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ABSTRACT

I use the lens of the “critical traveler” to argue that the international border crossing of Palestine/Israel is both a settler colonial technology for the State of Israel, and a site of resistance for the transnational Palestinian solidarity movement. Israel deems certain travelers as critical to its settler colonial project. Israel marks Palestinian and Muslim travelers as racially critical to Israel that aims to be a Jewish majority state. Israel also marks travelers as critical because it suspects that these travelers espouse critical views of Israel’s settler colonialist ideology and practice. As such, Israel has established a border security system to identify and subject critical travelers; the system consists of segregated surveillance, intelligence collection, biopolitical techniques, and border expansion.

Furthermore, Israel is an occupying power and critical travelers vary in nationalities; therefore, third states – states that are not Israel or Palestine – are also accountable to Israel’s treatment of critical travelers. As a third state, through policymaking and rhetoric, the United States has supported Israel’s unilateral control of international Palestine/Israel border crossings. However, the transnational Palestinian
solidarity network harnesses the narratives written by critical travelers to inform the legal and cultural discourse of critique of Israel’s colonial past, present and future.

The struggle between the critical traveler and Israel’s border security is not simply a matter between an individual traveler and a sovereign nation-state. Rather the struggle serves as an analytic for the global perpetuation of as well as the global resistance to Israel’s ongoing settler colonial project in Palestine.
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I. INTRODUCTION

“So, what kind of name is this? Are you Indian or Muslim?” The young female Israeli security officer haughtily repeated the same question asked hours earlier. Even though I carried a U.S. passport and even though these two options were not mutually exclusive, I quickly calculated the potentially self-preserving response of “Indian.” My political, cultural, social and familial life is very much rooted in the United States. Yet, I replied “Indian” remembering that Holy Land pilgrimage tours with Christian Indians frequent this crossing and shortly before my travel, India had signed a multi-billion dollar defense equipment agreement with Israel and strengthened its bilateral interests in tourism.1

Two hours ago, an Israeli officer had separated me from my delegation and had asked the same question, taken my passport and directed me to the waiting area at the Allenby Bridge Crossing, the Palestine/Israel border crossing from Jordan into the West Bank. Having crossed into the West Bank, fifteen students were in the bus outside while the faculty helped two of us with Muslim names get through the crossing. The Allenby Bridge Crossing is located in the Palestinian territory, the West Bank, yet Israel’s border security, intelligence, police and other factions of Israeli military have absolute control over its operations, including entry and exit decisions and security treatment meted out to entrants.

1 In 1992, after the fall of the Soviet Union, India announced full diplomatic relations with Israel. After 9/11 and the U.S.-India increased alliance, India has become one of Israel’s biggest customer of defense equipment. See P.R. Kumaraswamy’s India’s Israel Policy (New York: Columbia University Press, 2010) for historical development. For current people-to-people exchanges, see Maina Chawla Singh, “Indians and Israelis: Beyond Strategic Partnerships”, Israel Studies 17, no. 3 (2012): 22-44. For details of the 2010 agreement: “India to Hold Wide-Ranging Strategic Talks with U.S., Israel”, The Times of India, January 19, 2010.
It was May 2011 and we were travelling as part of a course entitled *Israel-Palestine Field School: Settler Colonialism and Postcolonial Critique*, jointly taught by faculty from Anthropology and American Studies at a U.S.-based university. The course included time in the university classroom during the semester followed by a field visit to Palestine/Israel at the end of the semester. In the classroom, we theorized and discussed settler colonialism, a specific formation and structure of colonization “where colonizers ‘come to stay’ and to establish new political orders” and have political, military, social and economic power over all other groups present. Settler colonial states are determined to displace the natives (in Israel’s case, Palestinians) in a “logic of elimination” from their land and institute a new permanent nation with societal structures and land utilization suited for colonial settlers (in Israel’s case, worldwide Jewish population). The field school employed a decolonial approach to the study of Palestine. While we studied colonialism, we also studied the postcolonial critique put forth by a variety of Palestinian, Israeli and international scholars, activists, journalists, students, politicians and community leaders.

---


4 In this paper, the terms “native” or “indigenous” are not U.N. designations of indigenous peoples of the world, but rather populations described in settler colonial theory as people to be eliminated or disappeared through the process of settler colonization. Palestinians are native to Palestine but are not recognized as members of global indigenous populations.

The travel to Palestine/Israel, as the experiential component of the course, examined historical and contemporary settler colonial technologies and their impact on Palestinians and the landscape of Palestine/Israel. The faculty worked with local individuals and organizations to organize trips to analyze such settler colonial technologies as the Wall,6 checkpoints, settler roads, destroyed Palestinian villages, and apartheid streets in “48”7 and in the West Bank, including East Jerusalem. Since its national founding, the Israeli government has developed these settler colonial technologies to limit and control Palestinians. In this paper, I use the field school’s decolonial approach of examination of Israel’s colonial practices juxtaposed with postcolonial critique to theorize the Palestine/Israel international border crossing; specifically, I examine Israel’s treatment of certain travelers, how these travelers respond, and how this interaction impacts the larger colonial narrative.

The other student waiting with me was the only Palestinian American in our group, 19-year-old Danya Mustafa. In the course of our wait, several Israeli border officers subjected Mustafa to aggressive interrogation, humiliation and name-calling, unfounded accusations, and intelligence collection. Mustafa endured and survived the verbal abuse, and both of us were eventually granted entry. The following day, Mustafa recounted all the details in a public Facebook note from our guesthouse in Beit Sahour, a town near Bethlehem in the West Bank. She recalled how in a security-locked

---

6 Israel began the construction of the West Bank barrier in 2002. It is referred to by many names such as security wall, separation barrier, and apartheid wall. In this paper, I use “the Wall” or “Israel’s Wall.” See Graham Usher, “Unmasking Palestine: On Israel, the Palestinians, and the Wall,” Journal of Palestine Studies 35, no. 1 (Autumn 2005), 25.

7 During the field school, we learned that the term “48” is used by Palestinians to refer to “Israel proper.” In this paper, I use “48” rather than “Israel proper” to denote the area of Palestine/Israel that was colonized in 1948.
interrogation backroom, a young female Israeli interrogator said to Danya, “HOW DO YOU EXPECT ME TO LET YOU INTO MY COUNTRY KNOWING THAT YOU HAVE NO RESPECT FOR ME? [all caps in original]”8 Danya dramatically ended her account with “We [people in the United States] are helping to fund humiliation, interrogation, murder, deprivation, and the torture of the Palestinian people.”9 Mustafa performed a public postcolonial critique of Israel’s treatment of Palestinians that linked Israel’s imprisonment of Palestinians with security treatment of international travelers at a Palestine/Israel international border crossing and invoked the complicity and responsibility of the United States and its citizens.

This incident is a recognizable scene within the larger Palestine/Israel settler colonial story. The politics of identity begin when an international traveler arrives at a Palestine/Israel international border crossing. An Israeli border security officer identifies the traveler by skin color, name, passport or immigration stamps as potentially being of critical interest to Israel’s settler colonial project. Then, the officer may ask the traveler, “What kind of name is this?” to initiate the interrogation process. This is illustrative of Louis Althusser’s scene of interpellation when the policeman hails the individual on the street with the “Hey, you there!”10 In this case, the border officer uses a linguistic strategy to transform the traveler into a concrete subject of Zionist ideology and to categorize the traveler as part of the insecure category them. Since Israel’s founding, the secure us has meant Jews – preferably European or American and Zionist, and the

8 Danya Mustafa, “What happened during my interrogation, for those who want to know”, Public Facebook Note, May 18, 2011.
9 Ibid.
insecure *them* has consisted of Arabs, especially Palestinians, as well as Muslims, African refugees, Asian immigrants, anti-colonial activists and scholars, and other travelers who trigger Israel’s demographic anxiety to be a Jewish-majority state. The critical travelers (*them*) are ethnically threatening if they intend to immigrate and settle; they could thus affect the Jewish majority. If they do not intend to settle in Palestine/Israel, they are potentially critical of Israel and thus can provide financial, emotional, political, and other forms of support to Palestinian Israelis and Palestinians living under Israel’s colonization and occupation. This support counters settler colonialism’s long-term plan of elimination of the native. On the other hand, the desired travelers (*us*) affirm some version of Zionist political, national and religious determination: that Palestine/Israel has a ruling Jewish majority.\(^\text{11}\) The *us* group includes participants in touring trips like the Taglit Birthright for young Jews and Holy Land tours for worldwide Christians. Israel’s border apparatus seeks to increase the numbers of *us* who come into Palestine/Israel, and decrease the numbers of *them* from Palestine/Israel by using legal, physical and psychological strategies available to the border apparatus.

In this paper, I coin the expression “critical travelers” to refer to travelers whom Israel identifies, categorizes and separates as *them*. The “critical traveler,” as a real individual and as a representation, is both an international subject that advances Israel’s settler colonialism and an agent for the transnational decolonial social movement set out

---

to challenge Israel’s settler colonialism. The critical traveler advances Israel’s settler colonialism by allowing Israel to practice and enhance its biopolitical techniques, such as feeding its intelligence database of international Palestinian solidarity network; concurrently, the critical traveler has the agency to expose Israel’s colonialism and biopolitics to international audiences because the critical traveler experiences Israeli dominance firsthand.

In this paper, I work with three questions: How are the logics of Israel’s settler colonialism, governmentality and biopower implicated in the production of critical travelers at Palestine/Israel international crossings? How does the United States buttress these moments of violent policing and surveillance of travel to a “colonial present”? And how do experiences, representations and agencies of critical travelers inform postcolonial critique aimed at Israel’s occupation, apartheid and colonization of Palestine/Israel?

My first question deals with the interplay between Israel’s settler colonialism, governmentality and biopower that produces the category of the critical traveler. After the first hailing, Israel embarks on a discriminatory security inspection. Various members of Israel Defense Forces, Israel Border Police, uniformed Israeli police, plainclothes secret agents, and an assortment of security personnel subject the critical traveler to the degree and techniques of domination that they deem appropriate based on

---


the traveler’s race, skin color, religious expression, nationality, outward signs of Palestinian solidarity, and other information uncovered from the inspection. For instance, Israel’s security apparatus subjected me, an Indian American who has a common Palestinian first name, to several hours of waiting, but treated Mustafa – a Palestinian American and an activist - with a hostile intelligence interrogation.

Clearly, Israel’s subjection is an exercise of biopower at Palestine/Israel international border crossings. Michel Foucault theorizes biopower as power exercised by the modern state to discipline, control and regulate its population.\textsuperscript{14} Rather than theorizing Israel’s enactment of biopower as a byproduct of the genealogy of the modern nation-state, I position Israel’s subjection as a technology with investment in settler colonialism. Scott Morgensen situates biopower in the genealogy of European settler colonialism, and denaturalizes settler colonialism in examining the practices of biopolitics.\textsuperscript{15} Following Morgensen, I examine Israel’s discriminatory security inspections at Palestine/Israel international border crossings as a site of settler colonial governance practiced on Palestinian and non-Palestinian travelers whom Israel identifies as demographic and ideological threats to its settler colonial project, Zionism. I consider two major categories of critical travelers, Palestinian and non-Palestinian travelers.

In considering Palestinian travelers, I use the meaning of “critical” as crucial, vital, decisive and important. Controlling the existence and the mobility of Palestinian bodies is so critical to Israel that it has formulated a deep-set systemic supremacy of its Jewish population. Think-tanks, research institutes, and domestic and foreign

\textsuperscript{14} Michel Foucault, \textit{History of Sexuality} (New York: Pantheon Books, 1978).

policymakers from a wide political spectrum devote their energies to strategizing the increase of the conforming Israeli Jewish population and a “containment” of the Palestinian population.\textsuperscript{16} Israel also uses demographic concerns to justify building expensive and expansive physical structures to block the entrance of non-Jewish migrants from Africa and Asia, as well as to enforce limited and complicated citizenship and entrance policies for Palestinians located in “48”, the West Bank, including East Jerusalem, the Gaza Strip, refugee camps in neighboring nations, and in the greater diaspora.\textsuperscript{17} Palestinians have been the first targets of the settler colonial state\textsuperscript{18} that perceives and treats all Palestinians, regardless of national citizenship, as a physical threat merely by their existence. The Israeli border apparatus perceives and examines every Palestinian as a critical traveler, even those with a single grandparent from Palestine. Israel’s biopolitical technology consists of exorbitant techniques to identify, interrogate,


\textsuperscript{17} I do not examine sub-Saharan African economic migrants and political refugees in this paper. Israel’s immigration policy is rooted in settler colonial “basic laws” set in 1948 when Israel was founded. These laws seek to secure a Jewish majority state. See Yaron, Hadas, Nurit Hashimshony-Yaffe, and John Campbell, “Infiltrators or Refugees? An Analysis of Israel’s Policy Towards African Asylum-Seekers,” International Migration Vol. 51, no. 4 (2013): 144-157; Joel Burstyner, “Israel’s Pain over Darfur Refugees,” Eureka Street Vol. 17, no. 19 (2007) : 14-16.

\textsuperscript{18} In addition to a settler colonial state, like the United States, Israel is also an “empire-state” formed by colonialism and structured with differentiating classes of civilians in the service of the ruling authority, European/Ashkenazi Jews. I do not focus on this aspect in this paper. For more on empire-states, see Frederick Cooper, Colonialism in Question: Theory, Knowledge, History (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005): 27. For Israel as imperial nation, see Nur Masalha, Imperial Israel and the Palestinians the Politics of Expansion (London: Pluto Press, 2000) and Michael Palumbo, Imperial Israel: The History of the Occupation of the West Bank and Gaza (London: Bloomsbury, 1990).
control, expel, and obtain intelligence from domestic and international Palestinians. These techniques are embedded in the settler colonial logic of elimination of the native Palestinian subject. Psychological strategies, such as humiliation, coupled with legal strategies, such as segregated surveillance, are applied to remove, displace, and transfer the Palestinian population from Palestine/Israel. The biopolitics at the Palestine/Israel international crossings uphold the message of “do not live in and do not return to Israel” for Palestinians.

The second meaning of “critical” refers to criticism, disapproval, judgment, and evaluation. Some travelers in this group can be racially identifiable as potentially being critical of Israeli policies. Travelers might display signs of Muslim-ness, such as a name or clothing; they can also be non-Palestinian Arabs, people of color, people from the Global South, or carrying passports from dissenting nations. Because of shared histories and experiences as colonized and racialized populations, Israel suspects that this group has formulated solidarity with Palestinians. Some critical travelers may not be immediately identifiable, have European names, tone and features, and have passports from Israel-friendly nations, but Israel suspects or is certain that the traveler criticizes Zionist policies. For example, Israel denied entry to Norman Finkelstein at Ben Gurion International Airport in May 200819 and to Noam Chomsky at the Allenby Bridge Crossing in May 2010.20 Israel provided bureaucratic explanations for their denial, but


both intellectuals—with differing analyses—are renowned critics of the Israeli policy of occupation. African American acclaimed author Alice Walker was detained for several hours at the Allenby Bridge Crossing.\(^21\) In either group, non-Palestinian critical travelers have access to specialized audiences, and increase the critical mass that opposes Israel’s occupation, colonialism, and apartheid in Palestine/Israel.

To identify non-Palestinian critical travelers, border officers employ techniques to determine the critical traveler’s Palestinian affiliations. Security officials will examine luggage for Palestinian cultural materials or ask the traveler if they will be visiting the occupied Palestinian territories or have any Palestinian friends. Israel fears that non-Palestinian international travelers will bear witness to the everyday realities of the occupation, and will interfere in Israel’s settler colonial project by responding to Israel’s violence with acts such as publicly critiquing Israel’s project, aiding in Palestinian survival, and getting politically involved in activism against Israel. In essence, Israel fears that critical travelers would tarnish Israel’s global image as a democratic nation. A crucial aspect of bearing witness is the responsibility to respond to the violence that is witnessed.\(^22\) Israel attempts to prevent this possibility by identifying non-Palestinian critical travelers by racially profiling and keeping databases of activists, and channeling this second category of critical travelers through Palestinian routes of the border crossing process to also relay the message, “Do not return to Israel.” In this way, Israel controls the mobility of non-Palestinian internationals using settler colonial techniques of


domination that it developed for Palestinians. Consequently, Israel’s discriminatory security inspections limit international access to the occupied Palestinian territories, and thereby limit international humanitarian efforts, solidarity actions, and knowledge of the occupation. The discriminatory security inspection serves as a settler colonial technology in these multiple registers that buttress the project of elimination of the native.

