Spring 2018

To Exist is to Resist: Palestine and the Question of Queer Theory

C. Heike Schotten

To Exist Is to Resist: Palestine and the Question of Queer Theory

C. HEIKE SCHOTTEN

This article provides an outline of the project of queer theory and the ways that this project has (and has not) engaged with the question of Palestine. Ultimately, the author argues that queer theory and Palestinian liberation share, albeit perhaps unwittingly, a defining resistance to elimination and an enduring commitment to unsettlement. As such, queer politics is and can surely become decolonial praxis, just as decolonization has a clear affinity with dissident queer resistance.

In *The Question of Palestine*, Edward Said explains his now-famous description of Palestine precisely *as* a question by unpacking what it means to characterize something as "the question of *x*." First, he notes, such a formulation suggests that *x* is a "matter apart," something to be addressed separately, on its own. Second, "the question of *x*" implies that *x* is not really a question at all, but rather a problem that awaits a solution—bringing to mind, of course, perennial formulations such as the Jewish question, the Woman question, the Negro question, and, today, the Muslim question. Third, "the question of *x*" suggests that *x* is "uncertain, questionable, unstable."[1] Said explains that he intends all three meanings in his title, *The Question of Palestine*:

> The use of "the question of" in connection with Palestine implies all three types of meaning. Like the Orient of which it is a part, Palestine exists in another world from the habitual Atlantic one. Palestine is also in some way what the most thorny international problem of postwar life is all about: the struggle over, for, and in Palestine, which has absorbed the energies of more people than any other for a comparable period of time. Finally—and this is a main reason for this book—Palestine itself is a much debated, even contested notion.[2]

In framing Palestine as a question, Said underscores its distinctness, uncertainty, and problematic status. In doing so, however, he also reveals the politics of asking "the question of *x*." For to formulate any people or place as a question is itself an arrogation of power. It is to presume the right to characterize that people or place at all and, moreover, to do so only in terms that render their existence questionable. Moreover, "the question of *x*" is never a question directed *at* the people or places being queried. Rather, when one raises "the question of Palestine" (or the Muslim question, the Negro question, the Woman question, and so forth), one is effectively confiding in another, non-Palestinian (non-Muslim, non-Negro, non-Woman) person and conferring with them

Journal of Palestine Studies Vol. XLVII, No. 3 (Spring 2018), p. 13, ISSN: 0377-919X; electronic ISSN: 1533-8614. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1525/jps.2018.47.3.13.

regarding how to answer (that is, solve) the question (that is, problem) that this Other presents. "The question of *x*," then, is perhaps more properly put as: "What are *we* going to do about *them*?" It is an ultimately reactionary question that seeks to shore up and protect the community of question askers and answerers it creates from the participation of the Other whom they are discussing and, through that very discussion, abjecting. Such interrogation is also, quite obviously, a refusal to acknowledge that Other or allow them to speak for themselves. Whatever or whoever *x* may be, for the purposes of this particular conversation, they are silent.

Said's commandeering of this otherwise colonizing interrogative, however, turns it on its head. In raising "the question of Palestine" *as* a Palestinian, he (re)presents himself in precisely the arena from which he is otherwise disbarred from speaking via the mechanism of the question itself. Moreover, Said does not hesitate to answer this question, stating that the essence of "the Palestinian experience"—which he declares to be both immutable and immune to theorization—is simultaneously the colonization of Palestine and Palestinian resistance to that colonization.[3] It is the struggle, he says, between a Palestinian presence and a Zionism that seeks to cover over, eradicate, or erase that presence. By raising the question of Palestine as a Palestinian, then, Said asserts a Palestinian presence where it otherwise exists only as a problem, thwarting the Zionist mandate that Palestine disappear, and revealing the Zionist presuppositions at work in the "question of Palestine" formulation itself. He thus interprets Palestinian resistance as not only a presence, but also an affirmation of self and land that stands against the Zionist denial that anyone was in Palestine prior to 1948. Palestinian affirmation and presence, then—in other words, Palestinian existence—is by definition Palestinian resistance. The intractability of the Palestinian experience is related to the intractability of the Palestinians themselves, who, Said notes, in refusing to disappear, "serve essentially as a synonym for trouble—rootless, mindless, gratuitous trouble."[4]

More than fifteen years later, writing from within the same U.S. context but on a seemingly very different subject, Lauren Berlant and Michael Warner published "What Does Queer Theory Teach Us about *X*?," an article that purported to address the question of just what queer theory was all about.[5] At the time, the field had just begun to emerge in the U.S. academy. Yet *queer* was already notorious for being impossible to define. The title of Berlant and Warner's article suggests a kind of generalized impatience or frustration with this evasiveness and a demand that queer theory not only define but also justify itself, in part by explaining how it might be made useful for academic knowledge production.

Notably, Berlant and Warner decline to answer their titular question, in part by refusing to acknowledge that there is any such thing as queer theory at all. They call the 1990s profusion of queer discourse queer *commentary* (rather than theory) and suggest that "queer theory is not the theory *of* anything in particular."[6] Moreover, they assert, "queer" does not refer to any specific set of people or "publics,"[7] just as "the publics in which queerness becomes articulate are not just made up of queers."[8] Indeed, they insist, *queer* does not possess any "stable referential content" whatsoever.[9]

Despite this potentially troubling lack of both definition and referent, however, Berlant and Warner do not thereby conclude that queer theory is useless. On the contrary, it is precisely these evasions that they find to be valuable. Chafing at the demand that all knowledge be

made "useful," Berlant and Warner read queer theory's seeming lack of programmatic character as itself a program:

> The question of *x* might be more ordinary in disciplines that have long histories of affiliation with the state. Sociology, psychology, anthropology, and political science, for example, have earned much of their funding and expert authority by encouraging questions of utility. Queer theory has flourished in the disciplines where expert service to the state has been least familiar and where theory has consequently meant unsettlement rather than systematization. This failure to systematize the world in queer theory does not mean a commitment to irrelevance; it means resistance to being an apparatus for falsely translating systematic and random violences into normal states, administrative problems, or minor constituencies.[10]

Queer, then, if not also queer theory, is about desystematization, anti-definition, and opposition to normalization. It therefore refuses precisely the sorts of questions as the one asked in Berlant and Warner's title, since, as the authors astutely observe, it is precisely these sorts of questions that are complicit with and perpetuate violence. While such violence may be more evident when considering the state and its apparatuses, Berlant and Warner's point is that violence attends all forms of systematization and institutionalization. What's useful about queer theory, then, is precisely its refusal to become useful. This refusal of utility is a refusal of complicity with regimes of systematization and normalization that, by definition, denigrate and seek to destroy the deviance they necessarily and inevitably produce.

