory, land and return

The provision of citizenship to the internal Palestinian refugees has shaped the notion that the Palestinian community in Israel, labelled as 'Israeli Arabs', became fully-fledged members of the Israeli democratic state (Shoughry 2012). However, the previous section demonstrated that their displacement is a continuous lived experience (Marfleet 2006; Boqa'i 2008). Any assertions of Palestinian origins and presence in historic Palestine subvert the foundational myth of indigeneity through which Zionist policies incrementally diminish the space and place in which Palestinians can exist as Palestinians (Sayigh 2015).

In this section, I aim to illustrate the similarities in the historical adjustment practices and activities employed by Palestinian refugees, whether internal or external. I argue that, despite the various challenges of their displacement, there is a committed persistence to the ongoing struggle against their oppression through practices of oral history and memory that bring to light narratives that are mostly omitted and excluded from the mainstream historical accounts (Said 1992; Humphries 2009). Moreover, I explore the similar patterns of the reproduction of their lifestyle in refugee camps and host villages and cities (Boqa'i 2008). Secondly, I analyse crucial turning points for the Palestinian refugees in general and the internal refugees specifically: the 1976 Land Day and The Madrid and Oslo Accords (Shoughry 2012). The events of the 1976 Land Day left a profound mark on the internal Palestinian refugees: a striking reminder of their fragile and subordinate position as Israeli citizens, which also led to a renewed strengthening of the community for their struggle. Their surprising erasure from the so-called Peace Process led to the internal refugees resorting to acts of citizenship contestation in their struggle. By establishing the ADRID, the internal refugees organised themselves politically in order to challenge the colonial hegemony from within and re-connect their struggle for return with their fellow refugees outside of historic Palestine (Musawa Channel 2016; Wakim 2001).

Adjustment patterns and practices

In the literature on Palestinian refugees, similar themes emerge in how the internal refugees make sense of their space and place. The point of departure is that the 1948 Nakba affects Palestinians wherever they reside: a society has been disintegrated, dispersed, and a complex and historical communal life has been disrupted violently (Sa'di and Abu-Lughod 2007). However, it is critical not to treat it as a one-time event set safely in the past, but as a continuing state of negation and exclusion which intersects with the present day of Palestinians and into the future (Sayigh 2015; Sa'di 2008). Though the cultural resources through which disaster-struck people cope with suffering are hard to articulate, this cultural property needs to be recorded (Sayigh 2015). This is to ensure that the dispossessed are not forced into an appearance of helpless victims, but rather as agents of their own physical, cultural and political survival. A focus on suffering emphasises dependence on

external aid at the expense of practices of endurance that embody agency and values (Sayigh 2015; Peteet 2005).

Although Palestinians had various forms of identity before 1948, including a sense of themselves as Palestinians (Khalidi 2010), there is little doubt that the Nakba in all its dimensions has not just determined their lives, but subsequently become a key site of collective memory (Doumani 1992; Khalidi 2010; Sa'di 2002). Since 1948, the state's strategy towards the internal refugees has consisted of practical oppressive measures, particularly suppressing the memory of the Nakba and the denial of return to the villages of origin (Masalha 2005). The struggle of the *present absentees* – as Israeli citizens – became a threat to the Zionist project of Judaizing Palestine (Boq'ai 2008). In reality, however, the more state policies were focused on suppressing the Nakba memory and attempting to dissolve the internal refugee issue through citizenship, the more the internal refugees' resistance to these policies became visible (Jamal 2005). Kracauer (1995:8) argued that the powerful cannot fully impose their will in constituting the hegemonic discourse about history: "there are always holes in the wall for us to evade and the improbable to slip in".

Memory constitutes one of the few powerful weapons available to those against whom the tide of history has turned (Sa'di and Abu-Lughod 2007). Indeed, Palestinian memory, by way of its narration, preservation and social production under the condition of its silencing, contributes to a counter-history (Sayigh 2015). As Bruner (1990) explained, what moulds collective memory is the shared 'cultural tool-kit' that is available through education, media, public holidays and so forth. However, if memory is mobilised through these mediums to buttress and bind states and nations – as demonstrated in the Israeli education system – memories can also call into question the status quo (Sa'di and Abu-Lughod 2007). Oral history and narration have been culturally available to the Palestinians as a tool-kit (Masalha 2008). However, it has been argued that the narration is not merely a static promotion of suppressed facts about the past, but the presentation of dynamic and contested narratives, because the past is read and represented through the politics of the present (Humphries 2009).

In his *Permission to Narrate* Edward Said urges Palestinians to retrieve and protect their narrative in the face of growing Israeli propaganda, particularly after the Israeli invasion of Lebanon in 1982 and the destruction of the Palestinian archives owned by the Palestinian resistance movements (Shlaim 2000). Furthermore, Matar and Harb (2013) emphasise how storytelling practices have spurred over the years a folk culture conveyed by songs, poetry and narrative which formed the foundational stones for some of the most durable collective memories that have shaped Palestinian popular discourse. As is the case with other subaltern groups, oral testimony and history is a vital tool for recovering the voice of the subaltern (Masalha 2008). Whether dispossessed in refugee camps in the outskirts of Beirut, Damascus and Nablus, or temporary homes in the Galilee, recording history was a matter of urgent need. The essential feature of Palestinian oral history is the direct participation of all Palestinians wherever they reside (Gluck 2008), who since the mid-1980s have shown an awareness of the importance of recording the events of 1948 (Masalha 2005).