I also argue that the production of critical travelers extends beyond the relationship between an individual traveler and a sovereign nation-state; it involves third states, that is, state actors other than Israel and Palestine. Palestinian grassroots and nonprofit organizations argue for third states to exercise their legal obligations based on international humanitarian law provisions, human rights treaties and customary humanitarian and human rights law.  

Third state responsibility is most discussed in regards to Israel’s illegal settlement building. I focus on how third state responsibility applies to the harsh limitations on mobility faced by Palestinians under the Israeli occupation and also to allowing Palestinians to receive international travel in their territories. The tension between a critical traveler and Israel’s border security involves several vested parties that influence Israel to make entry/exit and treatment decisions at the Palestine/Israel’s international crossings. In the case of the field school scenario above, the border security dialogue included India’s recent negotiations with Israel, the International Solidarity Movement (ISM), No Mas Muertes, unnamed European activists, 

23 Ingrid Jaradat Gassner, Al-Haq, “State Responsibility in Connection with Israel’s Illegal Settlement Enterprise in the Occupied Palestinian Territory”, legal memorandum, July 16, 2012. Right to Enter: Campaign for the Right to Enter the Occupied Palestinian Territory, “Third States.”
and the United States as the third state of which the critical travelers held citizenship and also a third state that is Israel’s closest ally.

Israel’s relationships with third states are crucial to how the third state challenges Israel in enforcing international law for Palestine to receive international travelers and for granting Palestinians mobility. Third states influence how travelers have the ability to invoke their own citizenship rights when they are subjected to Israel’s discriminatory security inspection. Palestine/Israel international crossings can be challenged and theorized using legal, political and cultural influences intertwined between Israel, international entities (such as the United Nations), Palestinian leadership, and third states of which the critical traveler holds citizenship. Third states set legal provisions regarding how their citizens travel to and from Palestine/Israel. Detained citizens seek assistance from their national embassies and politicians. Third states can support their citizens and demand that Israel permit entry of their citizens into the occupied Palestinian territories. They can make public statements about Israel’s conduct regarding expulsions of critical travelers from their countries. Chile provides an example of what can be asked for by third states in assisting their own subjects at the Palestine/Israel international border crossing. Palestinian Chilean Mauricio Abu-Ghosh was denied entry to Israel “for security reasons.” To Israel’s surprise, Chile’s Foreign Relations Committee member Ivan Moreira met with the Israeli ambassador to Chile and protested the denial of entry: “Abu-Ghosh has always acted peacefully defending the Palestinian cause with legal and political arguments.” He also reminded Israel in a written statement: “We must not forget

---

that between Chile and Israel exists a treaty of free migration and agreements of cooperation and friendship that should be respected, in addition, international law provides for freedom of movement and, here, was arbitrary grounds and false accusations to prevent entry Abu-Ghosh.” Chile as a third state acknowledged Abu-Ghosh’s anti-Zionist legal and political ideals, but argued that these did not make him a security threat. Israel was shocked by Chile’s forthright statement, especially when considering that in the case of Noam Chomsky, the United States did not protest.

Third states have agency to negotiate the degree and type of security Israeli airlines are allowed to use at international terminals within their own national boundaries. Israeli airlines require an extra layer of security when housed at international airports where Israeli security personnel practice discriminatory security inspections. Third states can boycott Israeli airlines from airports and negotiate the terms of Israeli security that is allowed in their airports. In 2011 and 2012, Denmark and Sweden respectively refused to allow Israeli security inspections with the conclusion that racial profiling against Arabs and Africans. They concluded that Israeli intensive interrogations are against civil liberties accorded to travelers, and both countries banned one Israeli airline, Arkia, from their airports.25 As a result, Israelis have to travel to Denmark or Sweden via the German airline Lufthansa.26

Third states have been historically involved in Palestine/Israel international

---


26 There is no guarantee that this policy will remain. Israel’s Foreign Ministry continues to press negotiations with these states in order to allow Israeli airlines to operate at their terminals with Israeli security inspections.
border crossing issues. In particular, the U.S.-Israel “special relationship” has aided in ratifying Israel’s domination over the governance of Palestine/Israel international border crossings.\textsuperscript{27} As both a third state and a permanent United Nations Security Council (UNSC) member, the United States is obligated to ensure Palestinians’ right to travel and to investigate the impact of Israel-imposed international isolation on the Palestinian population. However, rather than protecting the rights of Palestinians to travel in and out of Palestine/Israel and to receive international visitors, the United States consistently uses its permanent role in the UNSC to afford protection to Israel when Israel violates international law and advances its settler colonial project. In 2011, the United States exercised its veto power to block the near-unanimous UNSC Resolution 446 to demand that Israel “cease all settlement activities in the occupied Palestinian territory, including East Jerusalem.”\textsuperscript{28} Other third states, such as India, have political and economic relationships with Israel that normalize Israel as a nation-state; yet at the same time, third states have the legal obligation to hold Israel accountable to international humanitarian law (IHL).\textsuperscript{29}

The significant role of third states provides further evidence that the Palestine/Israel international border crossing is not a normative entry point into a democratic sovereign nation but that it is a settler colonial technology. Israel aims to


\textsuperscript{29} Right to Enter: Campaign for the Right to Enter the Occupied Palestinian Territory, “Third States,” http://www.righttoenter.ps/third-states/.
normalize its security practices as a right of national sovereignty. However, the Palestine/Israel international border crossings are not only gateways into the State of Israel but also into the occupied Palestinian territories that are protected by international humanitarian law. Right to Enter argues that the international community is responsible for international access to the Palestinian territories. By being implicated in the Palestine/Israel international border crossings, third states are also implicated in Israel’s settler colonial project.

My last research question is concerned with how the critical traveler is a significant site of postcolonial critique. Because the traveler experiences and witnesses a personal level of Palestinian suffering, Israel’s discriminatory security inspection pushes the critical traveler towards a responsible action. John Durham Peters analyzes “active witnessing” in the context of media communication: “in active witnessing one is a privileged possessor and producer of knowledge in an extraordinary, often forensic, setting in which speech and truth are policed in multiple ways [emphasis in original].”

Danya Mustafa was provoked to write her account and publicly disseminate the details of her treatment. Her testimony also included her argument that this treatment is evidence of Israel’s colonization of Palestine. Although she was victimized by Israel, she also became a producer of knowledge to challenge Israel’s border security technology. I am also a survivor-witness of Israel’s treatment of critical travelers, and thus responded responsibly by dedicating my graduate thesis to the examination of this issue.

Critical travel narratives are written from multiple subjectivities of the critical traveler: a subject of the Israel military, a witness to Israel’s colonialism and occupation

---

of Palestine, and a reporter to the international community. As a subject, the critical traveler is othered and experiences trauma, and in this subjectivity, the traveler’s experience is not much different from travelers who are subjected to security measures of other modern states. However, the critical traveler realizes the magnitude of Israel’s treatment of subjects who are categorized as an even higher threat to Israel’s settler colonial project – Palestinians in the Occupied Palestinian Territories. The traveler is propelled by the discriminatory security inspection to speak for him/her self and to inform the international community about the conditions of Palestinians.

The critical traveler arrives at the crossing with a degree of preparation for Israel’s attempt at subjection. Travelers’ narratives reveal that most critical travelers withhold information and at times conceal their plans to Israel’s border security officers. The faculty and students of the Israel-Palestine Field School carried an official university letter stating the course that studied Holy Land architecture; it did not mention settler colonialism. Critical travelers are often prepared to be disobedient, deceptive and resistant to the settler colonial state. The meeting between the Israeli state and the critical traveler is a struggle at once physical, ideological, psychological, political, social and emotional. Critical travelers come face to face with the Israeli military tasked to scrutinize their identity and extract information. But Israel’s border security personnel also come face to face with a traveler who questions Zionist practices. Alice Walker asked the young interrogator, “Don’t you think this behavior – insulting, threatening, humiliating – makes you all seem rather German-esque?”

Walker, “Auntie.”
stop at the border. The once-subject can adopt the roles of a truth-teller, witness, advocate, speaker, scholar, activist or writer about Israeli border practices.

Israel attempts to prevent the production of witness testimonies and critiques of Israel’s colonization of Palestine by prohibiting critical travelers, yet the preventive act itself instigates the type of knowledge production it fears. Although Israel’s intention is to suppress critical travelers from entering Palestine/Israel, Israel’s biopolitical techniques at the border in actuality produce the critical traveler as an important figure for the transnational Palestinian solidarity movement. Critical travel narratives (in their various formats) become part of the discourse that challenges Israel’s contemporary discriminatory security inspections, historical oppression and future colonization. The critical traveler uses her discursive agency to resist Israel’s process of subjection at the Palestine/Israel international border, and furthermore, the traveler assembles community agency to resist and critique Israel in its subjection of Palestinians, the indigenous subjects of settler colonialism. Critical travelers and their narratives counter Israel’s claim to national sovereignty and the normalization of Israel’s foreign relations with third states. Critical travelers garner attention from the public and forge a decolonial narrative in blogs, facebook, and cultural products. Activists, intellectuals, cultural workers and humanitarians in the solidarity network formulate a discourse around their experiences. Representations of and references to the critical traveler as a figure/subject/character appear in narratives, political essays, films, poems, and other forms of cultural works to inform different publics about Israel’s settler colonial project and its impact on Palestinians in Israel, on occupied Palestinian territories, and throughout the world.

My primary data source consists of reports written by or about critical travelers
and representations of them in cultural and political sources such as blogs, essays, anthologies, memoirs, narrative films, and news media. I perform a textual and political/cultural contextual analysis of the content in these narratives. Content includes the border location, the traveler’s socio-political identity, the traveler’s observations, the interrogator’s identity and questions asked, the purpose of visits to Israel, the traveler’s affective responses, the conditions of the detention facility, the reaction(s) from embassies, and critical analyses when the travelers are academics, activists, and artists. To further support my findings, I also consult secondary sources such as reports, press releases and position papers published by human rights and NGOs, related maps, hearings and border crossing statuses contained in the U.N. Information System on the Question of Palestine (UNISPAL) database, U.S. State Department travel advisories on Israel, the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, and speeches and press briefings by U.S. officials in response to issues concerning Palestine/Israel crossings.

While I focus on the critical traveler, other have analyzed Israel’s border security through the lens of neoliberal trade policies, corporate complicity, complex architecture and physical structures, neoteric surveillance and military technologies, and comparative culture. For example, Jesse Kapenga’s Master’s Thesis employs a comparative methodology to examine the rhetoric of fear employed by U.S. and Israeli politicians, bureaucrats, and media to gain public support for the construction of their respective border walls - the U.S.-Mexican border and the separation wall. Israel takes pride in the border control technologies of domination that it has developed in various protocols.
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including material (i.e. highly sensitive scanners), virtual (i.e. population databases), and human interaction (i.e. behavior detection security); many of these involve Israel’s relationships with third parties.

The Russell Tribunal on Palestine (RTOP)’s study of the corporate complicity of Israel’s multinational corporation Elbit Systems converges neoliberalism, U.S.-Israeli relations, and border technology. In addition to its domestic business of security and surveillance equipment in Israel, Elbit is dependent on and greatly profits from international sales of defense, intelligence, and war equipment such as drones used in the post-9/11 War on Terror. RTOP found that aid from the United States to Israel directly subsidizes Elbit as well as provides business. In 2014, the United States Homeland Security gave the potentially $1 billion contract to Elbit Systems to construct a more robust U.S.-Mexican border-surveillance technology, such as the spy towers use at checkpoints in the West Bank.

Kapanga and the RTOP examine how coloniality, governmentality and globalization work together at Palestine/Israel border crossings (including those within Palestine/Israel and international crossings) to support Israel’s settler colonial project. In contrast to these studies, my study juxtaposes colonial state power with transnational

---

resistance. In the first chapter, I examine the border crossing technologies – segregated surveillance, intelligence, biopolitics, and expansion - developed by Israel in order to identify and control the movement of travelers who are suspected to be critical of or to Israel’s settler colonial project. In the following chapter, I examine how the United States, as a third state, has supported Israel’s control of movement into, within and out of Palestine/Israel and thereby has supported the impediments to Palestinian mobility and international access to Palestine/Israel. I specifically discuss the U.S. policymaking role in the 1993 Oslo Accords and the 2005 Disengagement of Gaza. In the last chapter, I examine how critical travelers use their experiences at the border crossing to remind their audiences of Israel’s colonial past, Israel’s contemporary fascist and racist policies, and their own third state’s collusion with Israel’s colonization and occupation of Palestine. While states grant power to Israel to control the access to international Palestine/Israel border crossings, critical travelers have also claimed the border crossing as a site of resistance.
The quintessential Palestinian experience, which illustrates some of the most basic issues raised by Palestinian identity, takes place at a border, an airport, a checkpoint: in short at any of those many modern barriers where identities are checked and verified. What happens to Palestinians at these crossing points brings home to them how much they share in common as a people. For it is at these borders and barriers that the six million Palestinians are singled out for “special treatment,” and are forcefully reminded of their identity: of who they are, and of why they are different from others.36


## II. BORDER CROSSING COLONIAL TECHNOLOGIES

Rashid Khalidi launches his analysis of Palestinian identity with a discussion of the fundamental aspect of Palestinian identity, what he refers to as “special treatment” that Palestinians experience at any border crossing. The “special treatment” establishes and distinguishes the Palestinian as the indigenous Other of Palestine/Israel’s settler colonial present. As targeted subjects, all six million Palestinians, wherever they reside, fall in the category of critical travelers if identified at any Palestine/Israel international border crossings. To advance as a settler colonial state, Israel’s border system must be able to identify any Palestinian that arrives at a Palestine/Israel crossing and have absolute control over the traveler’s body to allow entry, deny entry, detain, expel, change immigration status, inspect, and deport. Israel’s segregated border security system, embedded within the intelligence apparatus, expects that Palestinians from many domestic and international locales will travel in and out of Palestine/Israel. In this section, I discuss four technologies embedded in the “special treatment” that the Israeli border security system employs at international Palestine/Israel crossings to regulate Palestinian international movement and extend it to non-Palestinian critical travelers:

segregated surveillance, intelligence collection, biopolitical techniques, and expansion.

**Segregated Surveillance**

Palestinians are segregated from other travelers in order that Israel can subject them with a “special treatment.” In contrast, the Israeli border system allows freedom of mobility and privacy to the settler citizen subjects. Helga Tawil-Souri argues that Israel must “count, document, monitor, control and limit Palestinians, and, importantly, simultaneously keep Jewish Israeli mobilities largely free-flowing.”

Palestinians throughout Palestine/Israel are meticulously categorized, issued differentiating identification cards and accorded limitations in their mobility depending on their ID, whereas Jewish settlers in the OPT have the same ID as Jewish citizens in Israel proper.

In order for the settler colonial society to function, the elaborate system of color-coded IDs must afford Jewish Israelis the ability to efficiently use crossings into/out of the external boundaries of Palestine/Israel, and authorize Israel to surveil and discipline Palestinians with the degree of violence that the state can enforce with impunity.