There are unexpected resonances between Said's dissident formulation of the question of Palestine and Berlant and Warner's refusal to answer the question of queer theory. In different ways, both Said, on the one hand, and Berlant and Warner, on the other, acknowledge the politics of question asking and seek to evade, refuse, or redeploy those questions in an affirmation and defense of those people and places deemed questionable or problematic. In doing so, they acknowledge the inevitably political stakes of epistemology and ontology. Said is of course famous for his historicization of Orientalist scholarship as a function and transmission node of colonial and imperial power. But Berlant and Warner's refusal to define queer theory or its utility demonstrates a similar understanding in their reading of queerness as a refusal to become a function or transmission node of the normalizing and disciplinary power of academic knowledge production. While Berlant and Warner are most interested in the ways in which these systems of power transmit heteronormativity, rather than imperialism and colonialism, like Said, I think they would similarly see apparatuses of scholarship and knowledge production as embedded within hierarchical and exploitative power relations that serve to justify, validate, and sanctify some (forms of) lives over others.

The most significant resonance between the two pieces of writing, however, is their acknowledgement that the unknown, unthinkable, inconvenient, and unaccounted-for *trouble* regimes of power and, as such, constitute a form of dissidence by their very existence. Why is it, after all, that Palestinians (are) trouble? Because, as Said observes, "they will not go away as they ought to."[11] Said's characterization of Palestinians as troublesome resonates with queer theory's defiant attachment to all those who are not or cannot be made assimilable. Indeed, the inassimilable is in some sense who and what *queer* names—that illimitable list of deviant

others whose existence destabilizes, disrupts, or thwarts the otherwise smooth functioning of institutionalized, hegemonic regimes of normalizing, heteronormative power. There is thus an unexpected overlap in Palestine studies and queer theory between the unthinkable and trouble, the unaccounted-for and dissidence. The politics of both colonization and heteronormativity, just like the politics of knowledge production, are premised on the disappearance or erasure of that which refuses to either be incorporated or else just go away. In this sense, then, the dissidence of both Palestine and queer theory is the refusal to become part of a hegemonic regime of power (Zionism, on the one hand, and heteronormativity, on the other) or disappear. It is the refusal to accept their (imposed) statuses as problems or "questions." It is a shared aspiration toward constant unsettlement.

It is therefore perhaps not such an outrageous stretch of the imagination to think that the question of Palestine might have something to say to queer theory and vice versa, or, that the question of what queer theory can teach us about *x* may have some relevance to the question of Palestine. In the rest of this article, I offer a modest outline of what I take to be the project of queer theory (a fraught endeavor, as will quickly become clear) and the ways in which this project has engaged with the question of Palestine. Along the way, it will become clear that queer theory has much to learn from the question of Palestine, and that the work of queer Palestinians themselves is an extraordinary testament to the vitality and emancipatory character of precisely such an unlikely decolonial alliance.

Queer Theory

Queer theory is a field of study that emerged primarily in the U.S. academy in the 1990s. Its roots are commonly considered to be both academic and activist in origin, and to include everything from AIDS activism, lesbian and women of color feminism, Michel Foucault's *History of Sexuality, Volume 1*, and what have come to be known as the feminist Sex Wars.[12] Teresa de Lauretis is frequently credited with naming the emergent field at a 1990 gay and lesbian studies conference at the University of California, Santa Cruz.[13] It has since become increasingly institutionalized as a subfield in any number of humanities disciplines and, in rare cases, an academic unit in its own right in various university settings.

Although this 1990s legacy is not always referred or returned to, it was and remains formative of the field itself and the work that transpires under its heading.[14] That legacy consists of (1) a rejection of naturalized and minoritized understandings of sexuality, sexual "orientation," or sexual identity in terms of discrete entities such as "gay," "lesbian," or "bisexual" (not to mention "heterosexual"); (2) a rejection of any sort of representational politics that might follow from such naturalized and minoritized identities (for example, a politics of tolerance, diversity, or inclusion); and (3) a conceptual and methodological conflation of *queer* with evasion, dissidence, dissonance, or indeterminacy (whether sexual, political, or otherwise). Indeed, perhaps the definitive feature of *queer* is its refusal to *be* defined, much less specified, whether as a particular name, person, practice, or identity. As an identity marker, *queer* is the nonidentity marker, the name for an identity that is anti-identity. As a method, *queering* operates similarly, as a refusal of orthodoxy, normalization, and homogenization in the domain of knowledge, an approach that delights in revealing the hidden improprieties of disciplinarity and celebrating the perversities it is complicit in erasing (when it is not unwittingly producing them). As a political praxis, queerness signals

noncooperation with, if not active undermining of, regimes of normalization which, following Foucault, are recognized to be at work effectively everywhere (and, thus, not restricted solely to the domain of the state and its institutions). In what has become something of a standard-bearer "definition" of queerness, Michael Warner writes, "The preference for 'queer' represents, among other things, an aggressive impulse of generalization; it rejects a minoritizing logic of toleration or simple political interest-representation in favor of a more thorough resistance to regimes of the normal."[15] As he says, "'queer' gets a critical edge by defining itself against the normal rather than the heterosexual."[16] *Heteronormativity,* an important terminological innovation of the field, is one name for that broader set of normalizing systems, discourses, and regimes that *queer* opposes. Elsewhere, Berlant and Warner define heteronormativity as "the institutions, structures of understanding, and practical orientations that make heterosexuality seem not only coherent—that is, organized as a sexuality—but also privileged."[17]

The field-defining preference for "queer" over "gay" and for "heteronormativity" over "homophobia" has significant conceptual and political consequences. While queer inquiry does not replace anti-homophobic inquiry—since "normal sexuality and the machinery of enforcing it do not bear down equally on everyone"[18]—the latter is identical with neither the mandate for nor the referent of queer praxis, both of which are wider and less determinate than the "more minority-based versions of lesbian and gay theory."[19] As Eve Sedgwick wrote memorably in 1993, the same year as Warner's *Fear of a Queer Planet*:

