

# IsraCampus.Org.il

[Site Index](#)

[Home](#)

[About IsraCampus](#)

[Search](#)

[עברית](#)

[Русский](#)

**Israeli Campuses**

[Ben Gurion U](#)  
[Hebrew U](#)  
[Tel Aviv U](#)  
[U of Haifa](#)  
[Other Schools](#)

**Gallery of Rogues**

[A-C](#)  
[D-G](#)  
[H-K](#)  
[L-N](#)  
[O-R](#)  
[S-V](#)  
[W-Z](#)

[Israeli Academic  
Extremism](#)

[Israeli Academic  
Extremists outside Israel](#)

[Anti-Israel Petitions  
Signed by Israeli  
Academics](#)

[ALEF Watch](#)

[IDI Watch](#)

[IsraCampus Essays](#)

[How to Complain](#)

[Contact Us](#)

## Editorial Article

### The Power of Insinuation: the modalities and normative anti-Israel discourse of Israel's academics as seen through The Power of Inclusive Exclusion.

#### Book Review

**The Power of Inclusive Exclusion** edited by Adi Ophir, Michal Givoni and Sari Hanafi, Brooklyn: Zone, 641 pages, (Hardcover), 2009 \$25.71

Reviewed by Seth J. Frantzman  
28/1/2010

The fact that there is yet another book about the "occupation" should not be a surprise. The fact that it consists ONLY of anti-Israel and anti-Zionist writers is not either. The fact that not a single pro-Israel writer was invited to participate should be met with yawns. Ideological self-recruiting to promote a political agenda under the guise of "research" has become trivially common in Israeli universities and elsewhere.

Books about the conflict are also unique in their attention to the most minor details of the conflict. Consider Tim Jon Simmerling's *Israeli and Palestinian postcards: Presentations of National Self* published in 2004. Or *Hollow Land: Israel's Architecture of Occupation* by Eyal Weizman, who coincidentally is also a contributor to this volume reviewed here. It is unlikely a coincidence that the photo used for the cover of *Architecture of Occupation* is identical to the one used on the cover of *Power of Inclusive Exclusion*. The book was commenced in 2003 as a project "under the auspices of the Van Leer Jerusalem Institute" (page 26). This organization spends much of its time hosting and funding extreme anti-Israel discourse. It currently publishes the Marxist Hebrew magazine "Theory and Criticism."

In part, such books are the result of Israeli and Jewish academics who build careers out of churning out such articles. Dr. David Hirsh, a sociology lecturer at University of London's Goldsmiths College, recently described these antics: "Israeli anti-Zionists boast that their country carries out the most important and horrific genocides in the world...[they have] delusions of grandeur." They are celebrated as minor celebrities by weaving a narrative about being "Jews" and "Israelis" who supposedly are supposedly courageously standing up against the mainstream. One example of this is Dr. Anat Matar of Tel Aviv University, who attended a February 17, 2010 London University School for Oriental and African Studies conference, where she spoke on "Supporting the boycott on Israel: a View from Within."

Consider the introduction of *Inclusive Exclusion*, where the editors claim, "This book has been conceived in an atmosphere that is generally hostile to the kind of political questions and theoretical perspectives it strives to open." This is nonsense. The academic world is awash with Bash-Israel diatribes and advocacy "research." Nevertheless every anti-Israel propagandist in academia insists

that he or she is challenging the dominant paradigm, “breaking moulds” and “exploding myths.” In loud unison every single one of these people casts himself or herself as the “lone voice” who is “radically refashioning.” In many departments devoted to Middle Eastern studies, for example, every single person claims to be a “lone voice” who “dares” to speak up about the Israeli occupation. It is the conformism of the postureurs of non-conformity. In reality it is a form of group think.

Entire conferences are held at universities and entire classes offered, such as Yehouda Shenhav’s ‘Bureaucracy, Governmentality and Human Rights’ at Tel Aviv University, where there is only one narrative provided, only one legitimate set of opinions, an extremist anti-Israel one. Students in these indoctrinations leave believing that they are the only ones who have been exposed to these materials.