International and domestic travelers enter and exit Palestine/Israel by air, land and sea at international border crossings. Israel relegates travelers to different crossings based on race, nationality and residency status within Palestine/Israel (see Map 1 and Table 1 of list of crossings and segregation policy).
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Map 1. OCHA Palestine/Israel International Border Crossings, Airports, and Partitions.
## OFFICIAL PALESTINE/ISRAEL REGION’S INTERNATIONAL CROSSINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Crossing</th>
<th>Travelers Allowed</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Ben Gurion International Airport in Tel Aviv, Israel | Air: International crossing into Israel proper, Tel Aviv | - Israelis  
- Internationals | People with Palestinian heritage of any nationality are advised not to use the airport – the most convenient form of travel. |
| Tabah Crossing                             | Land: Egypt and Israel proper           | - Israelis  
- Internationals |                                                                 |
| Jordan River-Sheikh Hussein Terminal       | Land: Jordan and Israel proper          | - Israelis  
- Internationals except with Palestinian heritage | Located north of the West Bank.                                      |
| Rabin Crossing                             | Land: Jordan and Israel proper          | - Israelis  
- Internationals except with Palestinian heritage | South of the West Bank                                              |
| Eliat Crossing                             | By Foot: Jordan and Israel’s Eliat resort | - Israelis  
- Internationals except with Palestinian heritage | Used for tourism on both sides. Palestinian Israelis have complained about discrimination. |
| Allenby Bridge-King Hussein Crossing       | Land: Jordan and West Bank (near West Bank town Jerico) | - Residents of West Bank  
- Internationals including with Palestinian heritage | Controlled by State of Israel; Jewish Israelis are not allowed to use this crossing. |
| Checkpoints near Green Line, especially Qalandiya/Kalandia | West Bank and East Jerusalem; West Bank and Israel proper | - Residents of West Bank  
- Palestinian Israelis  
- Some internationals | Controlled by State of Israel.                                      |
| Rafah Crossing                             | Egypt and Gaza Strip                   | - Gazans  
- Internationals except with Palestinian heritage | Officially controlled by Egypt, however, Israel is in constant communication with Egyptian authorities. Israel opens and closes based on political pressures and events. |
| Erez Crossing                              | Gaza Strip and Israel proper            | - Gazans  
- International humanitarian aid workers  
- Journalists | Bureaucratically an international border; special permits required for Gazans for medical emergencies and exceptional situations. |

**Table 1.** Official Palestine/Israel Region’s International Crossings. The Palestine/Israel’s international crossing points are all controlled by Israel. Crossings between from Lebanon and Syria are not included here because internationals are not allowed to use these. Policies and closures are subject to change. This Table contains information as of July 2013.
As shown in Table 1, Israel has set the following regulations to institutionalize a system of segregation of travelers by ethnicity and nationality at international crossings. The segregation allows Israel to implement surveillance measures without interference from Jewish Israelis:

- Jewish Israelis are not permitted to use the Allenby Bridge Crossing for travel, and thus are only involved in its operations, if employed in a security capacity.
- Palestinians in the West Bank are required to travel only through the Allenby Bridge Crossing between Jordan and the West Bank; most do not have the permission to travel to Tel Aviv to use the Ben Gurion International Airport.
- International travelers with Palestinian heritage who hold citizenships in third states, such as the United States, are advised to use the Allenby Bridge Crossing in the West Bank even in situations in which they are visiting Palestinian Israeli relatives in Israel proper. These travelers are arbitrarily held from entering and even exiting through the Ben Gurion International Airport. They can also be deported to Jordan and asked to enter from Allenby Bridge.
- The Erez Crossing spatially, technologically, and bureaucratically segregates the Gaza Strip from the rest of Palestine/Israel. Erez, “a long, lonely walk,” is completely administered by Israeli military through offsite monitoring using video cameras, automatic stalls, and microphones. Humanitarian workers, journalists, and other internationals have described Erez as unnerving.
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traumatizing, and anxiety-producing.\textsuperscript{40} In 2005, as part of the Disengagement Plan, Israel internationalized the bureaucracy of entering and exiting the Gaza Strip via the Erez Crossing. Previously, Erez functioned as a domestic crossing allowing for Gazans to cross for work, visitations, medical appointments, and school if they have obtained the proper permit through Israel’s Ministry of Interior. The usage of Erez as an international crossing requires permission from the Israeli military and permission is only granted under emergency circumstances.

In addition to assigning travelers to different crossings, the Ben Gurion International Airport is spatially organized to separate and conceal travelers. The Airport’s checkpoints, corridors, lines, side rooms, secret rooms, specialized x-ray scanners, and plethora of armed and undercover security officials influence the affective and physical experience of travelers. Israel’s border apparatus subjects only critical travelers, marked as \textit{them}, to these colonizing technologies; it marks desired travelers who naturalize or support Israel’s settler colonialism as belonging in the \textit{us} category and directs them through unobstructed pathways. Again, the primary reason for segregation is for surveillance of the Palestinian population.

From Table 1, it seems that Palestinian Israelis are allowed to travel through Ben Gurion International Airport, yet, they are segregated within the airport (Table 2).

\textsuperscript{40} Ibid. as well as: Richard Moore, “Crossing Erez,” \textit{Guernica: a Magazine of Art & Politics}, March 2011.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Checkpoint</th>
<th>Jewish Israelis</th>
<th>Palestinian Israelis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Identification and Interpellation at Main Entrance: Check for signs of “Arabness” - clothing,</td>
<td>Waved by</td>
<td>Pulled over for additional questioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accent, license plate, identity card, and stereotype of cars driven by Palestinians.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Terminal Entrance: Check for signs of “Arabness.”</td>
<td>Not stopped</td>
<td>Stopped for questions regarding destination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Before Check-in: Everyone needs to stop here for luggage and passport checks. This is where</td>
<td>One scanner for</td>
<td>Led to side rooms, asked the same questions by multiple security officials;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apartheid and segregation are most apparent. This checkpoint takes the longest time for</td>
<td>luggage; a few</td>
<td>luggage inspected using multiple modes including a scanner check, hand check</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestinians. There are rooms, such as one for body checks, of which Jewish travelers may be</td>
<td>general questions; luggage and passport with low security sticker</td>
<td>by multiple officials, and sent to the laboratory; possible strip search; luggage and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unaware of.</td>
<td></td>
<td>passports high security stickers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Passport Lines: Second scan of personal baggage and body.</td>
<td>Exempt from line – can keep shoes on, cell phone, laptop</td>
<td>Rescanning of baggage, removes shoes, belt, cell phone, laptop, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Pathway to the gate and seating.</td>
<td>Walk freely to gate.</td>
<td>Possibly escorted to gate; not allowed to speak with anyone; followed by security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>official to the bathroom, and then to seat on plane.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Apartheid at Ben Gurion International Airport as of 2006. The difference between the airport experience of Jewish and Palestinian Israeli citizens. Derived from “Suspected Citizens” report by HRA in 2006. Note that Mizrahim Jews, Arabs, and African immigrants can also be subjected to some of the treatments listed in the Palestinian column. This chart is specific to Palestinian Israelis.

Palestinian Israeli student Yara Hawari reminisces that when she was a child, her family “would reluctantly have to stand in the foreigners’ queue.” In 2004, there was an

architectural re-design of the terminal and Arab citizens were allowed to be in the same line as Jewish citizens. For many years, Israeli security officers placed color-coded stickers in passports to designate the security level linked directly to ethnicity, such as pink for Jew, yellow for Arabs traveling with families, and red for Arab citizens traveling alone. In 2007, the Association for Civil Rights in Israel (ACRI) submitted a petition arguing that racism against Arabs at the airport provides legitimization of racism in other sectors of society such as in the media, housing, employment, and education: “After all, if the state treats Arab citizens as suspects and if it is allowed to drive racism to maintain security, then why should the public not also demarcate, exclude, and abuse Arabs in the name of security?” As a response to ACRI’s petition, Transportation Minister Shaul Mofaz announced that colored tags would be discontinued and replaced with white numbered stickers. The intent was to obscure the segregation that remained by designating luggage of Palestinian Israelis with a sticker labeled with the number “5” and Jewish citizens with a sticker labeled with the number “1” rather than red and pink respectively (See Figure 1).


Using technologies of separation, isolation and segregation, Israel limits movement of international critical travelers, and thereby isolates Palestinians living in Palestine/Israel from social, cultural, political, and economic benefits of international engagement and prohibits professional, familial, and educational visitation contact between Palestinians located in the West Bank, the Gaza Strip, “48” Israel, and outside of Palestine/Israel. Israel’s primary objective for segregation has been surveillance that does not interfere with the lives of the settler population. Hence, I refer to this practice as “segregated surveillance.”

**Intelligence Collection**

Palestinians are segregated for surveillance that allows for convenient collection of intelligence. Israel’s intelligence agency General Security Security (GSS) thoroughly controls border security. GSS, also known as Shin Bet or Shabak, operates the security at
the border crossings into the region as well as providing security at international airports for Israel’s official airline, El Al. The key point is that the same government organization, Shin Bet, that directs border security also oversees the interrogation of prisoners, mainly Palestinians. Shin Bet was founded as Israel’s first intelligence agency shortly after Israel’s recognition as a nation-state in 1948. Israel’s founding instituted Zionism, which Ilan Pappé characterizes Zionism as a colonialist project that was pursued by settlers in the name of national ideals.\footnote{Ilan Pappé, “Zionism as Colonialism: A Comparative View of Diluted Colonialism in Asia and Africa” in \textit{Settler Colonialism} ed. Alyosha Goldstein and Alex Lubin (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2008), p.625-633.} The new colonial government immediately declared a state of emergency that holds until today. Shin Bet was initially tasked with counter-espionage, and then after the 1967 occupation, Shin Bet started to focus on internal security in Israel, the West Bank, including East Jerusalem, and the Gaza Strip – which effectively means surveillance, discipline, and control of Palestinians in Palestine/Israel.\footnote{Shlomo Shpiro, “No Place to Hide: Intelligence and Civil Liberties in Israel”, \textit{Cambridge Review of International Affairs} 19, 4 (December 2006): 630-631.} Shlomo Shpiro argues that heavy emphasis on securitization in Israel has allowed the Israeli public and government to grant unchecked powers to Israel’s intelligence community.\footnote{Ibid.} These powers include the right to racially profile, interrogate without legal documentation, conduct incursions into individual privacy, detain at will and even assassinate without mandate. While Shin Bet’s larger intelligence services (i.e. official assassinations and investigations of terrorist attacks) have a degree of oversight by and accountability to the Israeli government regarding civil liberties, Shin Bet provides smaller intelligence services without parliamentary supervision and knowledge of its on-the-ground
practices. These services include Israeli police intelligence units and prison intelligence as well as services provided at Palestine/Israel border crossings and international airports through which El Al travels.

With Shin Bet’s supervision, a security interrogation is the same as an intelligence interrogation, and an intelligence interrogation in the context of Israel’s national foundation is a settler colonial technology. A security interrogation consists of questions such as, “Are there any hazardous materials in your suitcase?” But the main objective of an intelligence interrogation “is to obtain usable and reliable information, in a lawful manner and in the least amount of time, which meets the intelligence requirements of any echelon of command.” In Israel’s case, the intelligence interrogation enacts settler colonial objectives to erase histories, cultures, and peoples of the Arab population. The Palestinian as a critical traveler presents the opportunity for Shin Bet to eliminate the Palestinian traveler by denying entry or discouraging return by humiliation and inconvenience, and to collect intelligence from the traveler’s materials found in the baggage, the interrogations, and the analysis of digital data. In the midst of the interrogation, the officer informed Danya Mustafa, “This room, do you know what it is?...we are like the Mukhabarat [Arab intelligence], you know…FBI.” Mustafa’s interrogator insisted that Mustafa had previously visited Gaza, had contact with activists

---

48 Ibid., 646.

49 Department of the Army, Field Manual on Intelligence Interrogation (FM 34-52), Washington D.C, 8 May 1987. available at http://www.globalsecurity.org/intell/library/policy/army/fm/fm34-52/index.html. This is not a current Israeli document. Still, the document’s principles of intelligence gathering from interrogation are applicable to this scenario.

50 Mustafa, “What happened during my interrogation.”
in Europe, and was involved with the International Solidarity Movement (ISM)\textsuperscript{51} and No Más Muertes - an organization that provides humanitarian aid to Mexican migrants crossing the U.S-Mexico border.\textsuperscript{52} Shin Bet suspected that Mustafa possessed, not hazardous materials, but critical information about activists and organizations that are potentially or resolutely critical of Israeli policies in Gaza. Using segregated surveillance, Shin Bet exploits critical travelers for intelligence.

**Biopolitical Techniques**

Israel applies biopolitical techniques to travelers whom it identifies as “Palestinian,” and then visually and physically separates the enactment of these techniques from Israel-friendly travelers. The treatment happens behind closed doors so that Israel’s practices are hidden and private. From my primary data of narratives and examination of human rights reports, I gathered this list of techniques that are part of what Khalidi refers to as “special treatment”:

- Long waiting periods during which the traveler’s documents are confiscated and the traveler receives little information on her/his status
- Multiple interrogations (but with the same or similar questions) at different points of the crossing station
- Item-by-item inspection of carry-on bags, including opening gifts and inspection of personal items such as underwear


\textsuperscript{52} Ibid.
- Strip-searching in private rooms with several security staff present
- Security escorts to the plane gate, including to the restroom
- Racialized taunting through name-calling and triggering statements regarding identity aimed at Palestinians, Africans, Asians, Muslims, and other people of color
- Gendered discomfort by name-calling, strip-searching, sexual harassment, and crossing personal boundaries by security officers of the opposite gender
- False accusations regarding where the traveler has been or activities in which he/she is involved
- Intelligence collection with interrogation using psychological techniques that are applied on state-labeled terrorists and criminals
- Intelligence collection through the confiscation and examination of luggage material, computer, phone and other information-holding items
- Arbitrary detention, imprisonment and criminalization at a facility with dingy accommodations resembling a jail for suspected and/or charged criminals
- Limited or no access to medication, food, water, and bathroom facilities
- Halting of communication with family, accompanying travelers and those waiting to welcome the traveler
- Separation of minors from their parents and caretaking adults, and even prohibiting contact with their parents and families
- Limited communication to the traveler’s national embassy, legal advocates, employers, and others who can assist the traveler
- Covert expulsion or change in visitation status to Palestine/Israel for a definite or
indefinite period

Border Expansion

Israel’s security apparatus is not geographically limited within the international borders that encase Palestine/Israel. Palestine/Israel international crossings differ from other Israeli settler colonial technologies such as the Wall, settlements and checkpoints that are physically located within the boundaries of Palestine/Israel. Domestic technologies do interact internationally through globalization: multinational corporations construct them, Jewish Israelis from third states settle and operate them, and transnational activists and human rights organizations come to Palestine/Israel to oppose them. However, Palestine/Israel international crossings can and do exist physically outside of the Palestine/Israel national boundaries, and they have the ability to materialize anywhere in the world through dialectical interactions between the different parties invested in sustaining or challenging Palestine/Israel’s colonial present (See Table 3).
UNOFFICIAL INTERNATIONAL CROSSING POINTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extraterritorial Crossing</th>
<th>Location(s)</th>
<th>Background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Airport terminals of El Al, Arkia, and IsrAir Airlines</td>
<td>International airport terminals throughout the world, including in Israel, Europe, the United States, Canada, South Africa, Australia,</td>
<td>Israeli airline security is embedded with Shin Bet and performs discriminatory security inspections of travelers and bystanders in international airports near Israeli terminals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airlines at European airports: Air France, Swiss Air, Brussels Airlines, Lufthansa (German), Jet2.com (British)</td>
<td>International airport terminals in European countries that fly to Tel Aviv</td>
<td>During the “Welcome to Palestine” campaign in 2012, 1300 activists flew from Europe to Tel Aviv to demand international access to Palestinian territories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediterranean Sea</td>
<td>International waters on route to the Gaza Strip</td>
<td>Israel claims control of the Sea; Free Gaza Movement and other groups sent voyages 2008-2012 to break the siege on Gaza.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek seaport</td>
<td>Athens, Greece</td>
<td>Site where Free Gaza Movement flotilla was set to depart in 2011, but Israeli negotiated with Greece to halt the ships.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Unofficial International Crossing Points. These spaces became Palestine/Israel border crossings where Israel identifies and examines critical travelers.