The predicament of the internal refugees differed from the external refugees only by their provision of citizenship (Wakim 2001). It has also been pointed out that the internal refugees' experience might have been more difficult due to their witnessing the establishment of a new colonial state on their ruins and the transformation of their own landscapes (Boqa'i 2005; Wakim 2001). However, the activities undertaken in the refugee camps and the shelter villages have exposed similar themes of social adjustments. During the first years of the war, the internal refugees believed they would return to their villages of origin, therefore they attempted to reproduce the life of the village of origin

within the place of refuge. Boqa'i (2005) asserts that these patterns of behaviour are linked directly to the centrality of the family and the village as a socio-cultural structure in the Palestinian *fellah* (peasant) life. Anthropologist Rosemary Sayigh (1979) pointed out that the solidarity of Palestinians in the villages provided both security from external dangers and an environment where villagers could live their own socio-cultural life, and unified people into a system of socially owned lands. This emanates from the theme of 'localism' that existed in Palestine during the Ottoman Empire (Khalidi 2010), which strengthened the autonomy of the Palestinian villages (Boqa'i 2005).

The collapse of the villages and the dispersion of the family in various places of refuge have had a negative consequence on the power of these social structures over their members. Reproducing the lifestyle of the village, many internal refugees have lived in separated neighbourhoods within the host villages located in the periphery and re-named after the village of origin (Boqa'i 2005). A similar pattern has been followed by the external Palestinian refugees (Sha'aban 2002; Roberts 2000). For example, the internal refugees from Saffuriyya live in the Safafri quarter adjacent to Nazareth (Wakim 2001). Saffuriyya's land has been taken over by several Jewish settlements established after the war, chiefly Zippori settlement in 1948 (Wakim 2001). Similarly, in refugee camps, refugees choose to live in neighbourhoods named after their villages of origin (Boqa'i 2005). For example, in Burj al-Barajneh refugee camp in Lebanon, people live in neighbourhoods named after the villages of origin such as al-Ghabisiyya and Tarshiha (Roberts 2000).

Furthermore, during the first year of refuge, many refugees found themselves 'renamed' after their village of origin (Al-Haj 1988). For instance, the name of 'Damuni' was given to all internal refugees from the depopulated village of al-Damun (Boqa'i 2005). The process of renaming in turn enhanced the affinity of the internal refugees based on their village of origin within the Palestinian social structure (Al-Haj 1988). These sentiments of localism represent a powerful undercurrent which continues to run through Palestinian society today, even among descendants of internal and external refugees (Bisharat 1997; Wakim 2001). Interestingly however, the reversed action of re-naming occurred occasionally, which demonstrates how the connection between internal and external refugees can transcend beyond political and physical borders. For example, following the September massacre of hundreds of Palestinian refugees in Sabra and Shatila refugee camp in Beirut after Israel's invasion in 1982, the Safafri neighbourhood in Nazareth (originally from Saffuriyya village) paved a new street and named it "Sabra and Shatila street" to honour those killed, many of whom were originally from Saffuriyya (Humphries 2009:241).

Land Day 1976

The ongoing colonial expansion, land confiscation and expropriation is possibly the most perilous subject in the relationship between the Palestinian community and the Israeli state (Masalha 2003). Anger and frustration over waves of ever-expanding land confiscation was found not only among the internal refugees themselves, but also among the new Palestinian generation who had not known pre-Nakba life (Humphries 2004), a generation that is more educated, involved and less fearful of the outcome of their politicisation. Ongoing land confiscation has become an inseparable trigger of collective anger over the dispossession and displacement of the Nakba that continues today. By the 1970s, Israel's Ministry of Agriculture published the Galilee Development Plan which spelled out the intentions of major land expropriations (Shoughry 2012). The reaction to confiscations of land that belonged to Palestinians reached a peak in the 'Land Day' of March 30th 1976, which began with a peaceful general strike and culminated in the killing of six Palestinians by the Israeli police forces (Kretzmer 1990). Since 1976, March 30th has become a national day of protest and commemoration for the larger Palestinian community, both inside and beyond Israel's borders, while also receiving significant attention from the outside world for the first time (Masalha 2003).

The bloody end to an initially peaceful protest reminded the Palestinian community of their subordinate position even as citizens, as the Israeli authorities considered any political movement or activity with suspicion and hostility (Shoughry 2012). Yet, the collective experience and events of the 1976 Land Day had a profound impact on the political life of the community that further united Palestinians in the region.

Madrid, Oslo and the founding of ADRID

Although the issue of the internal refugees is still conspicuous by its absence from the Israeli-Palestinian debate, the early and mid-1990s witnessed a major turning point (Masalha 2005). After the Peace Process at the 1991 Madrid Conference, Palestinians in all parts of the former British Mandate of Palestine found themselves confronting new challenges. As with all the political processes which by nature reflect the interests of the most powerful, the discourse of the negotiations between the Israeli government and the Palestine Liberation Organisation (PLO) failed to give reference to the Palestinian refugees' right of return (Aruri 2001). The Palestinian refugees were recognised by supporters and critics of the negotiations as an issue which Palestinian negotiators were likely to compromise to secure some form of an 'independent' state in the West Bank and Gaza (Humphries 2009). Despite the hope for some recognition and inclusion in the peace process, the internal refugee case was assumed to be an *internal* Israeli concern due to their status as citizens (Jamal 2005).