It is all part of a mass psychosis that affects a disproportionate amount of writing and research on the Middle East conflict. It requires that the writer believes himself to be part of a heroic persecuted minority and a victim. This is part of the larger western obsession with victimhood and minorities. The actual campus majority, academics who denounce and critique Israel, cast themselves as the pitiful threatened minority. In so doing they gain fame and attention. The bottom line is that one would be hard pressed to find any academic anthology published by any academic publisher taking a line OPPOSITE to that filling this new book, *Inclusive Exclusion*.

Another aspect of the culture that produces such works funding. Extremist anti-Israel works are produced by academics who often receive copious amounts of funding from the very state of which they are so highly critical, or from ill-wishers abroad. Consider Tel Aviv University Professor Adi Ophir, one of the editors of this book. In 1987-1989 he received a grant from the Israeli Academy of Sciences. In 1997 he received a grant from the same Academy for something called the “social production of evils.” In 1998-2002 he received yet another grant, this time from the Hartman Institute (a Jewish organization that claims to have something to do with Judaism, but which routinely supports anti-Israel endeavors) to research something called ‘The Experience of Catastrophes.’ At the same time, the same Ophir signed a petition encouraging Israeli soldiers to desert the army: “We, faculty members from a number of Israeli universities, wish to express our appreciation and support for those of our students and lecturers who refuse to serve as soldiers in the occupied territories.”

Contributors to the book are a Who’s Who of academic anti-Zionism ad far-leftism. Some are self-proclaimed Marxists. Professional bios are worth providing for the authors and editors of this book. Adi Ophir is Professor of Philosophy at the Cohn Institute for the History of Philosophy and Science and ideas at Tel Aviv University. Michal Givoni lectures in Political Science at Ben-Gurion University. Sari Hanafi is Associate Professor of Sociology at the American University of Beirut. Other authors include Caroline Abu-Sada, a PhD from Paris; Gadi Algazi ([http://www.isracampus.org.il/third\\_level\\_pages/TAU - Gadi Algazi - the fence.htm](http://www.isracampus.org.il/third_level_pages/TAU_-_Gadi_Alгази_-_the_fence.htm)), an Associate Professor at the Department of History at Tel Aviv University; Ariella Azoulay ([http://isracampus.org.il/third\\_level\\_pages/Editorial - Steve Plaut - Ariella Azoulay.htm](http://isracampus.org.il/third_level_pages/Editorial_-_Steve_Plaut_-_Ariella_Azoulay.htm)) of Bar-Ilan University; Orna Ben-Naftali ([http://www.isracampus.org.il/third\\_level\\_pages/other - College of Management - Orna Ben-Naftali - legitimacy to interfere.htm](http://www.isracampus.org.il/third_level_pages/other_-_College_of_Management_-_Orna_Ben-Naftali_-_legitimacy_to_interfere.htm)) of the College of Management Academic Studies in Israel; Yael Berda, a PhD candidate at Princeton (and graduate of Hebrew University); Hilla Dayan, who earned a PhD at the New School for Social Research in New York, Leila Farsakh, an Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Massachusetts; Dan Filc, a lecturer at Ben-Gurion University; Neve Gordon ([http://www.isracampus.org.il/third\\_level\\_pages/Editorial - Shaul Ben Joseph - Neve Gordon.htm](http://www.isracampus.org.il/third_level_pages/Editorial_-_Shaul_Ben_Joseph_-_Neve_Gordon.htm)) of Ben Gurion University’s politics department; Aeyal M. Gross of Tel Aviv University law school; Ariel Handel, a PhD from the Cohn Institute at Tel Aviv University; Keren Michaeli who studies at St. Anthony’s at Oxford; Ronen Shamir of Tel Aviv University; Yehouda Shenhav ([http://www.isracampus.org.il/third\\_level\\_pages/TAU - Yehuda Shenhav - not Arab Jews.htm](http://www.isracampus.org.il/third_level_pages/TAU_-_Yehuda_Shenhav_-_not_Arab_Jews.htm)) from the Tel Aviv University sociology department; and Eyal Weizman ([http://www.isracampus.org.il/third\\_level\\_pages/outside Israel -](http://www.isracampus.org.il/third_level_pages/outside_Israel_-_)

Goldsmiths College - Eyal Weizman - lawfare in Gaza.htm), who is an architect from London and who did a PhD in the UK.