As Table 3 indicates, Israel spreads its border security beyond the physical borders and airports of Palestine/Israel. In the first example of what I refer to as an “Extraterritorial Crossing,” Israeli airlines enforce their own security at international airports. El Al, Israir and Arkia transport Israel’s security apparatus to terminals and gates at international airports. El Al terminals are located all over the world, including at U.S. airports in New York, Newark, Los Angeles and Miami. In all of its locations, El Al performs the subjection of critical travelers on the soil of third states, either with permission from the host government or without its knowledge. El Al poses as a private company, yet, El Al airline’s website indicates El Al’s byline as “It’s not just an airline,
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it’s Israel.” The subtext of this statement implies that El Al carries Israel’s settler colonial ideology and practice wherever it travels.

As I argue in this paper, Israel security, intelligence, and settler colonialism are conjoined. Israel’s intelligence agency, Shin Bet, trains airline staff and communicates with the airlines with respect to day-to-day functions. At Israeli airline terminals throughout the world, travelers going to or returning from Palestine/Israel are subjected to Israeli biopolitical colonial techniques in addition to what is routinely conducted by the host state. Faraway from Palestine/Israel, Israel identifies, segregates, racially profiles, dehumanizes and criminalizes critical travelers, and assesses and exploits them for intelligence in order to protect and advance Israel’s settler colonial project. Anyone near the Israeli terminal, even those who are not traveling to Palestine/Israel, can be subjected to Israel’s discrimination security inspection. The South African investigative news program Carte Blanche placed an undercover Muslim-identifiable reporter near the El Al terminal at the Johannesburg airport.55 The program’s hidden camera caught an El Al staff member, dressed as and claiming to be “airport security” posing question to the reporter and requesting to see his passport. The reporter was not actually in the El Al terminal and was pretending to be waiting for a passenger. The report also featured Middle East expert Virginia Tilley, an American consultant with the Human Sciences Research Council of South Africa (HRSC), who was marked as a critical traveler holding information that is important to Israeli intelligence. Tilley was working on a special

project to investigate whether Israel is practicing apartheid as defined by international law. While the El Al staff interrogated Tilley, other staff made clandestine copies of the contents in Tilley’s briefcase and forwarded them to Israeli intelligence. In this case, gathering intelligence is the equivalent of a nation spying on citizens of another state. Israeli airlines allow for Israeli intelligence to monitor international critique of Israel and operate Israel’s settler colonial technology within the boundaries of other nations.

The remaining examples in Table 3 illustrate that Israel reaffirms its global settler colonial presence by using military force in conjunction with diplomacy and media to halt travel to Palestine/Israel well out of its territorial jurisdiction. A demonstration of Israel’s border violence took place in the summers of 2009 and 2010 when Israel’s military occupied international waters and attacked humanitarian boats and ships headed to Gaza. The Israeli Army killed one American citizen and eight Turkish citizens and kidnapped, detained and deported many others—actions it claimed were within Israeli law although the boats were located in international waters well outside the boundaries of Israeli waters. In the weeks following of the attack, Israel pressured international media, third states and airlines, applying diplomatic pressure to halt travel at international airports and seaports located thousands of miles away from Palestine/Israel. In 2011, Israel offered military assistance to Greece (specifically tear gas for its own citizens that were protesting austerity cuts) in exchange for the Greek government stopping the Gaza-bound flotilla from departing the Greek seaport, even though the Greek government has

57 Mustafa Bayoumi, Midnight on the Mavi Marmara (Chicago, IL: Haymarket Books, 2010).
no right to do so under maritime law. Then in 2012, in the “Welcome to Palestine” flytilla campaign activists flew from European cities in order to draw attention to the fact that Israel does not allow entry to international travelers who disclose that they will be visiting Palestinians in Palestine/Israel. Israel used intelligence techniques to send lists of passengers (with no criminal backgrounds) to airline companies at European airports. Lufthansa Airlines, Brussel Airlines and EasyJet dutifully cancelled about forty tickets. As these examples illustrate, the geographical location becomes an Israel’s extraterritorial crossing, even if temporarily, where domestic Israeli law applies far away from Palestine/Israel. International, corporate, and local laws give way to the legal ethics of an occupying and colonial power.

The Palestinian/Israel international border crossings are constructed to segregate descendants of the Arab population that were identified to be eliminated in the founding of the State of Israel. As a settler colonial technology from the very beginning of Israel’s statehood and Palestinian peoplehood, the crossings employed biopolitical techniques designed to recognize and categorize, and psychologically and spatially control the bodies of the Palestinians. Through diplomatic and military measures, Israel expands its mutable borders and applies its security strategies to the depths of international waters, seaports, and airports. On the other hand, Israel is forced to retreat when state and corporate entities refuse to give in to Israel’s demands. Some strategies discussed above include public pressure, legal challenges, and other means of noncompliance with Israel’s


settler colonial project. Hence, third parties play a critical role in how unreservedly Israel practices its border security methods. In the next section, I examine the United States as a third state.
...the incessantly repeated American mantra, whether in official statements or writing that is policy-oriented, academic, or journalistic, about a “peace process” has served to disguise an ugly reality: whatever process the United States was championing, it was not in fact actually directed at achieving a just and lasting peace between Palestinians and Israelis.  

- Rashid Khalidi, *Brokers of Deceit: How the U.S. Has Undermined Peace in the Middle East*

### III. U.S. SUPPORT OF ISRAEL’S CONTROL OF CROSSINGS

United States has been the primary financer in Israel’s project to colonize Palestine. Since 1948, the United States has granted Israel with $121 billion in direct aid in addition to military financing, arms sales, and appropriation bills for military and defense programs. Israel is the largest recipient of U.S. Foreign Military Financing. Unlike any other foreign country, Israel is allowed financial benefits such as loan guarantees, transfers to interest collecting accounts, and military funds for domestic defense rather than foreign defense.

Along with financer, the United States has assumed the role of a representative and a partner of Israel in negotiations regarding Israel’s occupation of Palestine. Indeed, Rashid Khalidi in *Brokers of Deceit: How the U.S. Has Undermined Peace in the Middle East* refers to the United States as “Israel’s lawyer” as he examines key moments when American policymakers, administrations and presidents acquiesced to Israeli interests while disregarding Palestinian well-being as well as national interests, thereby compromising long-term peace between Israelis and Palestinians. Israel boasts of and

---


celebrates the unique relationship between the United States and Israel. The American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC) referenced Israel as “the United States’ most significant security partner” in its summary of the U.S.-Israel Enhanced Security Cooperation Act of 2012. With designations such as financer, lawyer and security partner, the United States is in reality more of an extension of Israel than a third state. Even so, for this paper, I am interested in how the United States as a third state naturalizes the advancement of Israel’s settler colonial technologies at Palestine/Israel international crossings and in Israel’s treatment of critical travelers.

**Rhetorical Support**

Many American critical travelers, especially Palestinian Americans and Muslim Americans, expound on the unwillingness of the U.S. Embassy to assist them. In May 2012, Palestinian American Sandra Tamari traveled to Palestine/Israel for an interfaith conference and a family wedding. Israeli border security subjected Tamari to racial profiling (“What is your father’s name?”), interrogation (including pointblank “Are you a terrorist?”), humiliation (“searched every inch of my body”), email privacy violation, denial of entry deeming her as a security risk, detention overnight in a prison cell, and deportation. The linchpin of her border experience was the treatment by the United States Embassy in Tel Aviv, Israel. First, the staffer asked if she was Jewish and upon her reply that she was Palestinian, the staffer informed Tamari that the U.S. Embassy is unable to assist Palestinians. The staffer further suggested that she open her gmail

---


64 Associated Press, Ha’aretz, NBC, Fox, Mondoweiss, Electronic Intifada, DailyKos, and many others covered the story. Her original blog is located here: Sandra Tamari, “My Expulsion From Palestine,” *Sandra Tamari* (blog), June 11, 2012 (8:06 a.m.), http://www.sandratamari.com.
account because the “Israel Shin Bet are so good that they will find another way to access it.” In Tamari’s case, the United States government 1) racially profiled her according to Israeli national policies rather than adhere to rights granted by United States policy on civil liberties; 2) based on her ethnicity, did not provide assistance to Tamari based on her ethnicity; 3) sanctioned Israeli intelligence to violate her privacy and spy on her; 4) endorsed Israel’s sovereignty, power and right to humiliate, spy on, and deny entry to U.S. nationals; and 5) mandated that the U.S. Embassy in Israel is only responsible for assisting travelers who do not pose an ideological threat to Israel’s policies of occupation and settler colonialism.

The United States amalgamates its support of Israel’s border crossing policies, Israel’s security, and Israel’s settler colonial project. Regarding the U.S.-Israel Enhanced Security Cooperation Act of 2012, U.S. President Barack Obama stated:

> I have made it a top priority for my administration to deepen cooperation with Israel across the whole spectrum of security issues -- intelligence, military, technology.  

By cooperating “across the whole spectrum of security issues”, the United States cooperates with Israel in the settler colonial technologies at the Palestine/Israel international crossings that I discuss in this paper – segregated surveillance, intelligence collection, biopolitical techniques and border expansion.

At decisive historical moments of the Israeli colonization of Palestine, the United States partnered with Israel to set policies that segregate Palestinians inside and outside of Palestine/Israel that collect intelligence from Palestinian and non-Palestinian critical travelers, that allow for discriminatory security inspections, and that expand Israel’s
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border control. Below, I discuss two policymaking moments the 1993/1995 Oslo Peace Accords and the 2005 Disengagement Plan when the United States brokered negotiations that directly ensured Israeli control of the international borders and thus negatively impacted Palestinian mobility and critical international access to Israel/Palestine. Brokered by the United States, the Oslo Accords and the Disengagement Plan provided Israel with economic, rhetorical, and policymaking support to design the movement controlling technologies that advance Israeli settler colonialism. After these policies were in place, the United States continued to back Israel when it subjected critical travelers, such as Sandra Tamari, to discriminatory security inspections.

**Policymaking Support I: Oslo Accords and Fragmentation of the West Bank**

During the post-Cold War era, the Clinton administration presented the U.S.-led 1993 Oslo Accords negotiations to the international community as an opportunity for Palestinian self-government and Israel’s de-occupation of Palestinian lands. The Clinton administration promised a two-state solution even as it acquiesced to Israel having control over all entry and exit points to/from the Gaza Strip and the West Bank, Palestine/Israel external security, control of the use of water and air space, and control of all foreign affairs – all of the practices that impact the treatment of Palestinian and non-Palestinian critical travelers. These U.S. foreign policymaking choices were not in isolation with U.S. domestic policymaking strategies. American Studies scholar Alex Lubin juxtaposes U.S. domestic welfare reformation with the brokering of Oslo to illustrate how the American neoliberal turn impacted the Oslo negotiations.66 In the
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United States, welfare reform forced poor people of color into low-wage jobs with the pretense of self-reliance while the Oslo Accords changed the Israeli occupation to “a form of neocolonial governance that enabled Palestinians to ‘self-govern’ their own occupation and the dispossession of their land while also enabling Israel to receive an infusion of Western aid.” Israel received U.S. aid earmarked to implement Oslo negotiations. In the same period, the United States expanded its security relationship with Israel that included increasing arms sales to Israel and Israel holding munition stockpiles for the United States. According to Alex Lubin and Joel Beinin, the Oslo process was a neoliberal peace policy for economic benefits for the United States and Israel domestically and for their relationship.68

However, this economic solution to a political conflict consigned Palestinians to domestic and international isolation. Israeli political scientist Meron Benvenisti wrote in the Israeli newspaper Ha’aretz in 1999:

Control of the external wrapper is essential for the Oslo strategy, because if the Palestinians control even one border crossing - and gain the ability to maintain direct relations with the outside world - the internal lines of separation will become full-fledged international borders, and Israel will lose its control over the passage of people and goods.69

Israel’s control of the movement of people and goods outside Palestine/Israel thus continued the settler colonialism and occupation, but with the charade of peace that allowed for foreign aid and private investments to flow to Israel.

Palestinian isolation was not only international, but also within the

67 Lubin, 150.
territories. In the Accords, the United States granted Israel sovereign control of
the entry and exit of people and goods into and out of Israel, the Occupied
Palestinian Territories, between the territories of the West Bank, including East
Jerusalem, and the Gaza Strip, and between Palestinian towns and villages.\textsuperscript{70} The
Accords fragmented the West Bank into areas designated as Area A (Palestinian
controlled), Area B (Palestinian civil area with Israel military control), Area C
(Israeli settlements surrounding Palestinian cities) and H1/H2 (in Hebron where
Israeli settlers live among Palestinians).\textsuperscript{71} While this can sound reasonable, Area
A was only 3 percent of the territory consisting of Palestinian cities, towns and
villages.\textsuperscript{72} Even then, Israeli forces have continued to attack, invade, and raid
Area A Palestinian cities since the Oslo Accords.\textsuperscript{73} Furthermore, Area A became
enclosed with Area B that was negotiated to include Israeli military control, and
therefore the points of entry and exit into Area A became bordered with security
checkpoints manned by the IDF. The security layout obstructed the freedom of
Palestinians in Area A to visit family, attend school, go to work, and conduct
business outside of their own city without Israel military inspection, giving little

\textsuperscript{70} “Declaration of Principles on Interim Self-Government Arrangement (Oslo Accord)”,

\textsuperscript{71} The Interim Agreement (Oslo II) of 1995 had yielded the construction of two additional routes
for Gaza. The Gaza International Airport that was constructed in south Gaza operated from
November 1998 and the 28-mile Safe Passage Route that was constructed between the West Bank
and north Gaza opened in October 1999. Israel’s security bureaucracy complicated travel;
however, the two routes managed to allow travel to and from Gaza for a short period. Then,
shortly after the Second Intifada in 2000, Israel closed the Safe Passage Route and bombed the
airport.

\textsuperscript{72} Beinin, 27.

\textsuperscript{73} In 2002 Operation Defensive Shield attacked Jenin, Tulkarem, Qalqilya, Ramallah, Nablus, and
Bethlehem. In December 2012, Israeli forces raided Palestinian NGOs in Ramallah and stole
computers and files.
value to Area A as a Palestinian controlled area.

Oslo’s fragmentation cemented segregation by restricting Palestinians’ freedom of movement in the West Bank. Simultaneously, it allowed Israel to build settlements in Area C, consisting of 74 percent of the territory! With this much territory, the United States, via the Oslo Accords, gave the green light to Israel to construct open pathways for Israeli settlers to move within, into and out of the occupied Palestinian territories.

The Oslo framework of segregation in the Palestinian territories is mirrored at the international border crossings such as the Ben Gurion International Airport. In the above section on segregated surveillance, I discuss how border crossings are spatially organized to manipulate the affective and physical experience of travelers depending on how favorable they are to Israeli settler colonialism. The airport is a microcosm of the Oslo-organized occupied Palestinian territories. In the West Bank, paved roads are designated for settlers while rudimentary roads with obstructions and checkpoints are designated for the meticulously categorized Palestinians living in the territories, Palestinian Israelis, and the Palestinian diaspora. Many of these barriers, closures, restrictions, curfews, and regulations became institutionalized during the mid-1990s. With such obstructions in place, the actual distance between Point A and Point B became irrelevant to calculating how long it takes to travel between the two circuitous points in the West Bank. Israel received the Western political seal of approval along with economic aid to implement

---

74 Beinin, 27.

sophisticated movement-controlling technologies. Similarly, at international crossing sites, privileged and conforming travelers can pass efficiently through the airport or crossing, while critical travelers are held up for hours having to go through various checkpoints and barriers.