> That's one of the things that "queer" can refer to: the open mesh of possibilities, gaps, overlaps, dissonances and resonances, lapses and excesses of meaning when the constituent elements of anyone's gender, of anyone's sexuality aren't made (or *can't* be made) to signify monolithically. The experimental linguistic, epistemological, representational, political adventures attaching to the very many of us who may at times be moved to describe ourselves as (among many other possibilities) pushy femmes, radical faeries, fantasists, drags, clones, leatherfolk, ladies in tuxedos, feminist women or feminist men, masturbators, bulldaggers, divas, Snap! queens, butch bottoms, storytellers, transsexuals, aunties, wannabes, lesbian-identified men or lesbians who sleep with men, or . . . people able to relish, learn from, or identify with such.[20]

For Warner, "queer" can encompass this varied and inevitably incomplete listing of sexual subjects because it points to a "wide field of normalization, rather than simple intolerance, as the site of violence."[21] On this reading, queerness *names* the violence and power effects of this heteronormative social system and, through affirmative reclamation, suggests its users' resistance to them, both symbolic and actual. It is important to remember that "queer" was (and in some cases remains) a derisive and demeaning epithet used against presumptively homosexual and/or gender-nonconforming people as a slur meaning unnatural, perverse, and/or deviant, a form of discursive violence that works in tandem with physical and economic violence to maintain heteronormativity firmly in place. "Originally generated in a context of terror," then, *queer* becomes the mark of refusal to regimes of the normal, a resistance in particular to the specific regimes and subjectifying effects of heteronormativity.[22]

Given the broadening of queer beyond the minority-group "gay and lesbian" or, really, the particularities of any identity group at all, there is no way of stating for certain who exactly is "the

population whose interests are at stake in queer politics."[23] As Berlant and Warner note, "Just as AIDS activists were defined more by a concern for practice and for risk than by identity, so queer commentary has refused to draw boundaries around its constituency. And without forgetting the importance of the hetero-homo distinction of object choice in modern culture, queer work wants to address the full range of power-ridden normativities of sex."[24] Because queer, by definition, opposes the power effects of something like a material system of subjectification and social meaning called heteronormativity, it inevitably cannot demarcate from the outset on whose behalf it advocates or whose interests it represents.[25] Yet it remains acutely attuned and committed to those rendered deviant by heteronormativity's normalizing violence, whomever they may end up being, and it embraces their existence as both evidence of the violence of normalizing power and a form of resistance to it.

This dissident and constituency-nonspecific version of queerness, however, was evidence to many of queer theory's whiteness, if not also its bourgeois origins and normative assumptions. Indeed, queer theory is defined as much by these 1990s commitments as it is by the significant critiques of those commitments for their exclusions of race and class analysis and overall inattentiveness to forms of domination that intersect with, shape, mobilize, and orchestrate heteronormativity. This body of work, some of which is known as queer of color critique,[26] is as definitive of queer theory as the more frequently canonized founding texts. Thus, in another field-defining essay, Cathy Cohen notes the pronounced failures of queer theory's reading of heteronormativity when it comes to race and class.[27] Cohen writes that "queer" was initially attractive to her because it seemed to promise both a challenge to and an expansion of traditionally defined gay and lesbian (identity) politics. Unfortunately, quite the opposite occurred and, in her view, "queer" became the designation of anything "not-straight," reinforcing a thoughtless, binary view of power and oppression that relied on a single-axis identity model of politics. Cohen argues instead for a rethinking of marginal positionality in terms of one's relation to power, rather than in terms of a binary categorization of queer versus straight.

Although a critique of queer theory, her essay is also an early influential example of queer theory and a landmark contribution to it. Cohen cites the prohibition of slave marriages and the long history of obsession with black women's reproductive choices in the United States as examples of ostensibly heterosexual people inhabiting positions outside the bounds of normative sexuality because of their race, class, and property status. As well, and as referenced in her title, Cohen asks if the "welfare queen," although perhaps nominally heterosexual, is nevertheless a queer subject insofar as she is a member of a marginal constituency called queer that resists, undermines, or falls outside of dominant heteronorms. To recognize the race of heteronormativity and the sexuality of racism, then, is to recognize heteronormativity as a specific form of white supremacy and white supremacy as a particular manifestation of heteronormativity. Ultimately, Cohen suggests a "broadened understanding of queerness" that is "based on an intersectional analysis that recognizes how numerous systems of oppression interact to regulate and police the lives of most people."[28] This type of queer politics allows for an analysis of heteronormativity as part and parcel of a series of interlocking oppressions that co-constitute both one another and those they subject, a dissident queerness that remains tethered to sexuality and an opposition to sexual normalization, even as its politics is not defined in terms of sexuality alone.

Cohen's contribution, as with queer of color critique more generally, is thus foundational to queer theory insofar as it establishes the field's commitment to interrogation of its own complicities with normalizing regimes of violence. Whether it is the presumptive gay maleness of its homosexual subject or the unacknowledged whiteness and Europeanness of its account of identity, politics, history, and social movements, queer theory has undergone vital critical interrogation from a host of scholars who have aptly demonstrated the ways in which its dissident politics of evasion still functions to privilege the lives, identities, and political priorities of mostly white, mostly well-off, mostly male, conventionally gendered, easily identifiable gay folk. Queer of color critique's exposure, interrogation, and dismantling of these normativities and disciplinary injunctions has been part and parcel of queer theory's own internal development as a field.[29] Importantly, however, neither queerness nor queer theory has been abandoned in the face of such critiques. Rather, queerness as a concept, method, and set of political commitments has been expanded upon in innovative ways to theorize not just sexuality, but also histories and relations of race and racialization, empire and imperial nationalism, wars of conquest and aggression, immigration and refugee rights, as well as the carceral state and detention regimes of all sorts. Refusing the assimilation of queerness, queer theory, or LGBTQ (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer) politics to a rights-based model of liberal inclusion, this scholarship insists on retaining *queer* for more dissident and radical purposes that can account for hierarchies of race, class, nationality, gender, and (dis)ability (among others). In short, ensuring queer theory's relevance and political utility requires consistent interrogation of its own normativities, albeit in the service of extending its purview beyond that of identifiably white, bourgeois, and/or masculinist interests. This internal tension simultaneously characterizes the field's historical emergence and helps account for its continued relevance and vitality. As the editors of the formative *Social Text* special issue "What's Queer about Queer Studies Now?" write in their introduction, "That queerness remains open to a continuing critique of its exclusionary operations has always been one of the field's key theoretical and political promises."[30]