The authors of the contributions in this book claim in their study that they wanted to “create a joint multi-national team in which Israeli and Palestinian scholars would be equally represented,” but that this was “thwarted by the mundane reality (sic).” (page 27). They claim that more Palestinians could not be included as contributors because of the checkpoints separating them from Jerusalem. No doubt that people who have never seen a fax machine or an internet access will find this claim persuasive.

Ironically the intentional exclusion of Palestinians from this book is part and parcel of the “inclusive exclusion” that these authors pretend to be against. The work itself stands as a colonialistic statement. The organizers were not interested in any point of view; they sought out anti-Israel radical Jewish writers. Their axiom is clear: only anti-Israel Jewish elite academics from Tel Aviv can speak for the Arabs!

The book is filled with photographic propaganda, today often part and parcel of anti-Israel writing. The photographs are supposed to make a convincing argument for the reader, and pretend to be themselves a tool of analysis. In fact, the tendentious choice of photos illustrates the extent to which the book rejects any serious attempt at maintaining objectivity and neutrality. This is to be an unabashed Bash-Israel project! The first pages of the book show photos of an Arab woman, a portion of the concrete separation fence, Palestinians looking over a brick wall, a purported Arab standing in rubble, and Arab children looking over a wall. No Jewish victims of Palestinian terrorism are shown.

The book’s prose begins with an introduction lamenting about how the editors were unable to locate “enough” Palestinian academic collaborators to work with them. The editors add that because of this, the book is “partial and inevitably biased (page 27).” That is one of the few unqualifiedly correct statements in the book.

That “apology” by the editors is amusing. The book is a one-sided diatribe against Israel, written without the benefits of contributions from Arab academics. Would more Palestinian authors have provided nuance and made it more balanced and less critical of the occupation? The authors lecture the reader against “colonization” and a “Palestinian struggle” against it (page 15-16). They invariably represent Palestinians as innocent passive objects to which things are done, whereas Jews or “Israelis” are the ones doing the colonizing. The “Palestinian” invented in this book suffers a “disaster;” he can never productively do anything besides react to Israel (page 16). The editors of the book claim that those who write about the conflict are “trapped in conceptual frameworks offered by nationalized histories or by a pragmatic problem-solving set of mind (page 16).” They want to free themselves from this and examine “what kind of power is involved in and manufactured as part of the domination (page 16).”

Academic “discourse” being what it is these days, it is *de rigueur* to use words throughout the book that are not normally found in the English language. Take “externality” and “temporariness” that appear on page 16 of the introduction. Academics often seem to believe that they can cover up for a lack of serious evidence or depth of thinking by inventing and tossing about polysyllables

The main thrust of the book is that “sheer, brutal military violence may be one operation conduit of the occupation regime, but does not represent the sophistication of means and diversification of ends involved.” Thus there are “genealogies of the technologies of power studied (pages 16-17).” The reader can be forgiven if he fails to grasp how technology can have a “genealogy.” The authors argue that the occupation is a “political system in its own right that to a large extent determines the nature of this [Israeli] state.” Evidently they never discovered that Israel was created before 1967. Furthermore the “colonization and separation both presuppose the exclusion of the Occupied Palestinian Territories and their inhabitants from the pale of law (page 23).”

The editors think that Israel is uniquely evil. In the introduction the word "*sui generis*" is used twice. Latin terms are almost as vogue as polysyllables as substitutes for analytic thinking. The use of "*sui generis*" (page 25) by anti-Israel academics is *sui generis* in its own right.

The first essay in the book is authored by Orna Ben-Naftali, Aeyal M. Gross and Keren Michaeli, and pretends to examine the "illegality of the Occupational Regime (page 31)." In other words, its learned legal conclusion is in fact its opening axiom. This essay claims to be predicated on the theory of "international law." The authors begin with the 1907 Fourth Hague Convention and move on to the 1949 Geneva Convention and other international agreements which were created by Europeans for the world. They spend a great deal of time examining whether Israel still has "effective control" of the Gaza Strip through some of its borders, which they insist would mean that Israel, under European formulated "international law," would still be in occupation of Gaza. They speak of the "potential power" of Israel to take over the Gaza Strip as one piece of evidence that Israel still occupies the area. (pages 32-33). They fail to uncover any international laws against terrorist attacks by Palestinians against Israelis.