ADRID was founded in direct response to the neglect of internal refugees in the Madrid and Oslo negotiations (Wakim 2001). ADRID is an umbrella organisation whose three principal objectives are: (a) promoting the right of return of the internal and external refugees to their original villages and the rejection of compensation as an alternative to return; (b) uniting the efforts and activities of the various internal refugees within the framework of ADRID; and (c) conducting public relations on behalf of the internal refugees directed at international audiences (Masalha 2005). As a social and political movement, ADRID seeks to reframe their forced migration and infuse it in the Israeli-Palestinian debate and agenda (Jamal 2005). The Director of ADRID (a descendent of internal refugees himself) has stated the following in an interview: "We were very upset with the Palestinian delegation for not raising the issue of the internally displaced, and our fear of exclusion from the PLO's strategy led us to take action by forming a committee" (Wakim 2001:35). The committee aims to unify local efforts of internal refugees and to raise their predicament as a common cause rather than a separate struggle of each village (Humphries 2009). These efforts resulted in the first nationwide conference in the Galilee in 1995, with the participation of delegates representing 39 destroyed villages (Masalha 2005). This act became an essential turning point that transformed the standing committee into a nationwide organisation. Issuing a collective statement which "rejected all alternatives to the right of return" (Masalha 2005), it therefore centralised the activities of the internal refugees under the umbrella of ADRID (Wakim 2001).

One reason why the internal refugee 'problem' re-emerged is the fact that Israeli policies of control, oppression, and de-Arabisation through land confiscation and political de-legitimisation have never stopped (Jamal 2005; Ghanem 2001). These took different forms during the various post-military governments, but their real intentions and goals as a settler state went unchanged (Jamal 2005). Consequently, the more land confiscation policies and Judaisation of space increased, the more the internal refugees were provoked to adopt an active strategy to assert their presence and their right of return (Jamal 2005).

Acts of citizenship

Refugee ‘status’ terminates with official re-territorialisation in a sovereign territory with the ultimate provision of citizenship (Haddad 2008; Soguk 1999; Long 2008). From its inception, the Israeli government applied such an approach as a ‘durable solution’ to the internal Palestinian refugees. However, this was not done by favouring or protecting those who remained (Jamal 2005). On the contrary, post-1948 the state was still depopulating and transferring Palestinians in order to facilitate the repopulation of areas targeted for Jewish settlements (Boqa’i 2008). Yet, in the early 1960s this expulsionist activism died out, partly because of a wave of internal criticism from left and right wing civil society who desired Israel to be perceived as a democracy with a moral image (Pappé 2011:55). However, for the internal refugees, citizenship did not allow them to “develop their potential” and/or “live life that they value” (UNDP 2018). They were still experiencing forms of oppression and suppression by the settler state that claimed to guarantee them equal rights (Humphries 2009). Their predicament was more complex than receiving a legal ‘status’ of equal citizen.

Post-Oslo, the founding of the ADRID and their activities reflected the beginning of the tactical employment of citizenship as ‘practice’ (McNevin 2011; Isin and Wood 1999). ADRID activities became more evident and vocal, and they ultimately forced themselves on the political agenda (Shoughry 2012). As Chatterjee (2004:41) has argued, civil society is demographically limited and restricted to a small section of “culturally equipped citizens”. He distinguishes between civil society and political society, and refers to the latter to describe recent forms of entanglement of elite and subaltern politics. Accordingly, the state must descend from the high ground to the terrain of political society in order to renew its legitimacy as provider of well-being for its citizens (Chatterjee 2004). By adopting the broader definition of citizenship as both status and practice, it is possible to conceive how the internal refugees mobilised themselves politically through ‘acts of citizenship’ (Isin and Nielsen 2008). These acts of citizenship contestation challenge meanings of citizenship and membership in a nation state at the ontological level (McNevin 2011). They undermine the legitimacy of legal status as a ‘common-sense’ (Geertz 1983) determinant of equality and subjectivity (McNevin 2011). These acts of citizenship generate new modes of subjects’ recognition, with what Arendt has asserted as “the right to have rights” (1968:176). By identifying acts of citizenship, we can begin to perceive the potential for alternative configurations of political communities (Isin 2008 and Nielsen).

Storytelling and memory have always been central to the struggle against forgetfulness for the internal refugees (Sa’di and Abu-Lughod 2007). Since 1948 the ‘villages of origin’ have been the centre for collective memory sites (Nora 1996) and an important provider of ‘legitimacy’ for their presence and recognition (Masalha 2008). Local campaigns of internal refugees have reflected strong links between memory, a sense of ‘refugeeness’, and a desire to return to the village of origin (Masalha 2008). These three aspects intersect with the grassroots struggle of the internal refugees. Boqa’i (2005) has argued that the village of origin creates a space of ‘socialisation’ which helps renew and re-assert the struggle for return. The initiatives of the internal refugees have included annual Nakba commemorations, visits to destroyed villages, and establishing summer camps within the boundaries of the village (Boqa’i 2008). Issuing pamphlets and records about the destroyed villages, re-drawing and printing new maps, petitioning Israeli courts, and lobbying Arab parties and politicians have also been undertaken (Cohen 2003). While becoming a critical symbol for the provision of legitimacy for the internal refugees, their political activism is also directed more against the alliance of the Israeli government and the JNF (Jamal 2005). Both played a major role in the eviction from, theft of and concealing traces of their original villages, and transforming the land into ‘real estate’ (Jamal 2005). Moreover, Sa’di (2008) argues that activities at the site of memory demonstrate its ability to reclaim new terrains, acquire new meanings. This embodies the

adaptability to the new reality since the Palestinians live in scattered communities and lack the institutions that produce official narratives.