Queer Theory, Palestine, and (De-)colonization

Despite this broadening of the field and expansion of the work being pursued under its rubric, queer theory remains primarily a U.S.-based undertaking, with scholarship and praxis increasingly extending throughout the United Kingdom and Europe. The internationalization of queer theory beyond the West, as both a Euro-American phenomenon and a field that seeks to undermine its own normative commitments to specific constituencies and geographies, has led to vital developments in queer scholarship, both with regard to Palestine specifically as well as the broader Arab and Muslim world.[31] Perhaps most famously, Joseph Massad has argued that Western LGBT (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender) activism functions internationally to impose a specifically Euro-American narrative, trajectory, and definition of gay identity on non-Euro-American spaces, specifically in Arab and Muslim countries.[32] In an argument that could hold just as well for queer theory as for the Gay International against which he directs his ire, Massad devastatingly suggests that the result of otherwise well-meaning global gay activism is, on the one hand, a heterosexualization of less rigidly defined or definable sexual/social worlds and, on the other, increased surveillance, stigma, and punishment of nonheterosexual Arab and

Muslim people, who become forced to fit the Gay International's identity model in order to be represented, defended, and, subsequently, saved by it.[33]

Meanwhile, any number of scholars have pointed out the ways in which focusing on gayness or queerness as the central plank of a progressive politics has the effect of centering the whitest and wealthiest of LGBTQ folks in the Global North to the active exclusion of the lives, experiences, and political priorities of the LGBTQ poor, migrant, disabled, incarcerated, people of color, and the Global South.[34] An increasing number of queer and indigenous scholars are mounting formidable challenges to both queer theory's and queer people's relationship with settler colonialism, drawing attention to queer theory's near-total neglect to account for its own location and emergence from within settler states and to account for its own theoretical and political complicities with settlement.[35] Finally, queer Palestinians and queer Palestinian organizations have repeatedly insisted that their identities and political priorities are not continuous with those of U.S. queer communities and movements. U.S.-based understandings of gayness that prioritize public display and "coming out of the closet" as crucial political acts, for example, are rooted in a post-Stonewall identity politics paradigm ill-suited to the complexities of Palestinian life and culture, much less the situation of queer Palestinians, who view their major struggle as a fight against colonization, occupation, and apartheid, not homophobia.[36] Moreover, the standard litany of state-based rights and protections sought after by Euro-American gay advocacy movements—for example, marriage, military service, and inclusion in hate crimes statutes—reflects a solidarity with the state that is impossible from the perspective of refugees, the occupied, the segregated, and the displaced.

Rather than only duplicating or perpetuating a Western political or identitarian agenda, however, queer theory has also provided fodder for rich, intersectional analysis and critique of Zionism, (settler) colonialism, and imperialism. One of the most prominent sites of such critique has been the scholarship and activist work surrounding pinkwashing and homonationalism. *Pinkwashing* is an activist term of art that names and condemns Israel's official, well-funded, Brand Israel international marketing campaign, a central plank of which is the attempt to present the country as gay friendly.[37] Refurbishing the tired trope of Israel as "the only democracy in the Middle East," Brand Israel presents the Jewish state as a shining oasis of tolerance amid a sea of hostile and homophobic Arab and Muslim barbarism, with Tel Aviv a "gay mecca" vacation destination for international travelers. Brand Israel's deployment of gay rights is aimed squarely at Westernized audiences (focusing almost entirely on the United States, the United Kingdom, and Canada) and uses familiar Western images of queerness and liberal political values of inclusion, diversity, and tolerance to appeal to these particular audiences in order to burnish the country's image with them.

That pinkwashing is and continues to be an effective prop of the Israeli government is evidence of a phenomenon Jasbir Puar names *homonationalism*. In *Terrorist Assemblages: Homonationalism in Queer Times*, Puar defines homonationalism as the remarkable transition, already well under way in the United States, in the meaning of queerness from being a stigmatic marker of death (for example, as a symbol of nonreproductivity or HIV/AIDS) and, increasingly, toward becoming an aspirational symbol of life, in nationalist and consumerist forms of liberal multicultural citizenship and domesticity. Rather than always or only outside of the nation, in other words, Puar argues that homosexuality has become complicit with and is now part of the nation. Thus she sees homonationalism as the assimilation of some gay and lesbian subjects into the mainstream

of American normalcy, respectability, and citizenship simultaneously as Arabs and Muslims (and all those held to be such) are "queered" in the figure of the "terrorist," a personification of monstrosity, excess, savagery, and perversion.[38] For many, the very coherence of pinkwashing campaigns turns on this increasing subsuming of homosexuality into the nation-state.[39]

In this view, then, pinkwashing is a premiere example and symptom of the homonationalist landscape increasingly defining Euro-American—and, now, Israeli—expansionist projects. Indeed, a profound and bitter irony of the increasing visibility and politicization of homosexuality in the United States and Europe has been these countries' deployment of tolerance, secularism, and promotion of "gay rights" as a marker of civilizational and cultural superiority and, therefore, a lever of empire. Enfranchisement of LGBTQ subjects thus becomes the rationalization of racist violence of all sorts, including wars of aggression, military interventions, massacres, drone strikes, torture, unlawful imprisonment and detention, punitive immigration policies, and sanctions regimes. In this scenario, Euro-American LGBTQ advocates and defenders are not simply the saviors of Arab and Muslim and Palestinian queers, itself a familiar colonial positioning, but LGBTQ advocacy itself functions as the sharp end of the spear of empire and colonization.[40] Just as empire seamlessly donned the face of feminism to rationalize its expansionist warfare,[41] so too do today's wars on terror, refugees, and Islam shroud themselves in the pious guise of gay rights to justify their otherwise unjustifiable violence against the "savage," "backward," and ostensibly homophobic people and places they seek to target.