The idea that when a nation occupies something if it has "effective control" over its means that the U.S occupies not just Canada but the whole world. It means that South Africa "occupies" Lesotho since it controls all its borders, and Belarus controls Russia because it controls some of its borders. The authors believe that Israel has "obligations" to Gaza because its "people who are affected by its actions (page 33)." Just why Syria does not have similar obligations towards Israelis is never clarified. Furthermore these obligations include "humanitarian obligations" and "indeed amounts to an occupation (page 33)."

Eurocentrist bigotry in the book is boundless. The entire article is predicated on the idea that only Europeans can formulate "international law" and that the world must continue to submit to the definitions Europeans created for their own wars in 1907 and 1949. The authors claim to believe that the "acquisition of territory by force does not confer valid title to the territory." What they mean is that Europeans are the only ones who can convey "valid title" to territory. Thus when Europeans re-drew their borders and invaded one another, they conferred valid title to each other. But when other countries do the same thing, title is not "valid."

Behind this pseudo-analytic aggression against Israel is the insistence that Israel be judged by European standards and rules. The irony here is that the academic who claims Israel is a "European colony" and a "white" country invading and colonizing a "dark indigenous population" is the very same academic who relies on European laws and former colonial law for political definitions. The same Israeli "intellectual" who identifies the most with European culture, is the same one who claims to be the country's only "progressive."

The authors correctly note that "there is a different set of rights and duties applying to different groups in the occupied Palestinian territory (page 47)." They are wrong though when they assert that the differences are divided on "ethnic lines." There is indeed a different set of rules for Israeli citizens (many of whom are Arab) and those under PA or Palestinian control. The differences do not always benefit the Israelis, as the author acknowledge, such as regarding "the dismantling of a mere 16 settlements" in the disengagement (page 45).

The authors claim that Israel has not only "illegally" occupied a territory but that it has done so for too long. "Israel's indefinite occupation frustrates the purpose of this regime [of temporary occupation] (page 57)." The authors refer to South Africa's withdrawal from Namibia as something from which Israel could learn. However the authors seem to forget about the Turkish occupation of Cyprus or the Moroccan occupation of Western Sahara as cases contrary to their belief in the short nature of "occupation." Throughout the discussion the article rests heavily on the theory of

“international law.” If one does not accept the right of the Europeans to decide notions of law then the entire idea of legal and illegal occupation goes out the window.

The next article is Ariella Azoulay and Adi Ophir’s ‘The Order of Violence,’ which examines “power and violence.” They begin by asserting that “violence is a kind of power (page 101).” They then add that “insinuated or withheld violence does not differ from economic power, purchasing power, the rhetorical power of persuasion (page 102).” So the book moves from the claim that there is occupation if there is the *potential to occupy*. It advanced to the learned proposition that there is violence even if it is *withheld*. Thus a large man with big fists is violent whenever he does not beat up smaller people. The authors conclude that the evidence that Israel must “out to be violent” is that she is not. But what of the question of withheld violence when this theory is subjected to all countries? Trendy intellectuals insist that the world is all about “power” and have an obsession about it. Maybe this is because they rarely get to witness real violence. Thus non-violence becomes violence and the exercise of “power.”

Azoulay and Ophir speak of two types of violence, the “withheld and eruptive” (page 105). The Palestinian “erupts” in violence, whereas the Israeli “withholds” his violence. However the withheld violence constitutes “power,” while the eruptive violence is merely spontaneous. Thus “withheld violence is suspended violence whose potential dimension-usually invisible - is made visible and displayed conspicuously” (page 106). Which kind of violence did Hitler practice?