Interestingly, the struggle of the internal refugees has also been taken up among their descendants, those second, third and fourth generations (Masalha 2008). Dawud Bader, a second-generation internal refugee and one of the leaders of the ADRID, describes this well:

During the early years of the military rule, displaced people could only find a shelter to live in quietly and to advance themselves. Later, and gradually the younger educated became more involved in the political and national issues...they became more involved in confronting the Israeli authorities and their discriminatory policies (Masalha 2008:146).

Since the 1990s, the younger generation of internal refugees has been actively working on trying to articulate a new narrative of return and presence (Masalha 2008). Legally speaking, the internal refugees cannot enter their destroyed villages, though in practice the state does not enforce the ban since it does not want to impede on the freedom of movement of Israeli Jews who do not need permits (Wakim 2001). This is an ‘act of citizenship’, in which the internal refugees mobilise themselves strategically within what is permitted. But their socialisation engagements in the villages of origin represent something much deeper that cannot be captured by their legal status as ‘Israeli-Arabs’ per se. Furthermore, as Wakim (2001) explains, their task is not only to confront the state because of their displacement, it is more than this: “we aim to organise the displaced communities”. Humphries (2008) emphasises that out of all Palestinians, the internal refugees are the closest entwined with the Jewish Israeli society. They are also the only Palestinian refugees with access to the villages of origin. Thus, their narrative of the Nakba is the most accessible, and potentially the most disturbing, to the Jewish Israeli narrative (Humphries 2009). Chatty (2010:229) has articulated how the second, third and fourth generations of external Palestinian refugees were the first to become active and join the struggle of return. For many of them, the combined collective memory of their elders’ forced migration was merged in internal contradiction with their own narrative (Chatty 2010). Summer camps in the villages of origin organised by the ADRID invite a resident of one of the depopulated villages to give talks about its life pre-1948, stating that in order to pass it to younger generation, “it is not enough to talk about the village, but rather to live it 24 hours a day” (Boqa’i 2005:103-104).

Some of the churches, mosques and cemeteries still exist in the depopulated villages (Khalidi 1992). There has been a growing initiative for the protection and preservation of the original villages’ holy sites (Masalha 2005). Some activities have been carried out by the Islamic-led Al-Aqsa Association, which has been refurbishing and cleaning the remaining mosques and churches (Ben-Ze’ev and Aburaiya 2004). Wakim further emphasises the success of these initiatives, particularly in Hittin, a depopulated village near Tiberias, where calls to prayer were organised for the first time in the refurbished mosque since the village was displaced in 1948 (Masalha 2015; MusawaChannel 2016). Utilising the state’s recognition of their religious affiliation as non-Jews in the state, internal Palestinian refugees have re-opened a mosque in Hittin, an act that strikes through and represents their case in a symbolic way (MusawaChannel 2016). In 1998, the ADRID began organising the ‘Return March’ as a major annual event (Boqa’i 2005). The ‘Return March’ is held on the same day as Israeli ‘Independence Day’, with the participation of thousands of the Palestinian community in Israel (Masalha 2005). Initially the route of the Return March began in one of the host villages and ended in one of the villages of origin (Boqa’i 2008). In 2018, the ADRID planned the Return March towards Jerusalem as a collective march that comprised of Palestinians from the West Bank, Gaza, and the refugee camps in Arab countries, coinciding with the day of the US Embassy move to

Jerusalem (ADRID 2018). The symbolic ‘return’ each year to the village of origin on exactly the same day of Israel’s Independence Day is symbolically powerful and challenges the solid structure of the state from within (Masalha 2008).

These acts are within the realm of citizenship, yet their strategic employment undermines the legitimacy of the state by reproducing a new kind of citizen and rupture within the Israeli state (Isin and Nielsen 2008). Acts of citizenship expose something fundamental about citizenship beyond the distribution of social goods: “Citizenship is about political subjectivity. Not one or the other but both: political and subjectivity” (Nyers 2011:11). However, while these acts are within the limited space of citizenship, such as re-opening a mosque and marches, they transform the villages of origin as spaces of legitimacy (Boq’ai 2008). Through these grassroots activities the internal refugees believe they communicate their struggle with the larger Palestinian community (Humphries 2009:240).

6 Conclusion

This research explored the extent to which the provision of citizenship for the internal Palestinian refugees can be conceived as a durable solution to their predicament. Furthermore, it aimed to shed light on the absence of the internal Palestinian refugees from the Israeli-Palestinian debate.

It has been established that, in the current international state system, a ‘citizen’ of a national community represents “the national order of things” (Malkki 1992), the recognised mode of belonging, subjectivity and rights (Heater 1990; Oldfield 1990). The citizen is unproblematic and is rooted in a territorial sovereign space (Soysal 1994; Soguk 1999; Joppke 1999). Therefore, the refugee’s predicament is rectified through the ultimate provision of citizenship (Haddad 2008; Soguk 1999; Long 2008).

However, this research has demonstrated that the provision of citizenship as a durable solution to the internal Palestinian refugees has not ceased their ongoing displacement and dispossession as it continues to be as a lived experience (Marfleet 2006:193). The provision of citizenship has led the international community, Arab world and to some extent the Palestinian diaspora to believe that the internal Palestinian refugees were granted full citizenship with equal rights in the Jewish state (Shoughry 2012). Yet this research has shown that for the internal Palestinian refugees, chiefly what has led to their absence from the Israeli-Palestinian debate and the international community as a whole is citizenship. This is not to say that other internal, regional and international factors and conditions did not contribute to the internal Palestinian refugees’ predicament. As discussed, a dynamic combination of high politics, state policies, and the abrupt experience of expulsion itself (Chatty 2010) have all contributed – although not equally – to their impasse. It is rather to reinforce the idea that their ‘status’ as citizens did not develop into a durable solution, that is the enjoyment of protection, representation and the right to have rights (Arendt 1968).