Pinkwashing and homonationalism have become rich sites of knowledge production for scholars who have advanced its project and activists who have furthered its agenda; meanwhile, anti-pinkwashing organizing/activism has taken off in multiple cities and towns to the point that it can reasonably be described as a global movement.[42] The biopolitical analysis that underlies discussions of homonationalism and pinkwashing has also been taken up in radical new ways by scholars working under the rubric of what they call "queer necropolitics."[43] Drawing on Achille Mbembe's influential formulation of "necropolitics" and/as postcolonial critique of Agamben and Foucault,[44] queer necropolitics scholars examine the biopolitical neglect—and outright necropolitical targeting—of LGBTQ people of color, indigenous LGBTQ people, and Arab and Muslim LGBTQ people. Building on the analysis of homonationalism, these scholars analyze queerness as a fulcrum of classed, racialized, and nationalized exclusion, an analysis that relies simultaneously on the different meanings of queer wherein, on the one hand, queer demarcates LGBTQ people and, on the other, queer functions as another name for the unnatural, perverse, deviant, and abject. These scholars show how some LGBTQ people, places, or populations—in particular, the white and the Western, the European and the Eurocentric, the settler and the Global North—are enfranchised or privileged, and indeed become definitive of "LGBTQ" itself in ways that abject other LGBTQ and non-LGBTQ people, places, and populations—people of color, indigenous people, the Global South, Muslims, and so forth. These people, places, and populations are *queered* and become sites of "queer necropolitics"—spaces and places marked for death and neglect due to their abjection as improperly racialized, improperly queer, improper, queer.[45]

The newest queer theorizing in, on, and about Palestine goes yet further, taking up Native studies and settler colonial studies, on the one hand, and Latin American decolonial theory,

on the other, in order to advance the proposition that gender and sex/uality are themselves colonial categories, not simply tools of colonialism.[46] These approaches understand modernity and coloniality to be co-constitutive, arguing either for the primacy of "the coloniality of power"[47] itself and/or recognition of the heteronormative sex/gender system as itself a colonial formation. Understanding modernity and coloniality as co-constitutive is necessary insofar as, in the words of María Lugones, "heterosexualist patriarchy has been an ahistorical framework of analysis" that fails to understand how colonization makes "classification of the population in terms of race . . . a necessary condition of its possibility" and, therefore, of heteronormativity.[48]

From this perspective, decolonial queerness thus potentially becomes a name for the refusal and thwarting of the coloniality of power. It is queer dissent and/as decolonization. As the editors of an important volume on decolonial sexualities write:

> An ongoing critical reflection on decolonial readings of queerness is necessary since heteronormativity is sustained upon epistemic categories, among others, of race, gender, and sexuality. Decolonial queerness entails querying the workings of neo-colonial epistemic categories, systems of classification and taxonomies that classify people. Queering coloniality and the epistemic categories that classify people according to their body configuration—skin colour and biological molecular composition for the regeneration of the species—means to disobey and delink from the coloniality of knowledge and of being. At this intersection, decolonial queerness is necessary not only to resist coloniality but, above all, to re-exist and re-emerge decolonially.[49]

These scholars argue that queer dissidence is crucial to and intrinsically part of the work of decolonization. In the Palestinian context, then, decolonial queerness would be a project wherein queer liberation is not simply inextricable from anti-Zionism but is, in fact, identical with it. That is, any successful vanquishing of Zionism, any effectively decolonizing movement in Palestine, will necessarily rely upon and further a specifically queer resistance to coloniality, since the abolition of colonialism both requires and entails the destruction of colonial categories, norms, and practices of sex/gender/sexuality (much more so than it requires the enfranchisement of identifiable LGBTQ folks).

This perspective informs how alQaws for Sexual and Gender Diversity in Palestine defines its work. An organization that emerged in the wake of the Second Intifada, alQaws seeks to mobilize the political radicalness of "queer" in order to decolonize Palestine, queerness, and Palestinian culture itself. They focus on "dismantling three main hegemonies: first, Palestinian patriarchal culture and its norms and taboos on sexualities; second, the hegemony of western LGBT organizing, Gay Internationalists and western (cultural) imperialism; and third, the Zionist colonization of Palestine, including the Israeli LGBT movement's complicity with Zionist settler colonialism through pinkwashing and Zionist sexual politics."[50] This inside/outside set of political priorities reflects the inextricability of heteronormativity, patriarchy, Zionist colonization, and racist pinkwashing, which together define the situation of (queer) Palestinians in Palestine, not to mention the coloniality of modern power. As alQaws members Walaa Alqaisiya, Ghaith Hilal, and Haneen Maikey write, "The Zionist colonization of Palestine holds at its premise racial, sexual, and gendered discourses through which colonial

power is exercised"; "its power hinges on the bodies and desires of the colonized."[51] Thus alQaws understands its work toward sexual liberation as also decolonizing and specifically anti-Zionist work. It is a championing of decolonial queerness: "Decolonization of a certain type of knowledge on sexuality and its deriving modes of conducts is what can lay the foundation for a radical disruption of the colonial Zionist structure."[52] From this perspective, pinkwashing is not simply a tactic of Zionism or a symptom of homonationalism but, rather, constitutive of both.[53] Queer politics is therefore decolonial, and decolonization requires a commitment to queerness and the undermining of heteronormativity.

To Exist Is to Resist

Said writes that "for much of its modern history, Palestine and its native people have been subject to denials of a very rigorous sort." Because the Zionist project required what it called "a land without a people for a people without a land," "the Zionists convinced themselves that these natives did not exist, then made it possible for them to exist only in the most rarefied forms. First denial, then blocking, shrinking, silencing, hemming in."[54] As many scholars have argued, this purposeful attempt to disappear the native is the signature act of settler colonialism.[55] While the strategies of disappearance are multiple (including genocide, the spreading of disease, population transfer, replacing Native people and places with settler names, monuments, and histories, and so forth), the (desired) end result is the same: elimination of the natives and their replacement by settlers who are indigenized *post facto*. The result is an uncanny present absence and absent presence of the native.[56] As Said notes, the natives are simply not allowed to exist, and so in those circumstances where the settler state has not "successfully" eliminated its native population, when natives do happen to appear, they exist only in "rarefied forms"—as throwbacks to a bygone era, for example, or as figures of comedy, sports team mascots, monstrosities and terrorists, wayward children nursing irrational grudges, inappropriately fixated on an archaic and irrelevant past. This is not far from how queer Palestinians describe the ways that Zionism permits them to exist as queer Palestinians. They are either completely invisible—that is, they do not exist at all—or they are hypervisible, but only in and as pawns of the Zionist project, within a limited range of spurious and racist archetypes: the asylum-seeking victim of homophobic Palestinian culture, the infiltrator blackmailed by Israeli security forces, the "terrorist" who lures the unsuspecting gay Israeli lover, and so forth.[57]