The authors a bit characteristically refer to “the Palestinian” as a sort of inanimate object that never determines his own affairs or makes choices. He is like a wild animal, according to the authors, erupting in violence for no reason. They claim that Israel “changed the Palestinian habitat (page 117),” kind of like what loggers do to beavers. The word ‘habitat’ is rarely applied to humans in English and one must therefore conclude that Ophir and Azoulay believe the Arab to be a type of animal. This is typical racism of those who pass themselves off as progressive and claim to be working with Palestinians.

These authors claim that the “relations between Israeli violence and Palestinian violence are not symmetrical.” Instead the “Palestinians have neither the ability nor the means to respond violently to the violence exerted against them...the violence that they do resort to erupts in places where they recognize openings in the web of withheld violence...this use of violence against Israelis is not the regime they wish to establish or the power by which they wish to be ruled (page 123).” In other words, Palestinians do not have access to enough weapons and options involving terrorist violence. The authors claim that they know the true Palestinian mindset and they, and only they, know the true regime and power that the naturally peaceful Palestinians would like to establish. Hamas might disagree with their scholarly research.

The authors end with the claim that Israel wants the Palestinians to remain “on the verge of a humanitarian catastrophe (page 136).” They acknowledge that the Palestinians have been colonized by “welfare bodies, NGOs [and] UN agencies (page 136) “ In fact it is the international community that wishes the Palestinians to remain on the verge of a catastrophe. By extension, it is Ophir and Azoulay who require a Palestinian catastrophe in order to justify their continued award of grant money and fame as the “lone voices” opposing Israel’s actions.

The third essay is another gem from Ariella Azoulay. This essay is a photo essay of the “(In)Human Spatial condition (page 153).” It reiterates the “idea” that the Palestinians have become inhuman because they live in a sub-human environment. She speaks of an “irreversible...disaster” that befalls the Palestinians. She uses the strange term “*faits du prince* (page 159).” It means an “arbitrary act of government,” showing that she has a thesaurus on her desktop.

Azoulay claims that Israel has conspired in the occupation to prevent crowds from forming: “The

occupation regime ensures that crowds will not be allowed to form, but rather must continue to move or stand in a single file (page 158).” Azoulay’s “evidence” of this regime is a series of photos and diagrams. One diagram shows how a military checkpoint works, such as the one found at Kalandia near Jerusalem. Actually it works much like airport security and is perhaps less intrusive. One is left wondering whether the Israeli author has ever travelled on a plane or been to an airport. Has she stood in line at Jerusalem or Tel Aviv’s central bus station? We doubt she takes buses. Yet like so many who write about the occupation she imagines that the mere fact that people stand in line must be a uniquely oppressive aspect of the Israeli “regime.”

As part of this uniquely oppressive regime she prints pictures of concrete blocks, barbed wire, a demolished building and a hole in a wall. The insinuation is that only in evil Israel will one find these strange and alien objects.

Ariel Handel writes in the book on the “geography of disaster” in the occupied territories (page 179). Once again we see how an anti-Israel critic resorts to extreme language and tosses in a discipline that doesn’t seem to be part of the conflict. He claims to spell out what the occupation entails. It includes the West Bank, of which 41 percent is under Israeli settlement control and another 18 percent is under the control of the military and civilian Israeli authorities.

The author claims that “West Bank inhabitants cannot drive their own cars or travel continuously beyond their immediate surroundings (page 185). “ This is inaccurate. Most Palestinians can travel throughout much of the West Bank in their own vehicles. In only a few instances is the quote remotely accurate, and they are in cases where preventing murder of Israelis by terrorists dictates the restrictions.

Like most writing on the occupation the author ignores the security motives for Israeli decisions, while exaggerating the isolated inconveniences to Palestinians, and then claiming they are the norm. In a figure on page 186 Handel claims that an Israeli driver can travel 17 km in 11 minutes while the same drive by a Palestinian takes some 3 hours and 24 minutes. Handel disingenuously has factored in 3 one hour stops at checkpoints. This is a worst case scenario that only takes place after a terrorist attack in a given area. In most cases a Palestinian trip might be perhaps 24 minutes slower on slower roads than the Israeli might drive on. But in many cases the time for all would be the same; around 90% of all roads are shared by Israelis and Palestinians. The myth of the Jewish-only road is just that, a myth. In another figure on page 187 Handel shows the supposed drive from the Arab village of Faqqu’a to Nablus. He takes the driver on the most complicated long-distance route possible, instead of the most direct one just to make it appear that the Palestinians must drive strange circuitous routes. This is like claiming that people in San Francisco must drive through Silicon Valley to get to Berkeley.