Edward Said once said that the “problem of beginning is the beginning of a problem” (Said 1985:45). Citizenship for the internal refugees was meant to denote the beginning of supposed political membership, subjectivity and equal rights (Nyers 2011; Jamal 2005). However, following the termination of UNRWA’s mandate in Israel and the subsequent provision of citizenship, the remaining Palestinian community in Israel (internal refugees or not) was placed under a strict military government that lasted between 1948-1966 (Boqa’i 2008; Masalha 2005; Shoughry 2012).

Two policies that originated within the context of the military government targeted the internal Palestinian refugees and are still in effect today: The Absentee Property Law 1950 and the Israeli education system. The former defined them as *present absentees* under the law, which allowed their material dispossession and displacement, despite their legal status as citizens (Masalha 2005). The latter demonstrated the continued marginalisation and negation of the Palestinian community, thus failing from its inception to develop a common citizenship (Pinson 2005). What becomes evident is that Israeli authorities provision of citizenship to the internal refugees was based on a specific type of citizenship, in terms of legal status as ‘Israeli-Arabs’ with no rights or recognition regarding their history, villages of origin, and self-representation (Abu-Saad 2007). The surreal oxymoron *present absentee* captures this intriguing dissonance, and demonstrates that their displacement and dispossession have not ceased – they are still lived by the internal refugees (Marfleet 2006).

Adopting the broader definition of citizenship as both status and practice (Isin and Nielsen 2008), it is possible to recognise the potential of the internal refugees to organise themselves politically in countering their *absence* in national and international debates on Israel and Palestine. Under the condition of silencing the history of the Palestinians, collective memory and narrative became a shared cultural tool-kit (Bruner 1990) to counter history (Sayigh 2015). Therefore, the persistence of the Nakba collective memory has reinforced the continued experience of displacement and dispossession, and triggered subsequent political actions, as demonstrated in accounts of Land Day and the recent examples of the Return Marches to destroyed villages. When considering citizenship not only as status but also as practice, it is possible to notice the emergence of acts of citizenship contestation (McNevin 2011). These acts of contestation and negotiation can challenge meanings of citizenship and could undermine the legitimacy of legal status as a determinant of political belonging and equality in the state (McNevin 2011: 99). This is evidenced in grassroots activities, such as refurbishing churches, marches, and summer camps that centre around the villages of origin as spaces of legitimacy (Boqa’i 2005). Although their activities remain within the realm of the domestic Israeli state, they create rupture and reproduce new kinds of citizens and subjectivities (Nyers 2011). The re-opening of the mosque in the destroyed villages of Hittin, and using it for the call to prayer for the first time since 1948, is a symbolically powerful act (MusawaChannel 2016) that asserts their *presence*.

Acts of citizenship are used as a tactical approach to countering the Israeli state’s public claim to be democratic and equal. However, it would be a mistake to perceive these acts of citizenship as reflecting the straightforward acceptance of integration and full-fledged membership in the Jewish state as an end goal (Humphries 2009). Return is not only a legal case; it is also a political one. McNevin (2011) has argued that we cannot be confident that the language of citizenship is enough to do justice to the broadest range of ways of being political in the past, present or future. For the *present absentees*, the perpetuation of the community’s very existence is a political act (Humphries 2005). I argue that the struggle of the internal Palestinian refugees cannot be reduced to demands of civic equality as some have suggested (Cohen 2003). While official public rhetoric and campaigning of Palestinians in Israel is based on achieving civil rights, a look at grassroots political activism shows that their 1948 displacement remains rooted in the consciousness of the community (Humphries 2009). Their acts of contestation are within the confines of their Israeli citizenship, but most internal refugee activists believe they are engaging in a wider struggle that reconnects them with the wider Palestinian refugee population. They are communicating their struggle through the villages of origin that provide them with spaces of legitimacy and recognition as people who have been experiencing displacement and dispossession (Boqa’i 2005).

The internal Palestinian refugees have been treated as *present absentees* both by the Israeli authorities and the Palestinian national movement; they are often absented politically and theoretically despite their physical presence and despite their citizenship and displacement. Therefore, in order to better understand Israeli policies towards the Palestinian refugee population in the occupied territories of the West Bank and Gaza and the Palestinian refugee camps in the region, one must study first its colonial policies in Palestinian land occupied in 1948.