Both Said and alQaws insist on affirming their existence in the face of stultifying, violent, and racist regimes of normalizing power that seek to erase them. Zionism is one shorthand term for these regimes. Heteronormativity is another. Both Zionism and heteronormativity are normalizing regimes of power/knowledge that, through various forms of ideological and violent coercion, reinforce the normality and inevitability of the status quo at the expense of the eradication of those it cannot or will not assimilate. "The sheer blotting out from knowledge of almost a million natives,"[58] in other words, is of a piece with the systematic erasure of gender and sexual forms of life and existence deemed out of compliance with racialized regimes of heteronormativity. Queer Palestinians' focus on the "coloniality of power" and affirmation of "decolonial queerness" means, in other words, that Zionism is a premiere site

and source of heteronormativity that conditions *all* Palestinians' existence (queer and otherwise). alQaws's affirmation of their queer Palestinian existence troubles, disturbs, and disrupts what we can now recognize as, simultaneously, the heteronormativity of Zionism and the Zionism of heteronormativity. Indeed, we might even understand alQaws's affirmation of queerness as a queering of Palestinian existence as resistance, "a praxis that brings to the surface what is concealed or left behind" in order to "elicit what was rendered unintelligible, and foreground those political subjectivities and voices that are rendered most marginal."[59]

Palestinians' affirmation of their own existence and their insistence on remaining in Palestine confounds the colonial narratives that seek to define them only as impossible, irrelevant, troublesome, or problematic. In Said's dissident reformulation, Palestine is a question not only for the Zionists who would have it disappear, but for Zionism itself insofar as Palestine's existence troubles, disrupts, and disturbs the violent and hegemonic workings of colonial and imperialist power. Berlant and Warner's early refusal to answer the question of queer theory is a similarly dissident move, an affirmation of the existence of the inassimilable and a commitment to its existence as a perpetual disruption of violent regimes of normalizing power that would seek to eradicate it. For queer theory is also acutely attuned to that which will not or cannot be made to disappear. Queer's inevitably fugitive purview, meaning, and method can be seen as a kind of commitment to those forms of being deemed troublesome, unnatural, perverse, or fake, a commitment that resonates with Said's decolonizing insistence on Palestinian existence. For Palestine is a matter apart, uncertain, and problematic not by definition, but rather only to those who would deny its existence. So too with queerness (and queer theory): it is only a question to those who seek to deny its existence, its utility, its importance, and, perhaps most importantly, its integral place in a radical politics and liberated world. Viewed from the perspective of power, of course, the unthinkable and unaccounted-for is troublesome—a question, a problem. Viewed from the perspective of the oppressed, however, the persistence of the unthinkable and unaccounted-for is resistance to elimination. As both Said and alQaws make clear, this existence *is* resistance. And radical queer commitment to this decolonization may be the very meaning of liberation.

About the Author

C. Heike Schotten is associate professor of political science at the University of Massachusetts Boston, where she teaches political theory, feminist theory, and queer theory. She is the author of *Queer Terror: Life, Death, and Desire in the Settler Colony* (forthcoming from Columbia University Press).

ENDNOTES

1 Edward W. Said, *The Question of Palestine* (New York: Vintage, 1992), p. 4.

2 Said, *The Question of Palestine,* p. 4.

3 Said, *The Question of Palestine,* pp. 7–8.

4 Said, *The Question of Palestine,* p. 7.

5 Lauren Berlant and Michael Warner, "What Does Queer Theory Teach Us about *X*?" *PMLA* 110, no. 3 (May 1995): pp. 343–49.

6 Berlant and Warner, "What Does Queer Theory Teach Us," p. 344, original emphasis.

7 Berlant and Warner, "What Does Queer Theory Teach Us," p. 344.

8 Berlant and Warner, "What Does Queer Theory Teach Us," p. 346.

9 Berlant and Warner, "What Does Queer Theory Teach Us," p. 344.

10 Berlant and Warner, "What Does Queer Theory Teach Us," p. 348.

11 Said, *The Question of Palestine*, p. 7.

12 See Lisa Duggan and Nan D. Hunter, *Sex Wars: Sexual Dissent and Political Culture* (New York: Routledge, 1995); Annamarie Jagose, *Queer Theory: An Introduction* (New York: NYU Press, 1997); José Esteban Muñoz, *Disidentifications: Queers of Color and the Performance of Politics* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999).

13 Subsequently elucidated in Teresa de Lauretis, ed., "Queer Theory: Lesbian and Gay Sexualities," special issue, *differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies* 3, no. 2 (1991).

14 Kadji Amin, "Haunted by the 1990s: Queer Theory's Affective Histories," *WSQ: Women's Studies Quarterly* 44, nos. 3–4 (Fall/Winter 2016): pp. 173–89.

15 Michael Warner, "Introduction," in *Fear of a Queer Planet: Queer Politics and Social Theory*, ed. Michael Warner (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993), p. xxvi.

16 Warner, "Introduction," p. xxvi.

17 Lauren Berlant and Michael Warner, "Sex in Public," *Critical Inquiry* 24, no. 2 (Winter 1988): p. 548n2.

18 Warner, "Introduction," p. xxvi.

19 Warner, "Introduction," p. xxvi. "Antihomophobic inquiry" is how Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick describes her methodological approach in her equally field-defining book, *Epistemology of the Closet* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990).

20 Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, *Tendencies* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1993), p. 8.

21 Warner, "Introduction," p. xxvi.

22 Warner, "Introduction," p. xxvi. Queer theory's reclamation of this word as a term of political dissidence and self-identifying pride (as in the slogan, "not gay as in happy, but queer as in fuck you") was (and in some places remains) controversial.

23 Warner, "Introduction," p. xxvi.

24 Berlant and Warner, "What Does Queer Theory Teach Us," p. 345.

25 On "subjectification" and/as an arrangement of power, see the work of Michel Foucault, in particular *Discipline & Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, trans. Alan Sheridan (New York: Vintage, 1977); *The History of Sexuality*, vol. 1: *An Introduction,* trans. Robert Hurley (New York: Vintage, 1978); "The Subject and Power," in *Power: Essential Works of Michel Foucault, 1954–1985*, ed. James Faubion (New York: The New Press, 2000); "The End of the Monarchy of Sex," in *Foucault Live: Collected Interviews, 1961–1984*, ed. Sylvère Lotringer (New York: Semiotext[e], 1989).

26 Roderick A. Ferguson, *Aberrations in Black: Toward a Queer of Color Critique* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2003).

27 Cathy J. Cohen, "Punks, Bulldaggers, and Welfare Queens: The Radical Potential of Queer Politics?," *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 3, no. 4 (1997): pp. 437–65.