**Policymaking Support II: The Disengagement Plan and Siege on Gaza**

The Bush Administration also became involved in peace policymaking and in the process, continued to grant Israel control of Palestine/Israel international crossings. In August 2005, the enactment of Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon’s unilateral Disengagement Plan evacuated Israeli settlers and demolished settlements in the Gaza Strip and four enclaves in northern West Bank; and again, additional funding was afforded to Israel for the Disengagement Plan. And again, the event was presented in mainstream news media outlets as a historical moment of hope towards the two-state Quartet Road Map. In 2003, the Road Map was designed by the quartet of the United States, United Nations, European Union, and Russia as a peace plan for the conflict; Israel was to remove settlements from Gaza and the West Bank and stop the building of Israeli settlements (many built as a result of the Oslo Accords). This time the United States completely excluded Palestinian leadership and endorsed Sharon’s unilateral plan, once again affirming Israeli control of borders in a letter to Sharon on April 14, 2014:

> The United States understands that after Israel withdraws from Gaza and/or parts of the West Bank, and pending agreements on other arrangements, existing arrangements regarding control of airspace, territorial waters, and land passages of the West Bank and Gaza will continue.  

As with the Oslo accords, the United States knowingly negotiated a plan with Israel that
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continued the occupation of Palestine. The Negotiations Affairs Department of the PLO (NAD) maps and documents detailed how the disengagement of 8500 settlers from Gaza made room for 30,000 more in the West Bank, and enabled Israel to retain military control of the Gaza Strip, keeping its IDF soldiers, tanks and bulldozers in place. With the endorsement of the United States, Israel did not disengage its unilateral control of Gaza coastal waters, airspace, border crossings (i.e. Rafah border), aquifers and access to water, electricity, gas, and fuel supplies.\(^77\) Even so, Ariel Sharon and U.S. Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice were commended in the United Nations, international press, and in comments and blogs across the Internet.

Also relevant to my argument in this paper, the Bush Administration had no provisions in the Disengagement Plan to allow Gazans to move freely between Gaza and the West Bank. The division between Palestinian territories caused extreme limitations to educational and employment opportunities for Gazans. Social, familial and cultural activities were curtailed between Gaza and the West Bank. Gazan writer Laila El-Haddad begins her op-ed piece in the Washington Post, “Disengagement From Justice”, with her eight-hour wait at the Erez crossing to get to the West Bank, only to be denied. She predicted, “The Gaza disengagement will simply restructure Israel’s occupation. Instead of controlling our lives from within, Israel will control Gaza from without.” As predicted by El-Haddad, shortly after Disengagement, Israel passed orders to treat Gaza-Israel border crossings as international border crossings, setting up an even more strict

bureaucratic process for Gazans to receive permits to enter and exit Gaza.\textsuperscript{78} Gazans were permitted to exit Gaza only for emergency medical purposes, and even so, had to negotiate with a cumbersome extensive bureaucratic system to obtain permission from Israel to leave Gaza. These measures were being set up even before the Gazans elected Hamas as their government in 2006.

Thus, the Disengagement Plan was the prelude to the brutal siege on Gaza that controlled materials in and out of Gaza along with the movement of the people. The siege was followed by Israel’s multiple wars on Gaza. Noam Chomsky situates the 2009 Gaza War as a continuation of the U.S.-Israel assault on Gaza since the election of Hamas.

Chomsky lists the wide range of U.S. complicities in the Gaza War including Israel’s use of U.S. supplied weapons, the huge flow of U.S. arms into Israel, and the blocking of U.N. resolution to call for cease-fire.\textsuperscript{79} The U.S. support of Israel’s control of all border crossings is a subset of the larger picture in which the United States supported restructuring of the Israeli occupation of the Gaza Strip.

While the United States continued to support the siege and war on Gaza of 2009, transnational activists continued to challenge Israel’s control of international access to Gaza. The internationally organized flotilla, Mavi Marmara, set out for the Gaza Strip to challenge Israel’s blockade, which was declared a violation of international humanitarian


\textsuperscript{79} Ibid., 89-95. Chomsky also discusses a German merchant ship arriving in Israel with tons of unidentified ammunition sent by the US in the middle of War on December 31, 2008. The United States had responded that it was not for the war but for U.S. military for later use. In either case, the shipment provides evidence of how the US-Israel relationship is normalized even when nations and human rights organizations worldwide are appalled by Israel’s use of military force on a civilian population.
law by International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC).\textsuperscript{80} The six-ship flotilla consisted of 682 passengers, all of whom could be characterized as critical travelers, travelers whom Israel identifies, categorizes and separates as international subjects that both advance and challenge Israel’s settler colonialism. The Israeli Navy employed the border crossing colonial technologies to their full capacity and militarily attacked the ships and this time, actually killing nine critical travelers – treating them not as global citizens but as suspected terrorists. Israel continued with the biopolitical strategies discussed above, and captured and detained the survivors at Israeli prisons and detention centers.\textsuperscript{81} At these centers, critical travelers reported assault and the collection of intelligence. Ken O’Keefe, one of the detainees, recalls, “Women and the elderly were physically and mentally assaulted.”\textsuperscript{82} Henning Mankell, another detainee wrote of the account: “Every so often, someone is knocked to the ground, tied up, and handcuffed.”\textsuperscript{83} Another detainee, Iara Lee, a documentary filmmaker, writes that their footage was stolen, confiscated and re-edited by Israeli intelligence when released to the media.\textsuperscript{84}

At a briefing, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton responded to a question regarding the Israeli attack: “…it’s not helpful for there to be flotillas that try to provoke actions by entering into Israeli waters and creating a situation in which the Israelis have the right to


\textsuperscript{82} Bayoumi, 31.

\textsuperscript{83} Bayoumi, 26.

\textsuperscript{84} Ibid.
defend themselves.” In this short statement, Clinton justified Israel’s biopolitical techniques of fatal military action towards a humanitarian global citizenry. The United States, represented by Clinton, categorized travelers who are going to Palestinian land and who are critical of Israeli colonial policies as terrorists who physically threaten Israel and thus can be subjected militarily, be detained and assaulted, and have materials confiscated. Clinton also provided a rhetorical stamp of approval of the expansion of Israeli borders into international waters. In the previous section, I discuss Israel’s strategies to expand its borders by gaining control of territories that it does not have jurisdiction over. Clinton claimed that internationals were “entering into Israeli waters” and thereby “the Israelis have the right to defend themselves.” Rather than refer to international law, Clinton rhetorically granted Israel rights that are out of the jurisdiction of both the United States and Israel. The United States, through security rhetoric and lack of holding Israel accountable, colluded in Israeli biopolitical techniques, intelligence collection and border expansion – the key aspects of the Israeli border crossing system.

The United States supports Israel’s control of international border crossings through policymaking, racial profiling and public statements. The United States brokered both the 1993/1995 Oslo Peace Accords and the 2005 Disengagement Plan in favor of Israel’s control and dominance at international border crossings, and methods to restructure the occupation rather than policies that acknowledge the Palestinian right to
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freedom of mobility and international access to Palestine/Israel. Moreover, the United States through its embassy in Israel racially profiles Palestinian Americans and denies them assistance. Finally, when the international community challenges Israel, the U.S. offers public statements that support Israel’s settler colonial technologies such as expansion. In the next chapter, I examine how critical travelers use their experiences of Israel’s border colonial technologies to begin conversations and critiques.
Where there is power, there is resistance, and yet, or rather, consequently, this resistance is never in a position of exteriority in relation to power.

- Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality*

**IV. THE CRITICAL TRAVELER AS AN AGENT**

Israel’s claim that it is a democratic sovereign nation-state is employed to justify biopolitical measures at international Palestine/Israel border crossings. Israel argues that it is within its rights as a modern sovereign democratic nation to establish its segregated system and biopolitical techniques, and to have absolute control over the entry decisions about and treatment of all international travelers. Israel relies on Benedict Anderson’s notion of the sovereign state, understood to have authority to produce and implement border security, and to exclude and include individuals as imagined by the community of the nation.  

Mark Salter argues that any modern national border site is a permanent state of exception where “the decision to include/exclude is irreducible to the sovereign [nation]” and where the international traveler can “claim no rights but is subject to the law.”  

Israel claims to be another sovereign modern nation implementing the border security processes that it considers necessary to select and protect its citizen-subjects.

Although Israel claims the status of any modern nation-state, it also refuses to set permanent territorial boundaries. Territorial markers set the limits of political authority and jurisdiction of a nation-state by definition. However, becoming a modern nation by

---


89 Scholars have argued that there has been an erosion of physical national borders by the globalization of national economy and culture. Scholars such as Aiwha Ong and Saskia Sassen
setting territorial markers threatens Israel’s settler colonial designs. Territorial boundaries would open the possibility of a sovereign Palestinian state, destabilize Israel’s settlement blocs, force a decision on Jerusalem and raise territorial questions about areas such as Jordan Valley and the Golan Heights. Moreover, if Israel geographically and physically maps its borders, it would lose control over Palestinian movement on both sides of the Green Line as well as over Palestinian movement in and out of Palestine/Israel. By leaving its territorial boundaries unsettled, Israel aims to continue its national formation and eventually become a nation like the United States, Canada, New Zealand and Australia that are nation-states founded on European conquest and colonization. These states are recognized as democratic states by international governments with a settler colonial past, even though they continue have a settler colonial present with active social movements centering the sovereignty of indigenous populations. Yet, Israel invests immensely in maintaining the façade of a multicultural, equal, and democratic society in the hopes that it will achieve a settler colonial past.

Even so, Israel’s egalitarian façade poorly disguises its ethnocratic regime, which is in favor of the dominant group, Ashkenazi (European) Jews.\(^9\) Within the Jewish population, Israel has not lived up to its original vision of bringing together worldwide Jewry of varying nationalities and affording them equal rights within Israel proper. Scholars have argued that the politics of “Aliyah” (migration of Jews to Israel) has
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produced inequalities among settler ethnic populations.\textsuperscript{91} A potent example of this phenomenon is analyzed by Mizrahi Jews, Jews that come from the Arab cultures and make up at least 40 percent of Israel’s Jewish population. Ella Shohat focuses on the discursive and subversive knowledge production of historical and cultural connections between Arab Jews and Palestinians – a move that disrupts the Zionist stance that pits Jews against Arabs.\textsuperscript{92} In another example, Rachel Shabi, an Israeli journalist of Iraqi descent living in England, chronicles Israel’s historical racism against Mizrahis.\textsuperscript{93} The problem extends beyond racial inequality among Israeli Jews. Oren Yiftachel argues that the Israeli political system is not a democracy because it lacks a constitution, justifies occupation of Palestinian territories, allocates diminished rights and negates the protection of Arab minorities, empowers the Jewish diaspora over its own citizens, formulates citizenship rights based on faith and gender, and centralizes the military in shaping public policy.\textsuperscript{94} These critical features of Israel’s political structure are ignored when it is praised by the United States as “the only democracy in the Middle East.” At the same time, the United States has called for a democratization of Arab countries such as Syria, Tunisia and Egypt. Rather than a democracy based on equality, Israel has from


\textsuperscript{94} Yiftachel, Chapter “Debating Israeli Democracy”, 84-100.
the onset of its statehood entwined the concept of national citizenship with settler colonialism.

**Challenging the Israeli Nation Narrative by Remembering the Nakba**

Palestinians connect Israeli border security practices to the Nakba (“catastrophe”) of 1948, a turning point in Palestine/Israel history when Israel destroyed and depopulated approximately 500 Arab villages following the United Nations recommendation for Palestine’s partition on November 29, 1947 and through November 1948.\(^{95}\) Nur Masalha discusses the Israeli-sponsored “memoricide” that included forestation on destroyed villages, Hebrewisation of names and silencing Palestinian history.\(^{96}\) For Palestinians, remembering the Nakba is an act of decolonizing history; Nakba is a site of memory, trauma, dispossession and collective identity.\(^{97}\) In recounting Israel’s colonial governance at the crossings, Palestinians interweave the violence of the Nakba and the founding of the settler state.

While Israeli biopolitical techniques of inspection are inflicted under the pretext of privacy, Palestinian activists, scholars, writers, journalists, teachers and others have formulated a postcolonial critical public discourse around Israeli techniques at Palestine/Israel border crossings. In this discourse, Palestinian cultural and scholarly products strategically begin with a Palestinian character’s encounter at a Palestine/Israel border crossing. Academic Rashid Khalidi in *Palestinian Identity* begins his scholarly

\(^{95}\) The website www.palestineremembered.com lists 531 at the time of my writing this paper. Walid Khalidi in *All That Remains: The Palestinian Villages Occupied and Depopulated by Israel in 1948* (Washington, D.C.: Institute for Palestine Studies, 1992) has reference listings for 418.


\(^{97}\) Ibid.
monograph on Palestinian identity with the Palestinian experience at the border. Palestinian Israeli filmmaker Hany Abu-Assad begins two films, *Rana’s Wedding* (2002) and *Paradise Now* (2005), with a scene of a Palestinian protagonist encountering Israel’s security at a checkpoint in the West Bank. The first word in Palestinian American poet Dina Omar’s collection of poems *Sabr* is “kalandia,”98 the checkpoint between Jerusalem and Ramallah through which tens of thousands of Palestinian laborers and residents daily cross Israel’s commanding Wall for school, work, doctor appointments, family visitations and other activities of a normal life.

Artistically, it is both rational and potent to begin a Palestinian story with a checkpoint or crossing because the notion of “beginning” is critical to the Palestinian “stories of peoplehood.”99 The beginning of the State of Israel on May 14, 1948 is synonymous with the Palestinian Nakba, the beginning of their story of a peoplehood. As Israel officially became a settler colonial state, Palestinians became “Palestinian,” a people that is the Other in their own homeland. Khalidi writes that the “special treatment” at the border is a moment when Palestinians “are forcefully reminded of their identity: of who they are, and of why they are different from others.” Palestinians remember the historical Nakba as a forceful reminder of their identity, of who they are and why they are different from others. Accordingly, a Palestinian border encounter with Israeli border security is both a real contemporary moment that embodies the settler colonial present and an allegory for the Nakba of the colonial past. The encounter with Israeli border security is a catastrophe (the meaning of “nakba” in Arabic) of settler colonial

displacement; a Palestinian returns to her native home but rather than being received with a welcome, she is treated as a trespasser, transgressor, terrorist, foreigner and alien. The border encounter between a Palestinian traveler and Israel’s border apparatus remembers, relives, and reenacts the Nakba, a disastrous moment for the traveler, as well as the spectacle of dominance coupled with paranoia for the Israeli settler colonial state. There is a historical, political and colonial story before and after the Nakba; likewise, there is a story before the Palestinian, as a critical traveler, reaches the Palestine/Israel international border and is subjected to “special treatment.” As shown in the next example, this moment marks a milestone in the traveler’s life story, like the Nakba marks a turning point in the Palestinian story of peoplehood.

Palestinian American filmmaker Anne Marie Jacir visually employs the Nakba allegory in her film Salt of this Sea (2008). In an interview, Jacir affirms Khalidi’s analysis of the checkpoint as a critical site for Palestinian identity: “For many Palestinians, it is at borders and checkpoints where we realize we are in a different position than others, and where we become ‘Palestinian’.”* Salt of this Sea opens with black and white scenes of demolitions, bombings, and the chaos of families departing at a seaport. There is no caption indicating the time and place, though the black and white images and the soft music score imply that these scenes remember a colonial past. Yet, the scenes resemble news clips of Caterpillar D-9’s bulldozing buildings in the West Bank in the colonial present. The prologue sets the colonial past as the context of the

100 Anne Marie Jacir, Salt of this Sea, Philistine Films, 2012.
film’s upcoming main plot. Immediately following this scene of the past, the story shifts to present day indicated by the added color and by the sounds of the airport.