7 References

- Abu-Saad, I.** (2004) Separate and Unequal: The Role of the State Educational System in Maintaining the Subordination of Israel's Palestinian Arab Citizens. *Social Identities*, 10(1), 101-127.
- Abu-Saad, I.** (2006a) Palestinian Education in Israel: The Legacy of the Military Government. *Holy Land Studies*, 5(1), 21-56.
- Abu-Saad, I.** (2006b) State-Controlled Education and Identity Formation Among the Palestinian Arab Minority in Israel. *American Behavioural Scientist*, 49(8), 1085-1100.
- Abu-Saad, I.** (2007) The Portrayal of Arabs in Textbooks in The Jewish School System in Israel. *Arab Studies Quarterly*, 29(1), 21-38.
- Adalah** - Legal Center for Arab Minority Rights in Israel. *History of the Arabs in Israel*. At: <http://www.adalah.org/histlegal.htm> (accessed May 2018).
- ADRID** (2018) *Return March to Jerusalem*, Monday 14 May. At: <https://www.facebook.com/ADDPR/> (accessed 14 May 2018).
- Al-Haj, M.** (1986) Adjustment Patterns of the Arab Internal Refugees in Israel. *International Migration*, 24(3), 651-674.
- Al-Haj, M.** (1988) The Arab Internal Refugees in Israel: The Emergence of a Minority Within the Minority. *Immigrants & Minorities*, 7(2), 149-165.
- Al-Haj, M.** (1995) *Education, Empowerment and Control: The case of the Arabs in Israel*. Albany, NY: State University of New York.
- Anderson, B.** (2006) *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso Books.
- Appadurai, A.** (1996) *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Arendt, H.** (1968) *Imperialism: Part Two of the Origins of Totalitarianism*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
- Aruri, N.H.** (2001) *Palestinian Refugees: The Right of Return*. London: Pluto Press.
- Badil Resource Centre** for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights (2002) Statistics on the Internally Displaced Palestinians in post-1948. At: <http://www.badil.org/en/publication/survey-of-refugees.html> (accessed 20 May 2018).
- Beit-Hallahmi, B.** (1992) *Original Sins: Reflections on the History of Zionism and Israel*. London: Pluto Press.
- Benvenisti, M.** (2000) *Sacred Landscape: The Buried History of the Holy Land since 1948*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Ben-Ze'ev, E. and Aburaiya, I.** (2004) Middle-Ground Politics and the Re-Palestinization of Places in Israel. *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, 36(4), 639-655.
- Bisharat, G.E.** (1997) Exile to Compatriot: Transformations in the Social Identity of Palestinian Refugees in the West Bank. In Gupta, A. and Ferguson, J. (eds) *Culture, Power, Place: Explorations in Critical Anthropology*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, pp. 203-233.
- Bligh, A.** (1998) Israel and the Refugee Problem: From Exodus to Resettlement, 1948–52. *Middle Eastern Studies*, 34(1), 123-147.

- Boqa'i, N.** (2005) 'Patterns of Internal Displacement, Social Adjustment and the Challenge of Return', in Masalha, N. (ed.) *Catastrophe Remembered: Palestine-Israel and the Internal Refugee – Essays in Memory of Edward W. Said*. London: Zed Books, pp. 73-112.
- Boqa'i, N.** (2008) Palestinian Internally Displaced Persons inside Israel: Challenging the Solid Structures. *Palestine - Israel Journal of Politics, Economics, and Culture*, 15/16(4), 31-43.
- Brubaker, W.R.** (1992) Citizenship struggles in Soviet successor states. *International migration review*, 26(2), 269-291.
- Bruner, J.S.** (1990) *Acts of Meaning*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Chatterjee, P.** (2004) *The Politics of the Governed: Reflections on Popular Politics in Most of the World*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Chatty, D.** (2010) *Displacement and Dispossession in the Modern Middle East*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Chatty, D.** (2014) Iraqi Refugees in the Arab Muslim World: Ottoman Legacies and Orientalist Presumptions. In Fabos, A. and Isotalo, R. (eds) *Managing Muslim Mobilities*. New York: Springer, pp. 21-38.
- Cohen, H.** (2000) HaNifkadim HaNokhahim, HaPlitim HaFalestinim BeIsrael meaz 1948 [The Present Absentees: Palestinian Refugees in Israel Since 1948] [Hebrew]. Jerusalem: Institute for Arab-Israeli Studies. Also see Masalha, N. *A Land without a People: Israel, Transfer and the Palestinians*, London: Faber & Faber, pp.12.
- Cohen, H.** (2002) The Internal Refugees in the State of Israel; Israeli Citizens, Palestinian Refugees. *Palestine-Israel Journal of Politics, Economics, and Culture*, 9(2), 43.
- Cohen, H.** (2003) Land, Memory, and Identity: The Palestinian Internal Refugees in Israel. *Refuge: Canada's Periodical on Refugees*, 21(2), 6-13.
- Cohen, H.** (2005) The State of Israel versus the Palestinian Internal Refugees. In Masalha, N. (ed.) *Catastrophe Remembered: Palestine, Israel and the Internal Refugees – Essays in Memory of Edward W. Said*. London: Zed Books.
- Doumani, B.B.** (1992) Rediscovering Ottoman Palestine: Writing Palestinians into History. *Journal of Palestine Studies*, 21(2), 5-28.
- Dyck, N.** (1997) Tutelage, Resistance and Co-optation in Canadian Indian Administration. *Canadian Review of Sociology & Anthropology*, 34(3), 333-348.
- Elhanan, N.** (2012) *Palestine in Israeli School Books: Ideology and Propaganda in Education* (Vol. 82). London: IB Tauris.
- Freire, P.** (1993) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Bloomsbury Publishing USA.
- Gabbay, R.** (1959) *A Political Study of the Arab-Jewish conflict: The Arab refugee problem (a case study)*. Geneva; Paris: Droz; Minard.
- Gabiam, N.** (2015) Citizenship and Development: Palestinians in France and the Multiple Meanings of Statelessness. *Studies in Comparative International Development*, 50(4), 479-499.
- Garland, D.** (1997) Governmentality and the Problem of Crime: Foucault, Criminology, Sociology. *Theoretical criminology*, 1(2), 173-214.
- Geertz, C.** (1983) *Local Knowledge: Further Essays in Interpretive Anthropology*. New York: Basic Books.
- Ghanem, A.** (2001) *The Palestinian-Arab Minority in Israel, 1948-2000: A Political Study*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Gluck, S.B.** (2008) Oral history and al-Nakba. *The Oral History Review*, 35(1), 68-80.