28 Cohen, "Punks," p. 441. The series of epithets that constitutes her article's title also indicate the capaciousness of queer as a stigmatic marker, one that Cohen suggests might be reclaimed via a broader and more capacious understanding of normalizing power that can account for class exploitation and racial subordination *as well as* sexual normalization, and indeed recognize the ways in which these modes of oppression are intertwined and inseparable from one another, rather than discrete.

29 The literature is too vast to responsibly index here; a few field-defining examples are David L. Eng, Judith Halberstam, and José Esteban Muñoz, eds., "What's Queer about Queer Studies Now?," special issue, *Social Text* 23, no. 3–4 (Fall/Winter 2005); E. Patrick Johnson and Mae G. Henderson, eds., *Black Queer Studies: A Critical Anthology* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005); Muñoz, *Disidentifications*.

30 Eng, Halberstam, and Muñoz, "Introduction," *Social Text* 23, no. 3–4 (Fall/Winter 2005): p. 3. Of course, not everyone agrees: some argue that queer theory's commitment to anti-normativity is itself a normative injunction that produces its own idealized, disciplinary version of queerness; see, for example, Robyn Wiegman and Elizabeth A. Wilson, eds., "Queer Theory without Antinormativity," special issue, *differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies* 26, no. 1 (May 2015); Jasbir K. Puar, *Terrorist Assemblages: Homonationalism in Queer Times* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2007), p. 22.

31 See, for example, two journal special issues: Hanadi al-Samman and Tarek el-Ariss, eds., "Queer Affects," special issue, *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 45, no. 2 (May 2013); and Gil Z. Hochberg, ed., "Queer Politics and the Question of Palestine/Israel," special issue, *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 16, no. 4 (2010).

32 Joseph Massad, "Re-Orienting Desire: The Gay International and the Arab World," *Public Culture* 14, no. 2 (2002): pp. 361–85.

33 Massad's influential argument has been criticized for its exclusive focus on men, its seeming denial of authenticity to subaltern queer subjects, and its potentially determinist reification of Western power. Less noticed, however, have been the criticisms of feminist and queer Palestinians, who are just as skeptical of the Gay International as Massad but see his work as leaving them with the anti-liberatory nonchoice of complicity with the Gay International (and their own colonization) or suppression of their own movements for freedom and justice (Rabab Abdulhadi, "Sexualities and the Social Order in Arab and Muslim Communities," in *Islam and Homosexuality*, ed. Samar Habib, vol. 2 [Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger, 2010]) and tarnishes their movement in the eyes of other Arabs and Palestinians who are bolstered in their view of queer Palestinians as an export of the West, instrumentalized to further the colonization of Palestine (Haneen Maikey, "The History and Contemporary State of the Palestinian Sexual Liberation Struggle," in *The Case for Sanctions against Israel*, ed. Audrea Lim [New York: Verso, 2012], pp. 121–30).

34 See, for example, Ryan Conrad, ed., *Against Equality: Queer Revolution, Not Mere Inclusion* (Edinburgh, UK: AK Press, 2014); Haneen Maikey and Sami Shamali, "International Day against Homophobia: Between the Western Experience and the Reality of Gay Communities," alQaws, 23 May 2011, http://www.alqaws.org/articles/International-Day-Against-Homophobia-Between-the-Western-Experience-and-the-Reality-of-Gay-Communities?category_id=0; Maya Mikdashi, "Gay Rights as Human Rights: Pinkwashing Homonationalism," *Jadaliyya*, 16 December 2011, http://www.jadaliyya.com/Details/24855/Gay-Rights-as-Human-Rights-Pinkwashing-Homonationalism; Dean Spade and Craig Willse, "Marriage Will Never Set Us Free," Organizing Upgrade: Engaging Left Organizers in Strategic Dialogue, 6 September 2013, http://www.organizingupgrade.com/index.php/modules-menu/beyond-capitalism/item/1002-marriage-will-never-set-us-free; Rahul Rao, "The Locations of Homophobia," *London Review of International Law* 2, no. 2 (2014): pp. 169–99, doi:10.1093/lril/lru010.

35 See, for example, Scott Lauria Morgensen, *Spaces between Us: Queer Settler Colonialism and Indigenous Decolonization* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011); Mark Rifkin, *When Did Indians Become Straight? Kinship, the History of Sexuality, and Native Sovereignty* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011); Andrea Smith, "Queer Theory and Native Studies: The Heteronormativity of Settler Colonialism," in "Sexuality, Nationality, and Indigeneity," ed. Daniel Heath Justice, Bethany Schneider, and Mark Rifkin, special issue, *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 16, nos. 1–2 (2010): pp. 41–68.

36 Ghaith Hilal, "Eight Questions Palestinian Queers Are Tired of Hearing," Electronic Intifada, 27 November 2013, https://electronicintifada.net/content/eight-questions-palestinian-queers-are-tired-hearing/12951; Maikey and Shamali, "International Day." Hilal notes that the imposition of the "coming out" paradigm on Palestinian queers "without understanding context, is a colonial project."

37 For a history of some significant moments of Brand Israel and successful anti-pinkwashing activist resistance to it, see Nada Elia, "Gay Rights with a Side of Apartheid," *Settler Colonial Studies* 2, no. 2 (2012): pp. 49–68.

38 See also Jin Haritaworn, "Loyal Repetitions of the Nation: Gay Assimilation and the 'War on Terror,'" *darkmatter* 3 (May 2008). Terminologically, homonationalism has developed beyond the original parameters set forth in *Terrorist Assemblages*, such that Puar now suggests it functions more broadly as a demarcator of modernity, neoliberalism, and the sovereign nation-state. On these developments, see C. Heike Schotten, "Homonationalism: From Critique to Diagnosis, or, We Are All Homonational Now," *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 18, no. 3 (2016): pp. 351–70. For an important qualification of homonationalism as specific to U.S. Christian nationalism that cannot be generalized to European or other imperial projects, see Robert Nichols, "Empire and the Dispositif of Queerness," *Foucault Studies* 14 (September 2012): pp. 41–60. For an argument regarding the precarity of homonationalism even for those gays and lesbians "at the pinnacle of their inclusion" in the United States, see Karma R. Chávez, "The Precariousness of Homonationalism: The Queer Agency of Terrorism in Post-9/11 Rhetoric," *QED: A Journal in GLBTQ Worldmaking* 2, no. 3 (Fall 2015): p. 34.

39 Maikey, "History and Contemporary State," p. 127; Jasbir Puar and Maya Mikdashi, "Pinkwatching and Pinkwashing: Interpenetration and Its Discontents," *Jadaliyya*, 9 August 2012, http://www.jadaliyya.com/Details/26818/Pinkwatching-And-Pinkwashing-Interpenetration-and-its-Discontents.