In this next scene, a female border security officer at the Ben Gurion International Airport in Tel Aviv is questioning the film’s protagonist, Palestinian American Soraya Tahani who seems hopeful and friendly. The officer skeptically examines Soraya’s passport and questions her, “How do you say your last name?” Soraya replies, “Tahani.” The officer deepens the “special treatment” with more questions regarding the birth of Soraya’s parents and grandfather. The interrogation becomes a storytelling device through which the audience learns the birthplaces of three generations of Soraya’s family. Soraya was born and raised in Brooklyn, New York. Her father was born in Lebanon, and her grandfather was born in Yaffa. The female security officer’s neutral face suddenly transforms into a look of disdain, anger and stern resolve when she hears “Yaffa.” She promptly orders Soraya, “Step aside please.” Khalidi writes that even for Palestinians who hold first world passports, the “guard’s ominous words” lead to a “condition of suspense in which Palestinians find themselves at borders” because the ambiguous Palestinian identity is source of anxiety to governments.

The guards proceed with the interrogation in order to historically and unambiguously place Soraya’s identity as a Palestinian. In the context of settler colonialism, the Palestinian identity is critical and must be erased for Israel’s settler colonial project to be successful. With the interrogators’ questions, a calculation in genealogy and history identifies Soroya as indeed a Palestinian and therefore a critical

---

102 The city Yaffa has several names. “Yaffa” is the Palestinian Arabic transliteration of “Yafo,” the original name of the city. Jaffa is Hebrew name of the city.

traveler. Soroya’s grandparents were refugees who had fled to Lebanon during the 1948 Battle for Yaffa, the largest city in Palestine and a bustling port for the city for trade. After the interrogation, we realize that the movie’s opening scenes depicted Yaffa’s fall to the Israeli military and the thousands of Palestinians who were forced into exile in Lebanon, Syria, Jordan and other locations. Soraya’s parents were born as refugees in Lebanon, then most likely exiled again to New York where Soraya was born. Knowing Soroya’s personal history, the Israeli border security racializes Soroya as Israel’s Other, marks her as a critical traveler and pushes her further into the biopolitical techniques of the discriminatory security inspection: interrogations by multiple Israeli officers (who keep reassuring her, “you understand this is for your own security”), a strip search, and an item-by-item examination of her luggage. Close-ups of Soroya’s face shows her humiliated, defeated and frustrated as one officer with gloves methodically examines her hair, and another officer unwraps a gift for inspection.

In Salt of this Sea, Jacir follows a violent scene of colonial displacement in 1948 with a violent scene of border security. In an interview for Alif journal, Jacir states that she wanted her first film to be about the Nakba: “I had never seen a fiction film about the Nakba, and I needed that. I wanted that story to be told.” 104 To tell a contemporary story of the Nakba, Jacir begins with Soraya’s discriminatory security inspection. At the Ben Gurion International Airport, Soraya experiences catastrophic violence to her identity that metaphorically resembles the demolition in the Nakba scene preceding it. Significant

104 Ferial Ghazoul, “‘I wanted that story to be told’ (interview),” Alif: Journal of Comparative Poetics 31 (2011), 241.
elements of Soraya’s American and individual identity become irrelevant and she becomes simply “Palestinian,” a subject of Zionism like her grandfather in 1948.

Jacir uses visual cues to formulate the settler colonial connection between the historical moment of the Nakba and the contemporary moment of border security. Ramallah-based Suad Amiry uses frank dialogue with humor. Her collection of journal-like entries, *Sharon and My Mother-in-Law: Ramallah Diaries* (2005) also begins with an interrogation at the Ben Gurion International Airport in Tel Aviv. Amiry’s investigation takes place in the summer of 1995 at 4:30am on her way back from London.\(^{105}\) In her first chapter, “I Was Not in the Mood”, Amiry shares with the readers that she “certainly was not in the mood to tell the Israeli officer” her family stories in Damascus, Beirut and Amman, and current life in Ramallah. These stories were formed by displacement, colonization, and occupation that are central to Israel’s state formation and all that followed. As in the scene from *Salt of this Sea*, the Israeli border security officer examines her passport and rather nonchalantly asked Amiry, “How come you were born in Damascus?” She answered impulsively, “You kick us out of Jaffa, then wonder how come we’re born elsewhere!” Immediately, Amiry reminds the officer and her readers of Israel’s history of statehood, colonization of Palestine and its consequences for the Palestinian population. Amiry provides the roles of the characters, the action and setting in six words: “You kick us out of Jaffa.” Amiry’s choice of the personal pronoun “You” rather than an institutional term such as “Israel” situates the officer as a representative of Israel’s colonial past and as an actor of Israel’s colonial present. Amiry
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provides the past colonial action as “kick out” with the sentence’s object as “us,” the collective Palestinians, who are the objects of the colonial action. “Kick out” alludes to colonialism, Zionism, capitalism, modernity, development and nation-building that began in British Mandate Palestine. These systems of power backed the State of Israel in kicking Palestinians out of Jaffa, the settler colonial setting for both the fictional character Soraya Tahini and the real Suad Amiry.

Khalidi and Jacir employ the passive voice in describing the process of identification, categorization and identity construction of international Palestinians at crossings. Khalidi writes, “where identities are checked and verified” and “are singled out” and Jacir writes, “become ‘Palestinian’.” The perpetrator is missing in these statements. Who produces the “Palestinian”? What process produces the “Palestinian experience” at a border, an airport and a checkpoint? Amiry clearly states that it is “You,” the border security officer, who made the “Palestinian,” an identity formed by settler colonialism. The border security officer as a state position was also formed alongside the formation of the State of Israel to eliminate, remove, and erase Palestinians from Palestine/Israel.

**Challenging Israel’s Claim of Democracy and Equality**

I examine two cases in which the transnational Palestinian solidarity movement uses Israel’s treatment of Jewish travelers as a means to challenge Israel’s claim to being a democratic state. In her article “The Israeli Police State”, Avigail Abarbanel describes herself as a “Jewish, Israeli born and secular” woman and her husband’s security treatment by Israel as evidence to argue that Israel is a police state.\(^\text{106}\) She recounts her

husband’s experience of emigrating from Israel to Australia in 1991. Abarbanel’s narrative provides several critical subjectivities: a former conforming Israeli citizen, the wife of a former Israeli secret military agent, an emigrant of Israel, and a current Jewish peace activist. Returning to John Durham Peters’ discussion on witnessing, Abarbanel exercises her authority as having experience as both a perpetrator and a victim of Israeli border practices, and thus a producer of knowledge who can contribute to the discourse of Israel’s border practices. As a producer of knowledge, first Abarbanel testifies to the psychologically violent nature of Israel’s border practices and second, she uses her witnessing agency to critique Israel as a fascist state.

The second border crossing case involves American Zionist Jeffrey Goldberg who published an article written in the Ben Gurion International Airport lounge. Goldberg raves about the “politesse” of the “highly-trained young Israeli army veterans” that did not directly ask if he is Jewish. 

Goldberg is not a critical traveler; he was treated exceptionally well by Israeli security officers. Goldberg’s intention is actually to counter the critics of Israel’s border crossing security. But interestingly, his aims backfire when Palestinian solidarity bloggers within Israel take up Goldberg’s experience to discuss Israel’s racism towards Palestinian Israelis. Both narratives also include substantial points for discussion of third state involvement. Abarbanel’s narrative involves the third state, Australia, to which she is emigrating. Goldberg’s narrative provides an opportunity for a public discussion about the U.S.-Israel relationship. I will begin with Abarbanel’s narrative.

Along with the policies regarding the mobility of Palestinians, settler colonialism has also influenced entry/exit policies concerning Jewish citizens. From 1948-1961, Israel’s exit policy prohibited Jewish Israeli citizens to travel abroad temporarily without petitioning the government for a permit, even for short family visits. Orit Rozin examines the interactions between state and citizen represented in hundreds of emotional letters from Jewish citizens in their petitions to leave Israel. They employed “entreaty for help, appeal to compassion, threat to file a lawsuit or attempt suicide, expression of complaint, or denigration of a political figure, political party or the government at large.”\textsuperscript{108} Jewish citizens complained that the prevention of foreign travel is criminal and unjust.\textsuperscript{109} During these early days of statehood, Israel categorized and subjected Jewish citizens based on their criticality – both in terms of importance and in terms of forming critiques of Israel. The permit application allowed government officials to examine the private life of the individual citizen to determine the outcome, and thereby collect intelligence. Unsurprisingly, according to Rozin, only 50% were granted the freedom to exit Israel. Letters that demonstrated loyalty to the Zionist project were granted permission, while letters that requested travel for humanitarian, education, employment and other means were less often granted.\textsuperscript{110} The settler colonial technology of interrogation of travel intentions and plans, control of international mobility, and intelligence collection in relation to citizens can be traced back to these early days of Israel’s statehood. Some
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citizens employed publishing their critiques as a strategy of resistance to Israel’s control of international travel.

Even after the exit policy was abolished, Israel continued to interrogate Jewish citizens who wished to leave Israel. Abarbanel’s account reports on the ways in which Israeli authorities intimidate Jews from leaving Israel. In Abarbanel’s border encounter story, the protagonist is her husband, an Israeli Army Captain who is in the process of exiting Israel rather than entering Israel. Abarbanel and her husband were emigrating from Israel to Australia, which “was not on the list of countries that Israeli officers involved in secret military projects were prohibited from visiting or living in after the end of their service (yes, such a list exists).”

A settler colonial state, Australia has sided with Israel and the United States in major U.N. resolutions concerning the construction of the Wall and settlement expansion. Even when leaving Israel to relocate to a Zionist-supporting third state, the emigration of Israelis upsets the critical mass needed within Israel to maintain the demographic majority of settlers.

Abarbanel and her husband moved from the category of conforming settlers to the category of critical travelers. Previously as conforming settlers, they exercised Zionist tactics with Palestinians and other critical travelers. Abarbanel writes, “Our decision to leave [Israel] apparently placed us in a new position in society, outside that comfortable mainstream.” Now, by attempting to leave Israel, they were subjected to these tactics by
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other conforming settlers. As members of the Israeli military, Abarbanel and her husband were trained in subjecting Palestinians to the same strategies of domination, and thus they recognized the process of identification, categorization, interrogation and intimidation. Abarbanel writes, “Israeli officers are trained to watch body language, micro-expressions, perspiration, anything. The questions themselves are often just a pretext to induce stress so that they can watch their victim carefully to see if he has any secrets.” As an insider and perpetrator, Abarbanel testifies to the biopolitical and expansive strategies of the discriminatory security inspection.

For example, the encounter did not take place at a border crossing such as the airport. In the last stage of receiving permanent residency in Australia, her husband was called to “report to a certain location to ‘chat’” with the Military Police and was then aggressively interrogated by a female Military Police sergeant. As Israel’s border expands out to other nations, seas and into the air and ground, it also goes deeper into the State of Israel where secret rooms are constructed to interrogate and intimidate critical travelers who threaten Zionism. Abarbanel refers to a “certain location” where her ex-husband had to report for his “chat.” The mysterious vagueness of the location implies that Abarbanel either did not know or cannot disclose it because Israel performs these security inspections under the pretext of privacy and secrecy. Abarbanel further confirms how the location is chosen to produce intimidation in their victim: “He was taken to a small room and instructed to sit on a chair in the middle of the room. He was circled by a female Military Police sergeant…” In addition to psychological tactics, the Military Police used spatial arrangements to humiliate the critical Jewish traveler. By 1991, Israel
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had developed additional Zionist techniques of domination through its occupation of the Palestinian territories that it could apply to critical travelers.

Abarbanel’s narrative could imply that her husband’s experience is comparable to the Palestinian experience. However, the sergeant’s tactics of intimidation and aggression were of a much lesser degree than the tactics subjected onto a critical traveler such as Danya Mustafa. Additionally, Abarbanel’s husband exercised his Jewish privilege as he “stood up, reminded her [the sergeant] that he was a Captain and she a Sergeant, and left the room” – actions that are impossible for Mustafa to carry out. Furthermore, Abarbanel publishes her story for different reasons than Mustafa published hers. After the border experience, Mustafa reached out to her community for emotional support. She also wanted to document the security treatment and inform the global community about Israel’s treatment of Palestinians. Abarbanel entitled her narrative “The Israeli Police State” and chose to publish it in *The Electronic Intifada*, a source that centers Palestinian subjectivity. Her primary objective is to argue that Israel is a police state and thus Israel’s democracy is a myth. She demonstrates that the Military Police’s intimidation constitutes the behavior of a police state towards Jewish Israeli citizens, not only Israeli Palestinians and Palestinians in the occupied Palestinian territories. Abarbanel uses a critical traveler’s narrative as a public renunciation of Israel’s founding national narrative and colonial present: “It [Israel] is a powerful police state founded on pathological paranoia with only a veneer of civility, carefully crafted and maintained for the consumption of those who still believe in the myth of Israeli democracy.” ¹¹⁴ Abarbanel continues her argument with reminder to her readers that “All Palestinians live under constant military and police

¹¹⁴ Ibid.
surveillance.” Abarbanel aligns and allies herself with Mustafa and indigenous Palestinians as she compares life in the OPT to living under “a Pinochet-like regime” under which Israel can arbitrarily incarcerate and torture, and intimidate Palestinians into leaving because “what Israel really wants is all the land but without the people.” By invoking the Zionist phrase, Abarbanel argues that settler colonial designs influence Israel’s policies of discrimination security inspections of travelers who enter and exit Israel. Most importantly, Abarbanel provides an example of how Israeli security inspections produce critical travelers. Abarbanel was a conforming Israeli, but upon witnessing the inspection, she provided postcolonial critique from the perspective of the dominant group that is indoctrinated to settle and colonize.

Jeffrey Goldberg’s account of his crossing experience titled, “On Political Correctness at Ben Gurion Airport,” has an opposite objective of the account of Abarbanel. Goldberg’s intentions are to counter the discourse of ideologically critical narratives and to perform as a good Israeli citizen – not a legal one but a cultural citizen living aboard. Goldberg practices his democratic rights as an American to criticize U.S. border policies and affirm Israeli border policies. Goldberg argues that Ben Gurion International Airport’s security procedures are more secure those in the United States and that “Travelers are allowed to keep their shoes on through the physical screening process.” He states that the United States ignores the individual traveler and is only concerned with liquids and other items that are meaningless. He asserts that Israeli border security officers behave with political correctness and “politesse” by not directly asking
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him if he is a Jew. He writes a solution to long lines at Ben Gurion: “it struck me that if these screeners simply cut to the chase on this one crucial question, they’d be able to process passengers more quickly.” He attempts to manipulate the critical discourse that Israeli security officers are rude and invasive in asking personal questions; he argues that they are too polite.

Goldberg’s article itself is antithetical to the critical traveler narrative, yet his published account opened the door to a fury of articles challenging his claims by using the critical traveler as their central character. Rather than shifting the discourse in favor of Israel’s security measures as intended, Goldberg’s brief account provided the opportunity for articles by critical Jewish writers who live or have lived in Israel to highlight Ben Gurion International Airport’s segregation, a system in which Jewish internationals are favored over Palestinian Israeli citizens. The three writers from +972 Magazine discursively painted Goldberg as the naïve “Jew born and raised in the United States” unfamiliar with Israeli social culture and politics. Noam Sheizaf acknowledged that he also has a pleasant and polite experience at Ben Gurion International Airport because he is a Jewish Israeli and Israeli security personnel employ racial profiling against Palestinian Israelis while exempting Jewish Israelis and Jewish tourists. Sheizaf concludes, “Israel is more his [Goldberg’s] country than it is their [Palestinian Israelis’] country.” Mairav Zonszein subsequently argued that Goldberg ignores the humiliation of Palestinians at airports, and worse, implies that “all security needs to know is whether

a traveler is a Jew because a Jew could never pose a threat to airport security.” Lisa Goldman followed up with an article naming several prominent, elite and integrated Palestinian Israeli citizens who were humiliated at the airport: “…imagine how an Arab-Palestinian citizen of Israel who was born and raised in the country, who speaks unaccented, fluent Hebrew, must feel upon reading that an American man glides through airport security simply because he is a Jew.” The Israeli state identified Goldberg as belonging in the us category and all Arabs in the them category. These Israeli writers reversed the state’s categorization. They identified Goldberg as an ignorant American who does not have the authority to speak on Israeli security practices. They take the opportunity to bring the issue of racial profiling of Palestinian Israelis at the airport. For these writers, Palestinian Israelis, as citizens of Israel, belong in the us category. In fact, they are profiled from the airport entrance all the way to the waiting rooms and asked invasive and rude questions (see Table 2).