The entire Handel article is infected with this intentional distortion. He writes about a Palestinian trying to get to work and claims, “Just as the person reaches it [the checkpoint], after an hour’s delay, he finds that he is not allowed to pass. In both of the last cases, the workplace remains beyond the person’s reach.” Delays and congestion never occur anywhere else on the planet. He furthermore intentionally misleads the readers with this supposed evidence, providing a map on page 207 of “Israeli-controlled roads in the West Bank” that insinuates that the Israeli control prevents Palestinians from travelling these roads. This is not true.<sup>[1]</sup>

Neve Gordon, a radical anti-Israel senior lecturer in politics at Ben Gurion University, writes on “colonization” and “separation” (page 239). He also focuses on violence. He presents a figure claiming to show the average death toll of Palestinians between 1967 and 2006 (page 241). Naturally, he provides no context and never mentions the waves of terrorist violence by Palestinians against Jews. Just who were these people killed and why did they die? Gordon has no interest in such

irrelevant questions. The reader is supposed to believe that all Palestinian dead were innocent victims of Israeli brutality, part of an Israeli strategy to murder Palestinians just for the fun of it. Gordon does acknowledge that the “number of Palestinians killed is relatively small” in the context of some other occupations (page 241). But Gordon also believes that there is a “colonization of the territories” because the government “attempts to manage the lives of the colonized inhabitants while exploiting the captured territory’s resources (page 243).” Of course all governments do this, so by his “reasoning” the entire world is “colonized.” Gordon’s proof that Palestinians are “colonized inhabitants” is that he thinks they are.

Gordon asks, why “has Israel employed more lethal forms of violence after it abandoned the colonization principle and adopted the separation principle (page 258).” You know, unlike other countries that have borders and fences. Gordon doesn’t provide any answer. Instead he insists that the Palestinians now live in a “ghetto (page 258),” a deliberately misleading and charged word. Why not claim similarly that Palestinians are shoved by Israel into concentration camps?

Hilla Dayan writes an essay about the comparison between Israel and apartheid. Like the other authors she is fond of melodramatic and foreign words that make her sound sophisticated. She says, “The specter of political incorporation of out-group populations haunted pre-state Zionist institutions.” This is neither true historically nor is it a proper English. There is no such thing as an “out-group (page 292)” population. Why not just say “non-Jewish”? This reminds one of the Ophir and Azoulay fetish for the word “nonsubject” (sic) when referring to Palestinians.

Dayan provides a distorted history of the conflict, which - like all the essays here - sees the Palestinians as object to which things are done by evil Jews. Thus the 1948 war, in which 1% of the Jewish population died at the hands of Palestinian terrorists and Arab guns, is described as “the Palestinian catastrophe...during the short seven months in 1948 in which an estimated seven hundred thousand Palestinian were forced into exile by Jewish militias (page 293).”

The Palestinians are always victims, they never do anything themselves or cause harm to themselves through their terrorism and violent aggression. Thus in the 1950s the author speaks of “occasional military raids across the border” by the Israelis, but never mentions what these were in reprisals against Palestinian terror. Israel is responsible for everything and only Israel commits crimes or takes any actions or any sort. This reflects poorly hidden racism by the author

Dayan believes that “administratively” Israel acts much like the apartheid government in South Africa. She notes that the Palestinians in the territories were involved in “occasional knifing incidents, random attacks on Israeli-Jewish passerby” in the 1980s and 1990s (page 301). She has never heard of any bombings or sniping against Jews? The author never acknowledges that actual Palestinians were responsible for attacks that triggered “closings.” She also never mentions bus bombing nor mass terror attacks. Just some minor knife attacks, like a rumble in West Side Story. Palestinians only “erupt” in violence, they never plan it.