40 See Jin Haritaworn, Tamsila Tauqir, and Esra Erdem, "Gay Imperialism: Gender and Sexuality Discourse in the 'War on Terror,'" in *Out of Place: Interrogating Silences in Queerness/Raciality*, ed. Adi Kuntsman and Esperanza Miyake (York, UK: Raw Nerve Books, 2008); Adi Kuntsman, Jin Haritaworn, and Jennifer Petzen, "Sexualising the 'War on Terror,'" in *Thinking through Islamophobia: Global Perspectives*, ed. S. Sayyid and AbdoolKarim Vakil (London: Hurst, 2010); Maikey and Shamali, "International Day"; Puar, *Terrorist Assemblages*.

41 Jennifer L. Fluri, "'Rallying Public Opinion' and Other Misuses of Feminism," in *Feminism and War: Confronting U.S. Imperialism,* ed. Robin L. Riley, Chandra Talpade Mohanty, and Minnie Bruce Pratt (London: Zed, 2008).

42 See, for example, pinkwatchingisrael.com; *Pinkwashing Exposed: Seattle Fights Back*, directed by Dean Spade (Seattle, WA: Chicken Chicken Sit Down Media, 2015); Elia, "Gay Rights"; Heike Schotten and Haneen Maikey, "Queers Resisting Zionism: On Authority and Accountability beyond Homonationalism," *Jadaliyya*, 10 October 2012, http://www.jadaliyya.com/Details/27175/Queers-Resisting-Zionism-On-Authority-and-Accountability-Beyond-Homonationalism; Haneen Maikey and Mikki Stelder, "Dismantling the Pink Door in the Apartheid Wall: Towards a Decolonized Palestinian Queer Politics," in *The Global Trajectories of Queerness: Re-thinking Same-Sex Politics in the Global South*, ed. Ashley Tellis and Sruti Bala (Leiden: Brill/Rodopi, 2015), pp. 83–103.

43 Jin Haritaworn, Adi Kuntsman, and Silvia Posocco, eds., *Queer Necropolitics* (New York: Routledge, 2014).

44 Achille Mbembe, "Necropolitics," *Public Culture* 15, no. 1 (Winter 2003): pp. 11–40.

45 An especially acute example is Sima Shakhsari's argument that the figure of the "Iranian transgender refugee" functions to shore up and perpetuate the U.S. sanctions regime against Iran insofar as it confirms the backwardness of that country via the testimony of its queer subjects. Iranians therefore become the targets of rightful killing simultaneously as the Iranian queer subject is elevated as one deserving of rights, life, and asylum in the imperial West; see Shakhsari, "Killing Me Softly with Your Rights: Queer Death and the Politics of Rightful Killing," in Haritaworn, Kuntsman, and Posocco, eds., *Queer Necropolitics*, pp. 93–110.

46 See, for example, Mike Krebs and Dana M. Olwan, "'From Jerusalem to the Grand River, Our Struggles Are One': Challenging Canadian and Israeli Settler Colonialism"; Scott Lauria Morgensen, "Theorising Gender, Sexuality and Settler Colonialism: An Introduction" and Morgensen, "Queer Settler Colonialism in Canada and Israel: Articulating Two-Spirit and Palestinian Queer Critiques," all in "Karangatia: Calling Out Gender and Sexuality in Settler Societies," special issue, *Settler Colonial Studies* 2, no. 2 (2012); Smith, "Queer Theory and Native Studies."

47 Aníbal Quijano suggests that modernity and modern power are defined by/as coloniality: a Eurocentric, hierarchical, exploitative, and distinctively racialized formation that endures and

continues to order the world despite the ostensible demise of formal colonialism; see, for example, Aníbal Quijano, "Coloniality and Modernity/Rationality," *Cultural Studies* 21, no. 2–3 (March/May 2007): pp. 168–78.

48 María Lugones, "Heterosexualism and the Colonial/Modern Gender System," *Hypatia* 22, no. 1 (Winter 2007): pp. 187, 202.

49 Sandeep Bakshi, Suhraiya Jivraj, and Silvia Posocco, "Introduction," in *Decolonizing Sexualities: Transnational Perspectives, Critical Interventions*, ed. Sandeep Bakshi, Suhraiya Jivraj, and Silvia Posocco (Oxford, UK: Counterpress, 2016), p. 1.

50 Maikey and Stelder, "Dismantling the Pink Door," p. 87. The authors note that alQaws explicitly rejected putting "LGBT" in their name, and note that "queer" animates and defines alQaws's work only to the extent that it is understood as encompassing "feminism, sexual and gender diversity, anti-colonialism, and decolonial projects" in "the ongoing project of liberation" (p. 85).

51 Walaa alQaisiya, Ghaith Hilal, and Haneen Maikey, "Dismantling the Image of the Palestinian Homosexual: Exploring the Role of alQaws," in *Decolonizing Sexualities*, p. 125.

52 AlQaisiya, Hilal, and Maikey, "Dismantling the Image," pp. 125–26.

53 Schotten and Maikey, "Queers Resisting Zionism."

54 Said, *The Question of Palestine*, p. 19.

55 The classic statement of this is Patrick Wolfe, "Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native," *Journal of Genocide Research* 8, no. 4 (2006): pp. 387–409.

56 An unusually explicit example of this is the designation of approximately 30% of Palestinian citizens of Israel as "present absentees." They are the Palestinians who were displaced in 1948 but nevertheless remained "inside" Israel. Present absentees are not allowed to return to their homes or claim their property, and reside in what Israel calls "unrecognized villages." See Areej Sabbagh-Khoury, "The Internally Displaced Palestinians in Israel," in *The Palestinians in Israel: Readings in History, Politics and Society,* ed. Nadim N. Rouhana and Areej Sabbagh-Khoury (Haifa: Mada al-Carmel Arab Center for Applied Social Research, 2011), http://mada-research.org/en/2011/09/13/palestinians-in-israel-readings/.

57 AlQaisiya, Hilal, and Maikey, "Dismantling the Image"; Maikey, "History and Contemporary State"; Schotten and Maikey, "Queers Resisting Zionism"; Maikey and Stelder, "Dismantling the Pink Door."

58 Said, *The Question of Palestine*, p. 23.

59 Maikey and Stelder, "Dismantling the Pink Door," p. 100.