Goldberg’s narrative is also a useful text for examining counterarguments to those found in critical narratives. For example, he argues for the globalization of Israeli security strategies such as behavior detection and racial profiling. Goldberg begins with, “I’ve always appreciated Ben-Gurion Airport security, mainly because it works on the principle that people are dangerous, not inanimate objects.” In a 2008 article, Goldberg boasted of passing through U.S. airports and Transportation Security Administration


(TSA) checks without a photo ID and with “bad things” such as a book on jihad, a Hezbollah flag, a pro-Osama bin Laden shirt, and Yasir Arafat doll. The TSA security officer “politely” reminded Goldberg to carry a photo ID next time. In his article, Goldberg overlooked that the TSA based their treatment protocol on Goldberg’s identity as a white American male. Raed Jarrar, an Iraqi-Palestinian American architect, was stopped by the TSA for wearing a shirt with Arabic letters and was told by the guard, “Wearing a t-shirt written in Arabic and coming to a US airport is the equivalent of wearing a t-shirt that reads ‘I’m a robber and I’m going to a bank’.” While Goldberg passed freely, Jarrar was questioned – again disproving Goldberg’s assertion that TSA ignores the individual.

Goldberg also disregards the evidence that Palestinian solidarity cultural objects carried by a traveler, such as a book or t-shirt, are grounds for aggressive interrogation, denial of entry and detention at Palestine/Israel international crossings. One of the demands of the 2012 flytilla campaign was that travelers should not have to hide of their intentions to visit the occupied Palestinian territories. Activists proudly displayed Palestinian solidarity materials and disclosed their intentions of going to Bethlehem. (See Figure 2).
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In another narrative from 2004, American citizen Anjali Kamat recounts about her experience of being held up for questioning at the Israel-Egypt border. She was with her two white American friends and they were going to the Aida Refugee Camp as volunteers to build playgrounds. Kamat focuses her narrative on the incriminating objects that the guards find rummaging through the travelers’ bags: a scrap of paper with notes and a t-shirt from the World Tribunal on Iraq, a Turkish mystery novel, a U.S. temporary passport, a photo album from a previous trip to Aida Camp, academic articles on Arab and Palestinian film, and finally a small sticker with “Boycott Israeli Apartheid!” The last object, buried deep in a bag, sealed their denial of entry and expulsion from future visits to Israel. These objects are not a security threat and none could be manufactured into a dangerous weapon but they lead to a political framework that recognizes Israel as a colonial state and occupier of Palestinians, and the border security marked them as critical travelers.
Goldberg’s intentions in his articles were to demonstrate the weakness of U.S. border security that relies on “TSA-naked-scanning machines” and the strength in Israel’s approach of examining each traveler. In actuality, Goldberg confirmed that both TSA and Israeli forms of security inspections favor white Jewish and suspect Arab travelers. In a follow-up article Goldberg writes that he opposes racial/ethnic profiling in the United States: “If the TSA were only looking critically at Arab passengers, for instance, it would miss many other sorts of threats (including, by the way, people of different races and nationalities who have converted to Islam, as in the case of the shoe bomber, Richard Reid).”

Goldberg contends that racial profiling would be an ineffective security measure because it would not be able to profile all Muslims who Goldberg implies are a threat to the United States. Goldberg’s argument calls for the racialization of Muslims and calls for a globalization of this racialization so that all Muslims go through discriminatory security inspections at both American and Israeli airports.

**Challenging Israel’s Anti-Muslim Racism**

The Palestine/Israel border crossing is a significant site for producing Muslims as a singular race, rather than as members of diverse religious, national and cultural groups. Segregated surveillance, biopolitical techniques and international expansion of the Palestine/Israel border crossing support Israel’s domestic and global racial project of representing “Muslim” as a suspicious race regardless of citizenry, especially when
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travelling between nations at international terminals in Israel as well as in third states. In the pretext of security, Israel has the opportunity to categorize the cultural representation of any seemingly Muslim figure as a mobile threat, and thereby justify the normalization of profiling, humiliating, traumatizing, surveiling, and controlling Muslim-named travelers. For instance, as discussed in the section on “Border Expansion,” an El Al representative racially profiled, surveiled and attempted to control the seemingly Muslim reporter at South Africa’s Johannesburg Airport.

Israel’s racial project is conjoined with its settler colonial project. As a settler state grounded in the logic of a Jewish religious supremacy, Israel employs the strategy of racializing Muslims on the global scale in order to secure it settler colonial ambitions; the logic is that if Muslims can be represented as terrorists to be feared, then Jewish settlement in Palestine/Israel would be internationally sanctioned. Israel’s ethnic profiling at the Palestine/Israel international border crossings means that in addition to Palestinians, all people with Muslim-sounding names are subjected to treatment as critical travelers.

In 2008, Abdul-Rahim Jackson, a member of the Alvin Ailey American Dance Theater troupe, was singled out at the Ben Gurion International Airport. Israel’s security asked questions repeatedly about the origin of his name, his family members, his religion,
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and then forced him to dance twice to prove his dancing credentials. Rather than staying silent, Jackson spoke to the press. He stated that it was “embarrassing and unpleasant.” Interestingly, the incident was initially reported by the Israeli online newspaper Ynetnews: “They [Israel border security officers] noticed Jackson’s Muslim first name and that became reason enough to turn him into a suspect.”

Associated Press picked up the story and stated, “Israel is famous for the effectiveness of its airport security. But a key element in its security checks is ethnic profiling.” Discrimination against Muslims of any nationality is normalized, justified, expected and may even be seen as entertaining in Israel. The Ynetnews report has a tinge of humor to it, as if it wrote up the story for entertainment purposes rather than as an expository piece on a serious violation of human rights. The story was widely reported because of its gossip and star value; Israel’s profiling of Muslim-named individuals was reported as a justified element of security of a state that Associated Press wrote, “is constantly on the alert for attack because of the Israel-Palestinian conflict and extremist Islamic rejection of the Jewish state’s existence.”

The Israeli border security officer even advised Jackson to change his name and forfeit his identity. Unsurprisingly, Jackson and the dance company did not press any charges, the Israel border security refused to apologize to Jackson, and Israel’s policy of ethnic profiling has been unaffected by this incident and its reporting. And the United States did not reprimand Israeli security, even though the United States

---

126 Reuven Weiss, “If you want to enter Israel, dance,” Ynetnews.com, Sep 8, 2008.
127 Federman, “US dancer.”
128 Ibid.
has referred to the Alvin Ailey Dance Theater as a “vital American cultural ambassador to the world.”

While Israel partially succeeds in its objective of vilifying Muslims, Israel’s production of critical travelers also generates the production of narratives that critique Israeli policies, in this case, of ethnic profiling. Referring to herself as “An American-born U.S. citizen,” Shereen Shafi writes on her Wordpress blog a detailed account and analysis of her experience traveling through Ben Gurion International Airport. Shafi writes that she and her accompanying hijab-ed traveler Sundus – “an American-born Muslim of Egyptian descent,” were separated from their study tour group as the only students with Muslim names.\(^{129}\) Shafi and Sundus were interrogated multiple times for several hours; an Israeli border officer also recorded Shafi’s Palestinian contacts from her itinerary, explicitly collecting intelligence on Palestinian groups. Shafi was excited about visiting Israel, a country that she “had been learning about for so long, a country that many of my friends love and cherish.” Shafi’s narrative expresses astonishment at Israel’s racism against Muslims and Arabs at the airport. Shafi’s story exemplifies how Israel’s discriminatory security inspection produces critical travelers who may arrive with a degree of acceptance, ignorance and/or leniency towards Israel, but are invoked to write critical narratives after being targeted by Israel’s racism. Shafi’s main critique is Israel’s racism against Muslims and Arabs. She asks, “**How good can your security measures be if they are capable of wasting excessive time and resources on two obviously harmless travelers like me and Sundus?**” [bold in original].” Shafi acknowledges that
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Israel’s racism is at the level of the state’s official policy, that it is rooted in Israel’s history of settlement as a Jewish majority state, and that it extends beyond the airport and into all factions of Israeli society. Anti-Muslim racism is not an isolated discriminatory act, but an intentional racial project structurally violent against Muslims as a group.\textsuperscript{130} Shafi argues that Israel’s racism bolsters the occupation and prevents the annexation of Palestinian territory. Like Abdul-Rahim Jackson, Shafi expected that her American identity would shield her from Israel’s racism even as she knows “Muslims who have been discriminated against in my own country.” Yet, the experience was “outrageous” for her. Both Jackson and Shafi expected that the United States would advocate on their behalf; however, the United States foremost recognizes Israel as its political and military ally and as a sovereign nation-state with the right to set its border crossing practices.

**Challenging U.S. Policy Regarding Palestinian American Travel**

In the case of Sandra Tamari, the United States demonstrated confusion and inconsistency about its own policy regarding assisting Palestinian Americans at the Palestine/Israel border crossings. During a State Department Press Briefing, Associate Press reporter Matthew Lee questioned the Deputy Spokesperson Mark C. Toner about the denial of assistance to Tamari assistance as a Palestinian American. Toner provided the politically correct answer according to American liberal mores: “What is very clear is that we would never deny assistance to any American citizen, regardless of their religious or ethnic background.”\textsuperscript{131} The state official gave a response that Americans expect - that equality in American citizenship would be respected internationally. Toner’s reply
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implies that either Tamari lied or that Toner is unaware of the border crossing agreement between the United States and Israel. Rhetorically, the official reassured the audience that the United States adheres to its promise of civil rights. In practice, the United States had adopted the settler colonial framework of the Israel’s Jewish racial supremacy and Palestinian subordinancy.

The United States traveler advisory website continues to state: “by virtue of ancestry, will be treated for immigration purposes as residents of the West Bank and Gaza, regardless of whether they also hold U.S. citizenship.” It further states that Palestinian Americans will be “subject to the same restrictions on movements between Israel, the West Bank, and Gaza and within the West Bank and Gaza as those imposed by Israel on PA residents.” With such a disclaimer, Palestinian Americans are no longer “American” at Palestine/Israel international border crossings and the U.S. government exonerates itself of responsibility to its Palestinian American citizens. Both U.S. and Israel conspire to temporarily but completely denationalize Palestinian Americans when they travel to Palestine/Israel. If the U.S. Embassy in Israel refuses to recognize them American citizens, and both the United States and Israel do not recognize Palestine as a state, the Palestinian American has no citizenship to claim.

The Senate Bill 462 United States-Israel Strategic Partnership Act of 2013 included a section for Israel’s entry into the U.S. Visa Waiver Program, a program that allows for business and personal tourists from participating countries to travel to the

United States without having to obtain a visa. Participating countries, in turn, allow for Americans to travel to their countries without a visa. However, the bill uniquely exempted reciprocal treatment of Americans entering Israel, enabling Israel’s exceptionalism. The bill illustrated U.S. agency in dictating travel protocols between the two states, and at the same time, U.S. complicity in authorizing racial and political discrimination against Americans at Israel’s border under the guise of security. The legislation did not address the travel advisory that U.S. citizens with Palestinian ethnicity are not permitted to enter Israel via Ben Gurion International Airport, and it ignored the discrimination against Muslim Americans. The legislation also missed the opportunity to address the right of Americans to travel to the occupied Palestinian territories and to hold different political views of the conflict. That is, the legislation kept the discriminatory status quo at Palestine/Israel’s borders while it proposed that the visa requirement be waived for Israelis travelling to the United States.

The Palestinian solidarity network used Sandra Tamari’s testimony along with many testimonies of critical travelers as key evidence to intervene with the Senate version that exempted Israel’s reciprocity. When the bill went to Congress, it stated that Israel can only participate “when Israel satisfies, and as long as Israel continues to satisfy, the requirements for inclusion in such program specified in such section.” If critical travelers had stayed silent about their treatment, it is likely that Israel would have been granted entry with the exemption of reciprocity, adding to the list of exceptions that the United States makes for Israel.
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Fostering Solidarity Across International Institutions

The critical travelers discussed thus far have been individual citizen subjects. In this last example, I examine international law professor Richard Falk’s denial of entry. On December 14th, 2008, Falk arrived at the Ben Gurion International Airport where Israel subjected him as a critical traveler: denied him entry, detained him overnight, deported him back to the United States, and expelled him from future visits to Palestine/Israel. Falk’s denial of entry is unlike any other discussed in this essay because Falk was traveling to Palestine/Israel to carry out his professional duties as the United Nations Human Rights Council (UNHRC) Special Rapporteur in the Occupied Palestinian Territory (OPT).\footnote{The official title of the position is “Special rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Palestinian territories occupied since 1967.”} The position was created in a 1993 U.N. resolution mandating frequent investigations, documentations and reports of Israel’s violations of the principles of international law, international humanitarian law, and the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War in the Palestinian territories until the end of Israel’s occupation.\footnote{U.N. Commission on Human Rights, 49th Session, Official Records, “Resolution 1993/2 (A+B) [Question of the violation of human rights in the occupied Arab territories, including Palestine]” (E/CN.4/RES/1993/2 (A+B), February 19, 1993, Paragraph 4. Available on http://unispal.un.org/.)} It became clear from the start of this new appointment that in order to fulfill the mandate, the Special Rapporteur would need to visit Palestine/Israel in person, and consequently, obtain the authorization of the Israeli Government, the very government that this Special Rapporteur is mandated to...
investigate and hold accountable.\textsuperscript{136} Israel reluctantly granted permission to past special rapporteurs. With the expulsion of Falk, Israel set a precedent of denying entry to a person in a United Nations appointed position, and to require Israel’s approval in the assignment. Although not a territorial expansion, this is yet another form of expansion of Israel’s control of the border.

Israel’s Foreign Ministry defended its action in a public statement claiming that the U.N. position’s mandate is inherently biased and imbalanced, as it does not consider human rights violations committed by the Palestinian authorities.\textsuperscript{137} Additionally, Israel insisted that Falk’s “highly politicized views” work at “legitimizing Hamas terrorism and drawing shameful comparisons to the Holocaust,” and that he therefore traveled uninvited to Israel.\textsuperscript{138} As a U.N. member state, Israel has the legal means to address its concerns about the position’s mandate; however, rather than addressing concerns, the state chose to accuse an internationally renowned human rights expert of abetting terrorism and to elicit sympathies by invoking the Holocaust. Five days after the denial, Falk recounted his border incident in \textit{The Guardian}. He wrote that he had expected questions about his mission, but he had not anticipated that Israel would treat him like a “security threat, subjected to an inch-by-inch body search and the most meticulous luggage inspection” he had ever witnessed, and that he would be “confined, which amounted to a cram course on
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the miseries of prison life.” Falk was not only deferentially deported back to the United States; he was inspected and imprisoned as a terrorism suspect, and treated as if the institution that he worked for – the United Nations – is a terrorist organization. Israel maintained that it was all within its national right to do what it pleased with Falk. However, because Falk is an elected U.N. representative, his access to Palestine/Israel is an international decision, not Israel’s national decision. Falk represented the figure of the critical traveler who is both a subject and an agent for transnational critique.