Like the other articles this one is peppered with malapropisms and sentences that don’t make sense. One heading claims “the principle of population destabilization through misframing (sic) (page 304).” Dayan compares the expulsion of some Palestinians to the “banning orders” of South Africa (page 312). However in the end she claims, “I have not been concerned with the question of the sameness and apparent identity between the two cases - apartheid in South Africa and separation in Israel/Palestine (page 316).” Instead she wants to show how the changes in the 1990s in the territories can be examined through an “analytical lens on aspects of apartheid often less known outside South Africa (page 316).” She is fond of the nonsense word “sameness,” and other distortions of English.

The next section of the book is more tendentious Azoulay photos. One shows a tunnel under a bridge.

Only in Israel do tunnels go underneath highways. One photo, the one used for the cover of this volume, is labeled “Gilo, Apartheid road, 2005 (page 335).” It shows a highway bridge spanning a stream and a dirt access road that zigzags beneath it. But the zigzagging road apparently was built before the highway and zigzags in order to gain the heights of the neighboring hill. The photo is commonly shown in Bash-Israel propaganda to illustrate how much “longer” a Palestinian must travel underneath an Israel superhighway. Highways of course do not have individual exits for every small field and house along the way.

In the essay by Shenhav and Berda the reader is exposed to the “colonial foundations of the state of exception.” In it the authors claim to examine “colonial bureaucratic history” and compare it to Israel’s role in the territories (page 337). The authors begin with a thinly-veiled accusation that Israel’s bureaucracy may be compared to that of the Nazis. The authors write that there is a “disastrous connection between efficient bureaucracy and the loosely integrated apparatuses of the Nazi state terror” which Franz Neumann called “behemoth” (page 341). They then speak about the how “imperial bureaucracies” function. They take a look at India and other places in this context and then examine Israel. Like all their fellow travelers in the book, they fail to note that just 30 minutes flying time from Israel there is a far, far worse occupation, in Cyprus, maintained illegally out by the Turks. They cannot discuss Israel at all except as “a colonial power. “

Leila Farsakh claims to examine the “Palestinian economy under the Israeli occupation.” She too speaks about “colonialism [and its] relation of domination by which an invading foreign minority rules over an indigenous population (page 381).” She believes that Jews are not indigenous to the Land of Israel. Instead they are intruders, a foreign minority. The author claims that “as in other colonial processes, the Israeli military created settlements as a way to establish a territorial claim overran indigenously populated area. (page 385)” Never mind that the Israeli military did not create the settlements. Using her “logic,” all of America is an illegal colony because it was settled by “foreigners.” Farsakh has no interest in such comparisons – they do not get her the mileage that can be gotten from bashing Israel as a colonialist apartheid regime.

Next, Caroline Abu Sada examines how Israel supposedly cultivated “dependence” through Palestinian agriculture under the occupation (page 413). One wonders if the author thought to examine the way in which the UN has cultivated dependence among the Palestinians. She begins by examining the French and British colonial regimes. Then she complains that the second intifada, in which Palestinians murdered more than 800 Israelis, mostly civilians, triggered the “closure of the Israeli labor market to Palestinian workers (page 415).” Why could not those Jews just agree to be murdered without any closures? The article claims without evidence that “agriculture came to play an even more important role in the Palestinian economy.” Was the Palestinian economy a highly industrialized one before 2001? Abu Sada never lets statistics get in the way of her analysis. Actually the Palestinian economy shows the opposite, less dependence on agriculture over time.

The author claims incongruously that the “Palestinian returned to the land as a way to resist the military occupation (page 415).” The Palestinians supposedly “developed survival strategies focused on the rural economy (page 415)” in the 1970s. In fact this was not a “survival strategy” but simply their way of life. This is not even decent fiction. Jordan did little to develop the West Bank when it controlled it from 1948 to 1967 and the Palestinians were entirely rural and poverty-stricken when Israel came to control them in 1967. They did not “return to the land” at that time; they were already on the land. Any expansion of agriculture has been due to access to Israeli technology, to increased Palestinian wealth, and because of access to the Israeli market and through it to the international market.