- Haddad, E.** (2008) *The Refugee in International Society: Between Sovereigns*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heater, D.B.** (1990) *Citizenship: The Civic Ideal in World History, Politics and Education*. London: Longman.
- Humphries, I.** (2004) Palestinian Internal Refugees in the Galilee: From the Struggle to Survive to the New Narrative of Return (1948-2005). *Holy Land Studies*, 3(2), 213-231.
- Humphries, I.** (2005) A muted sort of grief: Tales of refuge in Nazareth (1948-2005). In Masalha, N. (ed.) *Catastrophe Remembered: Palestine-Israel and the Internal Refugee – Essays in Memory of Edward W. Said*. London: Zed Books, pp. 154-155.
- Humphries, I.** (2008) Listening to the Displaced Narrative: Politics, Power and Grassroots Communication Amongst Palestinians Inside Israel. *Middle East Journal of Culture and Communication*, 1(2), 180-196.
- Humphries, I.** (2009) 'Displaced Voices: The Politics of Memory amongst Palestinian Internal Refugees in the Galilee (1991-2009)', doctoral dissertation, St Mary's University College and University of Surrey.
- Isin, E.F. and Nielsen, G.M.** (2008) *Acts of Citizenship*. London; New York: Zed Books.
- Isin, E.F. and Wood, P.K.** (1999) *Citizenship and Identity*. London; Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Jabareen, H.** (2002) The Future of Arab Citizenship in Israel: Jewish-Zionist Time in a Place with No Palestinian Memory. In Levy D. & Weiss Y. (eds.) *Challenging Ethnic Citizenship: German and Israeli Perspectives on Immigration*. Oxford: Berghahn Books, pp. 196-220
- Jamal, A.** (2005) The Palestinian IDPs in Israel and the Predicament of Return: Between Imagining the Impossible and Enabling the Imaginative. *Exile and Return: Predicaments of Palestinians and Jews*, pp. 133-160.
- Jenkins, R.** (1996) *Social Identity*. London: Routledge.
- Jiryis, S.** (1979) The Arabs in Israel, 1973-79. *Journal of Palestine Studies*, 8(4), 31-56.
- Jiryis, S.** (1981) Domination by the Law. *Journal of Palestine Studies*, 11(1), 67-92.
- Joppke, C.** (1999) *Immigration and the Nation-State: The United States, Germany, and Great Britain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kamen, C.S.** (1987) After the catastrophe I: The Arabs in Israel, 1948. *Middle Eastern Studies*, 23(4), 453-495.
- Khalidi, R.** (2010) *Palestinian Identity: The Construction of Modern National Consciousness*. New York; Chichester: Columbia University Press.
- Khalidi, W.** (1992) *All That Remains: The Palestinian Villages Occupied and Depopulated in Israel in 1948*. Washington DC: Institute for Palestine Studies.
- Kimmerling, B.** (1977) Sovereignty, Ownership, and Presence in The Jewish-Arab Territorial Conflict: The Case of Bir'im and Ikrit. *Comparative Political Studies*, 10(2), 155-176.
- Kracauer, S.** (1995) [1969] *History: The Last Things Before the Last*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Kretzmer, D.** (1990) *The Legal Status of the Arabs in Israel*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Kristeva, J.** (1991) *Strangers to Ourselves*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Long, K.** (2008) *State, Nation, Citizen: Rethinking Repatriation*. Oxford: Refugee Studies Centre.
- Lustick, I.** (1980) *Arabs in the Jewish State: Israel's Control of a National Minority*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

- Magga, O.** (2003, November 17). *Indigenous peoples' perspectives on quality education, public debate "Indigenous People and Education."* Paris: United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organisation: <http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/pfii/members/Magga-Indigenous%20Education.htm>.
- Malkki, L.** (1992) National Geographic: The Rooting of Peoples and the Territorialization of National Identity Among Scholars and Refugees. *Cultural Anthropology*, 7(1), 24-44.
- Malkki, L.H.** (1995) Refugees and Exile: From 'Refugee Studies' to the National Order of Things. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 24, 495-523.
- Manna, A.** (2017) *Nakba and Survival: The Story of Palestinians Remaining in Jaffa and Hebron (1948-1956)*. Beirut: Institute for Palestine Studies (Arabic).
- Marfleet, P.** (2006) *Refugees in a Global Era*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mar'i, S.** (1978) *Arab Education in Israel*. Syracuse and New York: Syracuse University Press.
- Masalha, N.** (2003) *The Politics of Denial: Israel and the Palestinian Refugee Problem*. London: Pluto Press.
- Masalha, N.** (2005) *Catastrophe Remembered: Palestine, Israel and the Internal Refugees: Essays in Memory of Edward W. Said*. London: Zed Books Ltd.
- Masalha, N.** (2008) Remembering the Palestinian Nakba: Commemoration, Oral History and Narratives of Memory. *Holy Land Studies*, 7(2), 123-156.
- Masalha, N.** (2015) Settler-colonialism, Memoricide and Indigenous Toponymic Memory: The Appropriation of Palestinian place names by the Israeli state. *Journal of Holy Land and Palestine Studies*, 14(1), 3-57.
- Matar, D. and Harb, Z.** (2013) *Narrating conflict in the Middle East: Discourse, Image and Communications Practices in Lebanon and Palestine*. London: IB Tauris.
- McNevin, A.** (2011) *Contesting Citizenship: Irregular Migrants and New Frontiers of the Political*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Morris, B.** (1987) *The birth of the Palestinian refugee problem, 1947-1949*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Musawa Channel** (2016) *Episode with guest Wakim Wakim*. 2016. Close-Up. 16 November 2016, 22:00.
- Nyers, P.** (2011) Alien Equality. *Issues in Legal Scholarship*, 9(1).
- Oldfield, A.** (1990) *Citizenship and Community: Civic Republicanism and the Modern World*. London: Routledge.
- Pappé, I.** (2006) *The Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine*. Oxford: One world.
- Pappé, I.** (2011) *The Forgotten Palestinians: A History of the Palestinians in Israel*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Peteet, J.M.** (2005) *Landscape of hope and despair: Palestinian refugee camps*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Pinson, H.** (2005) At the Boundaries of Citizenship: Palestinian Israeli Citizens and the Civic Education Curriculum. *Oxford Review of Education*, 33(3), 331-348.
- Pinson, H. and Agbaria, A.K.** (2015) Neo-liberalism and practices of selection in Arab education in Israel: Between control and empowerment. *Diaspora, indigenous, and minority education*, 9(1), 54-80.
- Piterberg, G.** (2001) Erasures. *New Left Review*, 10, p. 31.