In response to Israel’s denial of entry to Falk, international human rights organizations published statements on the utility of the Special Rapporteur’s research and analysis. The Arab Israeli organization Adalah: The Legal Center for Arab Minority Rights published an urgent open letter to Israel’s Minister of Interior:

Prof. Falk’s arbitrary denial of entry into Israel is a severe blow to the rights of the Palestinian civilian population living under occupation, a population which must be afforded protection by the occupier under international humanitarian law. Denying Prof. Falk’s entry also impairs the work of numerous human rights organizations and human rights defenders working in Israel and the oPt [sic] to protect and advance the human rights of Palestinians.140 Adalah identifies the international significance of the Special Rapporteur who collaborates with Palestinian government officials and human rights organizations as well as neighboring state governments and non-state actors in order to grasp and assess the human rights situation in the occupied Palestinian territories. Falk’s reports are then employed by human rights organizations throughout the world working to advance human rights of Palestinians living in Palestine/Israel and living as refugees in various
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international locations. Israel’s treatment of Palestinians and entry decisions at the border have material consequences for Palestinians and international humanitarian work throughout the world, not only at the crossings into Palestine/Israel. Moreover, the process undermines the authority of international organizations and strengthens Israel’s own influence as a nation-state and as a hegemonic global power. Palestine/Israel’s settler colonial present is also internationalized through support from global regimes countered by challenges from transnational actors entwined in human services and political resistance. Regimes of global governance, such as the United States and Britain, buttress and are buttressed by Zionism through such means as economic trade, financial assistance for military technology, diplomatic and political support, and control of media. Adalah legally challenges Israel’s claim that Falk’s invitation and acceptance/denial of entry are exclusively determined by Israel.

In another response, the Ramallah-based NGO Al-Haq outlined Israel’s pattern of violating international human rights law in the OPT and its noncompliance with the United Nations, including not granting permission for Special Rapporteurs on Torture and Degrading Punishment, Violence Against Women and Adequate Housing. Al-Haq specializes in international law as it pertains to the legal status of Israel as an occupying power. Al-Haq called upon “UN Member States to exert pressure on Israel to grant
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Professor Falk a visa to enter Israel and the OPT in his official capacity as Special Rapporteur.” By calling on other states, Al-Haq regards the intervention and authority of other states as within the legality of international law; Al-Haq’s call bolsters the notion that a Palestine/Israel international crossing such as the Ben Gurion International Airport in Tel Aviv is not exclusively under the sovereignty of Israel if its legal status is that of an occupying power.

The influence of Israel’s settler colonial structure of Zionism is pronounced to entities like Adalah and Al-Haq. Meanwhile, its influence is denied, mute, invisible and irrelevant to Israel and the United States. Israeli officials, such as Israel’s Attorney General, responded to critiques of Israel’s border control by citing the nationalistic Entry into Israel Law (1952):

A person who isn’t an Israeli citizen has no vested right to enter Israel. The authority for allowing entry lies with the competent authority. The rule is that when this authority exercises its power, it will naturally take into account the security of the public and the state.\(^\text{143}\)

Denial is one of key characteristics of settler colonial societies. The claim that a non-Israeli citizen has “no vested right to enter Israel” denies the history of Israel founded on settler colonialism, Israel’s occupation of Palestinian territories, and the existence of Palestinian refugees scattered throughout the world. The claim also denies that Israel is an occupying power, and thus must allow international access to Palestinians living in Palestine/Israel.

In fact, Shin Bet denied entry to Falk especially because Israel was organizing to

\(^{143}\) This statement by Attorney General Yehuda Weinstein is quoted in the following article: Ofer Edelman, “Shin Bet Can Continue to Access Tourists’ Emails Upon Arrival at Ben-Gurion, AG Says,” The Ha’aretz, April 25, 2013. The full text of Entry into Israel Law is available at several websites including Knesset.gov.il and Israel Law Resource Center (http://www.israellawresourcecenter.org/).
advance its settler colonial project of eliminating the native. Falk’s account was predictive; he writes that there were signs of a “threatened Israeli reoccupation [of Gaza after the 2005 Disengagement],” and he wanted to make the situation transparent “before such a catastrophe happens.”\footnote{144} Just thirteen days after Falk was denied entry, Israel launched its 22-day Operation Cast Lead that deployed Israel’s navy, air force, and army for a sea, air, and ground invasion of the Gaza Strip. Israel’s sudden attack on multiple civilian sites in Gaza had been secretly and meticulously planned for six months, taking into account dates and times of the U.S. presidential transition and inauguration, Christmas holidays, Sabbath, and crowds in Gaza City.\footnote{145} The Washington Institute for Near East Policy reported that Operation Cast Lead required strong collaboration between the intelligence wing of Israel’s military agency Israel Defense Forces (IDF) and Israel’s internal intelligence agency, Shin Bet, which is assigned to make all final decisions on entries and denials into Palestine/Israel. As early as November 2008, Israel was in the process of banning Israeli and foreign media from Gaza. Shin Bet orchestrated Falk’s detainment, denial and deportation being well aware of Israel’s impending attack on Gaza.\footnote{146} Having a U.N. investigator in the region would have interfered with Israel’s plans of war.

Israel enacted immense state authority by denying Richard Falk. Nevertheless, it was unable to convince the international community that Falk is biased. Falk remained in
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\footnote{146} Falk also discusses the relationship between his expulsion and the Gaza War in an interview on the show “Beneath the Surface” with Michael Slate, KPFK 90.7FM, Los Angeles, January 6, 2009. Recording available by contacting www.kpfk.org.
his position and continued to publish reports in the capacity of the Special Rapporteur.

For the next six years of Falk’s assignment, Falk’s reports included a reminder of Israel’s non-cooperation and legal culpability of third states:

This Special Rapporteur was expelled in December 2008 when attempting to enter Israel to carry out a mission of the mandate to visit occupied Palestine, and detained overnight in unpleasant prison conditions. Such humiliating non-cooperation represents a breach of the legal duty of States Members of the United Nations to facilitate all official undertakings of the organization.147

In Falk’s report on the denial of his entry, the border crossing concerns are recorded along with human rights violations. In his statement, Falk includes Israel’s humiliating treatment and arbitrary imprisonment of critical travelers, unilateral power to make entry decisions to Palestine/Israel, non-cooperation with the international community, and third state negligence and responsibility.

The boycott is an act of tough love to achieve justice through peaceful means. Alicia Keys’ concert, on the other hand, served to legitimize and normalize Israeli policies of violence, occupation, incarceration, segregation, and settlement.148

- Robin D.G. Kelley

V. CONCLUSION

In this conclusion, I summarize the three-pronged argument that I have presented. I have argued that Israel’s treatment of critical travelers is a settler colonial technology. I have also argued that the United States is a third state that has historically supported and continues to support Israel’s control of Palestine/Israel international border crossings. And finally, I have argued that critical travelers are not only subjects of Israel’s settler colonial project, but are also agents of social change. After the summarization of my arguments below, I discuss the Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions (BDS) movement, a global Palestinian-led movement that calls for boycott, divestment and sanctions against Israel until it complies with international law and until Israel ends the occupation, allows for equality for Palestinians, and for the right to return for all Palestinians.149 The BDS movement has co-opted Israel’s strategy of targeting critical travelers. To counter Israel, BDS targets public figures and challenges them to adopt a decolonial framework when travelling to Palestine/Israel.

Since Israel’s founding, under the pretext of security, Israel has developed border control technologies with the settler colonial objective towards the elimination of the


native Palestinian. In this paper, I discussed the specific strategies of segregated surveillance, intelligence, biopolitics and expansion that Israel subjects “critical travelers” who it deems are critical to and/or critical of its settler colonial project to eliminate the Palestinian native from Palestine/Israel. Using technologies of separation, isolation and segregation, Israel limits movement of international travelers. All of these technologies are used to identify and subject critical travelers, and control the degree and type of international contact that Israel affords to Palestinians living in Palestine/Israel. With each encounter with a critical traveler, Israel builds its biopolitical strategies, collects information about Palestinians and Palestinian solidarity, and limits international access to Palestine/Israel. To constrain international solidarity with Palestinians, Israel shields the everyday life of Palestinians in the occupied territories from internationals and Israeli citizens by having excessive unilateral control of who can and cannot enter Palestine/Israel. It thereby isolates Palestinians living in Palestine/Israel from the social, cultural, political, and economic benefits of international engagement. Israel also prohibits professional, familial, and educational visitation contact among Palestinians located in the West Bank, the Gaza Strip, “48” Israel, and outside of Palestine/Israel.

One of the major objectives of segregation is surveillance of the Palestinian population. Israel also utilizes the border crossing to collect intelligence about the locations and activities of Palestinians and other critical travelers who are potentially in solidarity with Palestinians and working towards decolonization. Israel employs biopolitical strategies such as racial profiling, humiliation, interrogation, intimidation, and arbitrary detention to deter undesired critical travelers from returning to Palestine/Israel. Israel expands its jurisdiction and control of movement over travelers
beyond the Palestine/Israel borders to control travel to Palestine/Israel. Some of its expansion sites have included Israeli airlines terminals at international airports, other airlines that travel to Israel, the international sea, and other countries’ seaports from which ships depart for Israel. To obscure its colonial objectives, Israel has produced a system of rhetoric with refrains about national sovereignty and security. When the international community critiques Israel’s entry denial decisions and treatment of critical travelers, Israel and its supporters respond with, “Israel [as a sovereign nation] has the right to defend itself.”

Third states have the agency to hold Israel accountable as an occupying power and a settler colonial state that is functioning outside of international law. Third states can support, reprimand or challenge Israel’s entry decisions, especially when Palestinians, their own citizens or international representatives are targeted as critical travelers, subjected to Israeli state biopolitical techniques and the collection of intelligence. Third states can also allow or disallow Israeli airlines to identify critical travelers through racial profiling and to collect intelligence from critical travelers at their airports and seaports.

The United States is a third state, Israel’s closest ally, and the world’s imperial superpower. It has been in collusion with Israel in the treatment and entry decisions of critical travelers - including Palestinian, international representatives and U.S. citizens. In addition to failing to advocate for critical travelers, the United States has supported Israel’s unilateral control of Palestine/Israel international border crossings through policymaking and rhetoric. To obscure its colonial objectives, Israel has produced a system of rhetoric with refrains about national sovereignty and security. When the international community critiques Israel’s entry denial decisions and treatment of critical
travelers, Israel and the United States respond with, “Israel [as a sovereign nation] has the right to defend itself.”

I examined two policymaking moments, the 1993/1995 Oslo Accords and the 2005 Disengagement of Gaza, when the United States assumed the role of an objective negotiator, however, it succumbed to Israel in demanding unilateral control of Palestine/Israel international border crossings. In the case of the Disengagement Plan, the United States even agreed to entirely exclude Palestinians from the negotiation table. Both policymaking moments had severe consequences for Palestinian mobility and international access to Palestinian territories. Wherever located, the Palestine/Israel international border crossing with its production of critical travelers is a potent site for the advancement of powerful global systems such as settler colonialism, imperialism, racism, white supremacy, nationalism, orientalism, neoliberalism, and Zionism (though not all are explicitly discussed in this paper).

The Palestine/Israel international border crossing is also a formidable site of transnational resistance involving states, NGOs, individual activists, educational institutions, grassroots groups, international institutions and coalitions. Critical travelers write narratives that inform the cultural, legal, historical and political discourse about Israel’s settler colonialism and third state complicity. Critical travelers also use their narratives as an opportunity to critique different aspects of Israeli coloniality, such as anti-Muslim racism and claim to democracy. Filmmakers use the representation of the critical traveler to remember the Nakba and challenge Israel’s national story of independence. With each discriminatory security inspection of a critical traveler, the discourse of the transnational Palestinian solidarity movement collects information about
Israel’s system of dominance at Palestine/Israel border crossings. The Palestinian solidarity network employs the experiences of critical travelers at opportune times. In one instance, the Palestinian and solidarity legal activists successfully used Israel’s discrimination against Palestinian American travelers to protest Israel’s entry into the U.S. Visa Waiver program. In another instance, Israeli journalists intervened by citing the border treatment of Palestinian Israelis when a prominent American Jewish journalist complimented the “politesse” of the border security officers at Ben Gurion International Airport. Now, I will discuss one more instance of how the Palestinian solidarity network has employed Israel’s treatment of critical travelers for social change.

Returning to my own experience at the border, the field school faculty pointed to me after several hours of waiting, and ordered the young Israeli male border security officer to let me through: “She has nothing to do with this place! This looks bad for Israel! Just let her go through!” The statement was made out of frustration as a way to manipulate the onerous situation (and I believe it worked). Yet, there is an important question to pursue from his statement that as a non-Palestinian, I have nothing to do with this place. What does an Indian-born naturalized American citizen with a Muslim name have to do with Israel’s occupation and colonization of Palestine? At the beginning of the trip, the answer to the question seemed to be that the Israeli border apparatus is racist against Muslims and people of color. However, after our ten-day alternative tour of Palestine/Israel, that answer is too simple. The anti-Muslim racism at the border crossing is just one of the many tools that serves how Israel maintains the settler colonial present in Palestine/Israel. We visited the Dheisheh Refugee Camp, the Wadi Fukin Village, Hebron, Jerusalem, Nablus, Qalqilia, Nazareth, and the sites of destroyed Palestinian
villages Dayr Yassin, Saffuriyya, Dayr Al Hawa, and Zakariya. In each of these places, we witnessed and learned about the varieties of settler colonial technologies of erasure and occupation.150

On the last day of the field school, we gathered in a restaurant in Ramallah and spoke with members of the BDS campaign. The movement has had major victories with third states refusing business to Israel and Israeli corporations. For example, Norway and Brazil have both cut ties with Elbit Systems - the symbol of Israeli apartheid – due to public pressure from proponents of the BDS movement. The BDS campaign also targets high-profile personalities who are invited to Israel. These figures have included Macy Gray, Joy Harjo, Alicia Keys, Stephen Hawking, Red Hot Chili Peppers, and other entertainers, academics, and speakers. In contrast to critical travelers, Israel wants these public figures to visit Israel and treat it like any other normal nation-state for their tour. Ironically, Israel prefers artists of color because their visit to Israel supports its claims of a racially equal democratic society and its alignment with the racially oppressed. The BDS campaign intervenes on the artist’s travel to Israel by informing the artist of Israel’s colonization and the Palestinian call to boycott travel to Israel as a means of nonviolent direct action. By going to Israel and supporting settler colonial institutions within Israel, the artists “legitimize and normalize Israeli policies of violence, occupation, incarceration, segregation, and settlement” as Robert D.G. Kelley, Alice Walker, Omar Barghouti, and others argue. The BDS campaign does not argue for a blanket boycott of all travel to Palestine/Israel. It calls for a decolonial framework for travelling to

150 Alex Lubin and et al., “The Israel/Palestine Field School.” The article written by faculty and students of the field school goes into more detail about our experiences at these places.
Palestine/Israel that both critiques coloniality and produces knowledge from the Palestinian experience as the colonized.\textsuperscript{151}

The BDS strategy of targeting public figures has effectively flipped Israel’s categorizing of which travelers are critical to its settler colonial project. The BDS movement singles out travelers who otherwise “have nothing to do with Palestine/Israel”, and marks them as indeed very critical to freedom, justice and equality of Palestine. The Palestinian solidarity network forces these travelers to take the \textit{obstructed} path to Palestine/Israel even though Israel has designated them to go through, figuratively and literally, the unobstructed path bypassing Israeli colonial technologies of dominance. BDS activists obstruct the travelers’ path to Israel with thousands of testimonies, arguments, narratives, historical facts, legal documents, emails, pleas, petitions, and a plethora of information about Palestine/Israel. The public figure often argues, “Leave me alone…this has nothing to do with me.” But the BDS movement provides the analysis of how everyone throughout the world is implicated in Israel’s violence, occupation, incarceration, segregation, and settlement of Palestine. The BDS movement calls people of conscience in the international community to shoulder the moral responsibility to fight injustice.

In light of this call, we can all become critical travelers.

\textsuperscript{151} Alex Lubin and et al., “The Israel/Palestine Field School.” These are examples of groups that organize decolonial travel to Palestine: Alternative Tours (Palestine), Birthright Unplugged, Free Gaza Movement (Cyprus), Go Palestine: A Summer Experience for Diaspora Palestinian Youth and Friends, Interfaith Peace-Builders: Delegations to Israel/Palestine, International Solidarity Movement, and Palestine Summer Encounter: Volunteer, Study Arabic, Host Families.
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