More tendentious photos follow. Ariella Azoulay in one of her “photo essays” on page 454-455 claims that getting to a security checkpoint might “consume about half a workday.” That means the



whole workday, getting there and back, is consumed with the security checkpoint. So it's not a workday actually and no one would choose to go to "work" if the entire day was truly spent going through checkpoints. Of course the Palestinians wanted to be economically independent of Israel in the first place so that they could hold jobs at home, in their own villages. Since when is employment inside Israel some sort of entitlement?

Near the end of the book Neve Gordon and Dani Filc examined the popularity of Hamas. They scribe all of it to the Hamas being "intricately tied to and informed by the mechanisms of control that Israel has employed (page 457)." The authors blame Israel for the rise of radicalism in Lebanon as well, claiming that "Israel's military logic and in terms of the effects of its military actions on risk society, the public domain, and the ascendancy of postmodern religious fundamentalism (page 481)." According to the authors the Israeli war on Hizbullah was part of "Israeli strategy that had been in place for about three decades" and that this has created Hizbullah (page 481). The authors follow their book colleagues in that they see Arabs as mere passive objects to which things are done. Thus only Israel created Hamas and Hezbollah, and were Israel to change then the Arabs, their ideologies, and religious beliefs would change as well. Once again this "analysis" in thinly disguised racism, for it does not believe that Arabs can ever control themselves.

The concluding essays in the book are the most nakedly biased. One examines the refugee camps and their "locus of resistance (page 495;" another examines the "colonial capitalism" of the occupation, whatever that is. Anti-Israel architect Eyal Weizman examines Israeli "targeted killings" against terrorists, and claims that "this projection of endless war in all likelihood will fulfill itself (page 566)." Naturally Weizman ignores the Palestinian targeted killings of Israelis by terrorists.

Ronen Shamir examines the "impossibility of borders" due to the occupation (page 587). Occupations never seem to prevent the creation of borders anywhere else though. He claims that "as with lepers and plagues, the logic of occupation does not easily succumb to the analytic neatness of opposing spatial forms (page 595)."

Like Gordon, Shamir misuses the terms "frontiers and ghettos" (page 595). Lots of group-think here. In fact both of them have copied the term from James Ron's *Frontiers and Ghettos: state Violence in Serbia and Israel*.

All in all, the book is a longwinded exercise in group think and endless repetition of accusations against Israel. It has no pretense of being anything more than a one-sided indictment of Israel. Some of the contributors to the book are on record calling for Israel to be eliminated altogether. Not long ago at any serious university, a student turning in a research paper resembling the materials in this book would find it rejected as pseudo-academic propaganda, not research. Unfortunately, as evidenced by such "researchers" as Nadia Abu El Haj's politicized academic work on Israeli archeology, the passing off of political opinion as academic research is becoming not only common but also the accepted, and even expected, form of academic discourse. This book is yet one more exercise in "academic" aggression against Israel's existence and against Zionism.

There are no substantive case studies, no surveys, and no genuine new information in it. There is no attempt at providing a balanced and unbiased approach, there is no semblance of decency. Instead this is academic propaganda at its worst, composed by people with an extremist political agenda. These are also people who believe that the academy's role is first and foremost to serve as a political indoctrination tool. And much of this activity is rewarded with grant money.

What is extraordinary is that the editors and writers in this "book" have succeeded in convincing not only partisan organizations such as Van Leer and the Hartman institute of their worth, but the Israeli Academy of Sciences as well.

*Seth Frantzman is a contributor to the Jerusalem Post, Frontpage magazine and Middle East quarterly and runs the Terra Incognita Journal blog. ([sfrantzman@hotmail.com](mailto:sfrantzman@hotmail.com)).*

---

[1] As a point of fact one of the few roads in the West Bank that was actually closed to Palestinian traffic is the 443 that runs from Jerusalem to the coastal plain's Ben Shemen interchange east of Tel Aviv. In 2002 it was closed to Palestinians whose cars have green license plates issued by the PA. In December of 2009 this road was ordered opened to Palestinian traffic by Israel's High Court.

=====

**Op-Ed articles appearing on IsraCampus.Org.il are those of the writer and do not necessarily represent the opinion of IsraCampus.Org.il**