- Podeh, E.** (2001) *The Arab-Israeli Conflict in Israeli History Textbooks, 1948-2000*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
- Raz-Krakotzkin, A.** (1999) The Textbook Debate: No significant Change in the Perception of the History of Zionism. *Within Israel and Palestine* XV: 1-6.
- Rogan, E.L. and Shlaim, A.** (2007) *The war for Palestine: rewriting the history of 1948*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ryan, J.L.** (1973) Refugees within Israel: The Case of the Villagers of Kafr Bir'Im and Iqrit. *Journal of Palestine Studies*, 2(4), 55-81.
- Sa'di, A.H.** (2002) Catastrophe, memory and identity: Al-Nakbah as a component of Palestinian identity. *Israel Studies*, 7(2), 175-198.
- Sa'di, A.H.** (2008) Remembering Al-Nakba in a time of amnesia: On silence, dislocation and time. *interventions*, 10(3), 381-399.
- Sa'di, A.H. and Abu-Lughod, L.** (2007) *Nakba: Palestine, 1948, and the claims of memory*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Said, E.W.** (1992) *The Question of Palestine*. New York: Vintage.
- Sanbar, E.** (2001) Out of Place, Out of Time. *Mediterranean Historical Review*, 16(1), 87-94.
- Satzewich, V.** (1996). Patronage, moral regulation and the recruitment of Indian affairs personnel, 1879-1900. *Canadian Review of Sociology & Anthropology*, 33(2), 213-234.
- Sayigh, R.** (1979) *Palestinians: From Peasants to Revolutionaries: A People's History*. London: Zed Press.
- Sayigh, R.** (2015) Silenced Suffering. *Borderlands*, 14, 1-20.
- Schechla, J.** (2001) The Invisible People Come to Light: Israel's "Internally Displaced" and the "Unrecognized Villagers". *Journal of Palestine Studies*, 31(1), 20-31.
- Seliktar, O.** (1984). The Arabs in Israel: Some Observations on the Psychology of the System of Controls. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 28(2), 247-269.
- Sha'aban, H.** (2002) *Palestinian Refugees in Lebanon: From Hosting to Discrimination*. Jerusalem: PASSIA-Palestinian Academic Society for International Affairs [Arabic].
- Shihade, M.** (2014) Not Just a Picnic: Settler Colonialism, Mobility, and Identity among Palestinians in Israel. *Biography*, 37(2), 451-473.
- Shihade, M.** (2016) Reflection on Elia Zureik's Israel's Colonial Project in Palestine: A Brutal Pursuit. *Arab Studies Quarterly*, 38(4), 709-713.
- Shlaim, A.** (2000) *The Iron Wall: Israel and the Arab world*. London: Allen Lane, the Penguin Press.
- Shoughry, N.** (2012) "Israeli-Arab" Political Mobilization: Between Acquiescence, Participation, and Resistance. New York: Palgrave Macmillan US.
- Soguk, N.** (1999) *States and Strangers: Refugees and Displacements of Statecraft*. Minneapolis; London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Soysal, Y.N.** (1994) *Limits of Citizenship: Migrants and Postnational Membership in Europe*. Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press.
- Swirski, S.** (1999) *Politics and Education in Israel: Comparisons with the United States*. New York: Routledge.
- UNDP** (2018) About human development. At: <http://hdr.undp.org/en/humandev>. Accessed May 18 2018.

UNHCR (2015) UN conventions on Statelessness. At: <http://www.unhcr.org/pages/4a2535c3d.html> accessed (May 18 2018).

UNRWA (2018) About Palestine Refugees. At: <https://www.unrwa.org/palestine-refugees>. Accessed May 10, 2018.

United Nations General Assembly (1993) 44th Session. Executive Committee of the High Commissioner's Programme. *Note on International Protection*. 31 August (GA, A/AC. 96/8 I5).

Wakim, W. (2001) The 'Internally Displaced': Seeking Return within One's Own Land. *Journal of Palestine Studies*, 31(1), 32-38.

Wertsch, J.V. (2002) *Voices of collective remembering*. Cambridge University Press.

Yazbak, H. (2017) The Internal Refugees under Military Rule. At: https://www.arabs48.com/article_120573

Young, I. (1989) Polity and Group Difference: A Critique of the Ideal of Universal Citizenship. *Ethics*, 99(2), 250.

Zaher, S. (2010) *The Prohibition on Teaching the Nakba in the Arab Education System in Israel*, Adalah (The Legal Center For Arab Minority in Israel), September 2010.

Zureik, E. (2001) Constructing Palestine through Surveillance Practices. *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, 28(2), 205-227.